Wednesday, August 12, 2020 Meeting

Presidential Commission on University History

Discussion

Recognized need to address the scope and goals of the subcommittee; need to determine if/how research overlaps with University History committee?

Discussed process for assimilating existing research, identifying gaps that need to be addressed, and recommendation for how the research should be coordinated and organized. Recognizing that resources are limited, and acknowledging recommendations that students are involved in the process, the committee discussed the value of having dedicated faculty oversight beyond the committee. Suggestions for oversight included: Lydia Brandt (SVAD), Thomas Brown (History), Bob Weyeneth (Public History), Allison Marsh (Public History), Jessica Elfenbein (History – department chair). Asked if Elizabeth West should serve on this committee also?

Understanding that this must be a very thorough and thoughtful process AND that students are eager for some progress, committee agreed to prioritize up to five names for research and use to build case studies that could help define future criteria.

In an effort to identify gaps, suggestion made to reach out to past students who previously worked on UofSC history research projects.

Committee briefly discussed criteria that could be used to determine whether or not a name should be removed from a building (acknowledged changes could go beyond buildings to rooms, portraits, sculpture housed in university settings). Criteria included: association with the university; time period of association and correlation with time of naming; position of power, did they actively oppress other people, contribute to the progress of the university, state, etc.; how does "repentance" factor in? do we consider a person's evolution over time?

Suggestions that renaming could go beyond a connection to USC, especially for African Americans who were not admitted to the university between the end of Reconstruction and 1963. Some names mentioned briefly: Althea Gibson, Celia Saxon, Joe Frazier, Eliza and Harry Briggs, Sr.

Action Items

Research processes and criteria at other institutions

Send suggestions for criteria: Create a document to develop criteria to assess; have this well developed for discussion at next meeting

Research template: Create a document to gather consistent information about each researched name

Gather basic information on each of the five names identified

Recommendations

- 1. Create a common space for committee to share documents and information (possibly through Teams)
- 2. Ask the full committee about the possibility of a faculty member overseeing research through a course buy-out or other method
- 3. Begin research on five names: Thurmond, Cooper, Hampton, Thornwell, Lieber (?)

Monday, September 14, 2020 Meeting Presidential Commission on University History

Discussion

Update on research assistant:

- The research assistant will primarily work at least initially on the Names subcommittee to develop general information about the people for whom the buildings are named
- Elizabeth will share a job description with us when completed
- Possibly temp or graduate student for immediate work

Teams documents and committee work:

- Reminder to subcommittee to review documents, add peer institution renaming guidelines for committee review
- Use Teams to begin developing broad criteria for discussion

Criteria:

 Extensive discussion on how to develop and discuss criteria; suggestion to begin broadly looking at individual's writings, speeches, memberships, articulated views on slavery or segregation, slave ownership, Carolinian Creed

Recommendations work:

- Incorporation of public input in recommendations work
- The importance of the committee employing a democratic process in arriving at recommendations
- Categories for recommendations: remove, remain, needs further research
- Prioritize: highest concerns to lower concerns

Action Items

Interim report by end of the semester with fuller report in the spring, brief information on each person for which a building is named.

Research processes and criteria at other institutions (UNC Chapel Hill, UVA, Princeton) in order to develop and compare criteria to assess

Create biographical descriptions for the five prioritized names:

• Files basic research created for: Thurmond, Cooper, Hampton, Thornwell, Lieber

Schedule a subcommittee meeting exclusively for discussion about criteria

Wednesday, October 14, 2020 Full Commission Meeting Presidential Commission on University History

Date of the Subcommittee meeting: October 7, 2020

Discussion

Research assistant:

 Melissa Develvis has begun work researching names on the landscape, prioritizing the first five identified individuals. Melissa and I will be in contact on a consistent basis to discuss progress, challenges and other questions that may arise.

Criteria:

- Further discussion on how to develop criteria.
- Agreed to use UNC's principles document as a foundational guide to modify and augment their existing work in forming our own criteria.

