



**Trinity Legacies Review Working Group**

**Friday 10<sup>th</sup> March 2023**

**2.00pm**

**Present:** Eoin O’Sullivan (Chair), Aidan Marsh (Secretary), Gabrielle Fullam (SU), Chloe Staunton (SU), Francis O’Toole (AHSS), Siobhan Ward (HS), Patrick Wyse Jackson (STEM), Rachel Moss (IFUT), Kevin Byrne (SIPTU), Francis Hendron (UNITE), Helen Shenton (Librarian), Catherine O’Mahony (Comms), David O’Shea (Dev. & Alumni), Sinead McBride (College Solicitor), Patrick Walsh (TCL), Catriona Crowe (formerly of the NAI)

**Apologies:** Mihai Mesteru (SU), David Quinn (Craft Unions), Clíona O’Farrelly (Fellows), Linda Hogan (AVPEDI), Lynn Scarff (NMI)

**TLRWG/22-23/014**

**Minutes of the Meeting of 10<sup>th</sup> March 2023**

The minutes of the meeting of 10<sup>th</sup> March 2023 were approved.

**TLRWG/22-23/015**

**Update on the Inishbofin Remains**

College has been engaging in discussion with the Island community which has expressed a desire to bury the remains and are in the process of constructing a coffin according to local tradition. An issue has arisen in that both graveyards, a monastic graveyard and a community graveyard, have been found to be designated archaeological sites. The Island community is seeking ministerial permission for the interment via Galway County Council.

The current proposal of the Island community is that the reburial take place on the anniversary of the removal of crania in July. A hearse will be dispatched to College with the coffin to facilitate the transport of the crania and the College Chaplains will provide a blessing if needed.

A query was raised as to what criteria the decision of Board was based. It was advised that the relevant minute of Board be consulted for that information.

A related letter has been received by the Senior Dean in relation to crania obtained on an expedition to Finian’s Bay, which also form a part of the Haddon-Dixon Collection. This is another matter to be reviewed by the Working Group in due course. However, at present no known information on the acquisition of these crania exists

**TLRWG/22-23/016**

**Updates & Discussion on the Berkeley Legacy**

The options reached by the Working Group at the meeting of 10<sup>th</sup> March 2023 are to go before Board at their April meeting.

The Senior Dean has met with representatives of the Department of Classics. The present departmental position is that they wish to rename the medals if possible. However there will first be a requirement to speak with the College Solicitor to determine whether such a change may be possible, and with the Financial Services Division to discuss what funds remain in the benefaction.

With regard to the various portraits of Berkeley in the College Art Collections, the preferred option of the Working Group is that the Provost and Curator of the University Art Collection re-establish the College Art Collections Advisory Group.

The preferred option of retaining and explaining the Chapel window has been discussed with the College Chaplains who will bring the matter to the Chapel Committee. That body will establish a recommendation on how to explain the window which will be returned to the Legacies Working Group.

The Working Group was unanimous in its view that the preferred option presented to Board regarding de-naming the Library should be clear that it is not about “cancelling” Berkeley as a writer, philosopher and intellectual historical figure, and that his work should still be taught at Trinity and that Berkeley’s philosophical work remains relevant today.

Discussion took place as to whether the Working Group is in favour of providing stronger direction in the options it presents. There was a general acknowledgment that the Working Group is required to provide options; however it was noted that if the available evidence would provide stronger weight to a particular option, there is scope to use this for re-enforcement if the Working Group feels it to be suitable.

**TLRWG/22-23/017**

**Discussion on Draft Guidelines & Procedures on Legacy Issues at Trinity College Dublin**

A Philanthropic Naming Policy is at the draft stage and due to be approved by the Executive Officers’ Group. Any future names relating to contemporary individuals will be the province of the Philanthropic Naming Group.

It was asked if there may be anything in the philanthropic donor process that would be of relevance to the Working Group. The current process can be found in the documentation for the Gift Acceptance Committee and may be examined further in the future regarding further criteria in relation to values.

There was discussion as to whether the Working Group should be using the same process in how it looks at past names as other groups in relation to contemporary names. It was also raised if the Working Group should look at other policies, such as the College Ethics Policy. It was the view of the Working Group that there may be a need on a College-wide basis, to aim towards a unified ‘future-proofed’ criteria, because Legacy work is about fostering future values as well as examining the past.

It was noted that the Geology Collection is not a part of the Collections & Monuments listing. It was suggested that a recommendation be made that the collection be added *to the listing*. It was also recommended that the Gift Acceptance Committee circulate their principles to the curators of the various College collections, because those areas are frequently the recipients of offers of gifts which may not be within the standard province of the Gift Acceptance Committee.

David O’Shea from Trinity Alumni and Development, the Chair of the Gift Acceptance Committee (Professor Linda Hogan) and the College Solicitor (Sinead McBride) are to meet with the Chair of the TLRWG to discuss integrating elements the draft College Naming Policy, the College Ethics Policy (which are under review) and the Gift Acceptance policy into the draft guidelines on legacy issues to ensure there is consistency across these College policies.

**TLRWG/22-23/018**

**Discussion on Working Group Terms of Reference**

As public submissions come through, there will be the need to delegate local issues to appropriate areas. It may be the duty of the Working Group to decide what issues should be considered “local” and what issues should be considered relating to the wider college community.

The de-naming of the Schrodinger Lecture Theatre was considered as an example of what might come before the Working Group in future, and whether, if the same matter occurred today, it would be considered by the Working Group for a greater consultative process or if it would instead be referred to the School of Physics as it was at the time. There was general consensus that such would be a matter for the Working Group if a similar case arose. It was also discussed that, in general, legacy issues should come to the Working Group even if later referred to a local level for the purposes of record keeping.

It was agreed that a set submission period would allow for prioritising and dividing the review process over the course of a year. There will need to be a communications strategy around the submissions process for clarity about the consultation period. It was thought that a broad template could be designed to be filled in as part of the submission. Suggested questions included “What is your connection to the material proposed in the submission”, and it was suggested that examples could be given of an “evidence-based submission” It was recognised that the questions of any such form should be designed intelligently, compassionately, and accessibly.

Work is currently underway on a Legacies website which will be used as a submissions portal.

**TLRWG/22-23/015**

**Any Other Business**

It was noted that the Working Group’s efforts could be used in a case study for any organisations going about undertaking similar matters, and that the College has been approached about being a case study in a research proposal.