Action Items

• Created a working group within the subcommittee to create and modify criteria. Three members volunteered. The first draft of criteria is now being worked on by these three members. Once we have each had a chance to read, comment and revise on each other's contributions, I will send that draft to the full Names on the Landscape Subcommittee and schedule another meeting for members to provide feedback, revise, etc. in the fourth week of October. Once the draft document is acceptable to the majority, I will send it to Elizabeth West to be shared with the full commission.

Monday, November 2, 2020 Full Commission Meeting Presidential Commission on University History Date of the Subcommittee meeting: October 28, 2020

Action Items Completed

- Created a draft of the criteria to be considered for use in the review and recommendation of names on the landscape. The criteria are based on UNC's principles and modified to include key elements of the Carolinian Creed (UofSC's statement of values) and language from the website of the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion.
- Distributed the draft document to subcommittee members for feedback.
- Held a subcommittee meeting Oct. 28th to discuss the draft and at the request of a subcommittee member, added back two criteria in the subcategory related to characteristics that might weaken a case for recommendation for removal.
- Sent the draft criteria document to full commission for discussion.
- Introduced Melissa Develvis, research assistant, who gave a summary of her work to-date. The committee agreed that Melissa will notify us as research on each name is complete so we can review files on a rolling basis for efficiency.
- Research on Thomas Cooper is largely complete and notice to subcommittee members has been sent asking for their review and comments.

Guidelines of our written report as outlined in the charge to the committee

- Summary of why the building was reviewed
- Historical summary of the individual for whom the building is named
- An argument for retaining present naming
- An argument against retaining present naming
- Final commission recommendation on naming based on the preponderance of merit

Tuesday, January 12, 2021 Full Commission Meeting Presidential Commission on University History Date of the Subcommittee meeting: December 14, 2020

Discussion

- Most of the meeting consisted of discussing three of the five research files pertaining to Thomas Cooper, Francis Lieber and Wade Hampton.
- We considered what additional information may be warranted/sought/added to the current research. As an example, some named buildings lack documentation of the reasoning behind the naming. Subcommittee members lauded the thorough efforts of Melissa Develvis.
- We discussed adding some explanatory language of historical terms and concepts to the research write-ups to make the information more accessible to non-historians.

Action Items Completed

- Criteria document: Received additional feedback on the draft of the criteria document from the full commission, gathered that new information into a "feedback" document, and sent it to the Commission Co-chairs for the next step in the process of adopting the criteria.
- All five research files on Cooper, Lieber, Hampton, Thornwell and Thurmond are ready for review.

Guidelines of our written report as outlined in the charge to the committee

- Summary of why the building was reviewed
- Historical summary of the individual for whom the building is named
- An argument for retaining present naming
- An argument against retaining present naming
- Final commission recommendation on naming based on the preponderance of merit

Thursday, February 18, 2021 Full Commission Meeting Presidential Commission on University History

Dates of the Subcommittee meetings: December 14, 2020 and January 26, 2021

Discussion

Dec. 14, 2020

- Most of the meeting consisted of discussing three of the five research files pertaining to Thomas Cooper, Francis Lieber and Wade Hampton.
- We considered what additional information may be warranted/sought/added to the current research. As an example, some named buildings lack documentation of the reasoning behind the naming. Subcommittee members lauded the thorough efforts of Melissa Develvis.
- We discussed adding some explanatory language of historical terms and concepts to the research write-ups to make the information more accessible to non-historians.

Jan. 26, 2021

- Technology housekeeping in regard to support for Teams to ensure every subcommittee member has access to all files.
- Discussed all 5 research files in terms of completeness/ any outstanding concerns.
- Gathered suggestions for next names to be researched.

Action Items Completed

- Criteria document: Received additional feedback on the draft of the criteria document from the full commission, gathered that new information into a "feedback" document, and sent it to the Commission Co-chairs for the next step in the process of adopting the criteria.
- All five research files on Cooper, Lieber, Hampton, Thornwell and Thurmond are ready for review.
- Melissa has begun research on Jonathan Maxcy.
- Criteria adopted by fill commission at special called meeting Feb. 12, 2021.

Next Meeting: Feb. 26, 2021 at 10:00a.m.

Guidelines of our written report as outlined in the charge to the committee

- o Summary of why the building was reviewed
- Historical summary of the individual for whom the building is named
- o An argument for retaining present naming
- An argument against retaining present naming
- o Final commission recommendation on naming based on the preponderance of merit

Tuesday, March 9, 2021 Full Commission Meeting Presidential Commission on University History

Dates of the Subcommittee meetings: February 26, 2021 and March 5, 2021

Discussion

Dec. 14, 2020

- Most of the meeting consisted of discussing three of the five research files pertaining to Thomas Cooper, Francis Lieber and Wade Hampton.
- We considered what additional information may be warranted/sought/added to the current research. As an example, some named buildings lack documentation of the reasoning behind the naming. Subcommittee members lauded the thorough efforts of Melissa Develvis.
- We discussed adding some explanatory language of historical terms and concepts to the research write-ups to make the information more accessible to non-historians.

Jan. 26, 2021

- Technology housekeeping in regard to support for Teams to ensure every subcommittee member has access to all files.
- Discussed all 5 research files in terms of completeness/ any outstanding concerns.
- Gathered suggestions for next names to be researched.

Action Items Completed

- Criteria document: Received additional feedback on the draft of the criteria document from the full commission, gathered that new information into a "feedback" document, and sent it to the Commission Co-chairs for the next step in the process of adopting the criteria.
- All five research files on Cooper, Lieber, Hampton, Thornwell and Thurmond are ready for review.
- Melissa has begun research on Jonathan Maxcy.
- Criteria adopted by fill commission at special called meeting Feb. 12, 2021.

Guidelines of our written report as outlined in the charge to the committee

- Summary of why the building was reviewed
- Historical summary of the individual for whom the building is named
- o An argument for retaining present naming
- An argument against retaining present naming
- o Final commission recommendation on naming based on the preponderance of merit

Tuesday, April 6, 2021 Full Commission Meeting Presidential Commission on University History

Dates of the Subcommittee meetings: March 12, 2021 and March 26, 2021

Action Items Completed

- The committee met on March 12 and March 26.
- Nine research files completed, two in progress.
- We have completed review, discussion and recommendation voting for seven of the buildings: Cooper, Hampton, Lieber, Longstreet, Preston, Thornwell, and Thurmond.

Future Work

- At our next meeting on April 13 will review Barnwell, Maxcy and possibly one more.
- We continue the work of preparing the recommendations for the full commission.
- We have three meetings scheduled for April: 13, 21, 27. Because our in-meeting work is dependent on completed research, we will most likely meet twice on the 13th and 27th and forego the April 21st meeting.

Guidelines of our written report as outlined in the charge to the committee

- Summary of why the building was reviewed
- Historical summary of the individual for whom the building is named
- An argument for retaining present naming
- An argument against retaining present naming
- Final commission recommendation on naming based on the preponderance of merit

Tuesday, May 4, 2021 Full Commission Meeting Presidential Commission on University History

Dates of the Subcommittee meetings: April 13, 2021 and April 27, 2021

Action Items Completed

- The committee met on April 13 and April 27.
- Twelve research files completed, final one in progress.
- We have completed review, discussion and recommendation voting for ten buildings: Barnwell, Blatt, Cooper, Hampton, Lieber, Longstreet, Maxcy, Preston, Thornwell, and Thurmond; and one marker: Lee tree marker.

•

Future Work

- At our next meeting on May 14 will review Hollings and Gressette.
- Once those thirteen names are reviewed we will begin the process of writing recommendation reports for each in order to submit those, along with the research materials, to the full commission for consideration.

Guidelines of our written report as outlined in the charge to the committee

- Summary of why the building was reviewed
- Historical summary of the individual for whom the building is named
- An argument for retaining present naming
- An argument against retaining present naming
- Final commission recommendation on naming based on the preponderance of merit