

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

December 1, 1999

I. Call to Order.

CHAIR CAROLINE STROBEL - I would like to call the meeting to order. (The meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m.) Do you have a copy of the minutes as printed? Are there any editions or corrections? If not the minutes are approved.

II. Reports of Officers.

President Palms:

Good afternoon and welcome to the South Carolina winter. A few quick reports to you. We have been extraordinarily busy on the capital projects as you can see around the campus. We are making very good progress on the arena. We've had to accumulate pieces of land and it has been difficult with the city council and with the Norfolk Southern railroad, but we've had some breakthroughs and have been able to acquire some land with the help of the Development Foundation that gives us that kind of flexibility. We hope to move ahead with this and get it done in the next couple of years.

Just to bring you up-to-date, so far, through the master plan, we have constructed more than 773,000 sq. ft. of new space on the campus for teaching laboratories and

residence halls, and this doesn't include all the renovations that we have been involved in so far. There is still an awful lot to do, but we are making progress.

Our endowment is up to \$257,000,000 as of 31st October, and the campaign and the gift and pledges are up to \$251.6 million. I know there are many colleges who still haven't raised sufficient funds to satisfy them. We have 31 people now working in the campaign. Altogether we had about 4 or 5 about 6 or 7 years ago. We have 48 gifts and pledges of \$1,000,000 or more for the campaign, and I think we had one \$1,000,000 gift before we started this campaign. Norma and I, both of us, were in Texas two weeks ago kicking off campaigns in Houston and in Dallas. As you know we have 90,000 alumni living out-of-state. I think some of the most wealthy graduates are out-of-state. We have had very good response. Somebody who was at one of these receptions in Texas pledged \$100,000 at the event, and there is great potential there. You do have to go out and make those contacts with those individuals, and we will

continue to do so. Next week we hold a regional campaign event in Myrtle Beach and Georgetown.

This is also the time of the year where we are busy getting the members of the legislature oriented towards what our needs are. We still have the major challenge before us to convince the key members of the legislature as well as the Commission on Higher Education what it takes to build an AAU institution--what it requires such as faculty salaries and staff salaries. We are being forceful as to who we want our peers to be that they compare us to. There are people that we have identified that would be proud to have as our peers such as the University of Virginia, Chapel Hill and the University of Florida. We are sticking with that. So that will be our continuous challenge.

The top legislative priority for this year remains faculty and staff salaries. By any kind of comparison, we are falling behind the high quality schools, particularly the private major AAU institutions but also some of the public institutions. So that will be our focus.

I'm sorry I can't be with you for the whole meeting. The Rhodes Scholarship Selection Committee is meeting on the campus and I am interviewing students for that, including two candidates from the Honors College. I will be glad to take any questions, Madam Chairman.

PROFESSOR CHARLES MACK (ART) - I read your letter about the flag issue and I want to thank you. Personally, I am probably speaking for a lot of my colleagues here, I thank you for your expressions in that letter. It is much appreciated.

PRESIDENT PALMS - Thank you very much.

PROVOST ODOM:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll be very brief today. Following up on what the President said about our legislative priorities, yesterday the university hosted the Higher Education Subcommittee of the House, Ways and Means Committee and I think we had their attention for three hours. We discussed a number of capital projects as well as programmatic desires that we have for this year and I think it was a very good visit by those committee members. We will continue to work with them and at some point we will also involve many of you in talking to various legislators about our requests.

From time to time, I stand up here and I am not the most enthusiastic or praiseworthy in terms of the CHE so what I would like to do is to tell you some good things about the CHE. Last year, the commission put aside \$2½ million dollars for research and

over \$2.2 million of that was designated for the three research universities in the state. They have reviewed all of the proposals that have been submitted. There were total 94 proposals. The University of South Carolina submitted 41 proposals of those 94. MUSC submitted 21 and Clemson submitted 18. So we by far submitted the largest number of proposals. We had 9 of those funded for a total of about \$825,000. These have been recommended and the full commission will vote on these tomorrow but I think there is no doubt that they will pass and we will have 9 faculty members who are very, very happy.

At the same time they set aside \$2½ million for research, they also set aside

half a million for what they called instructional technology and incentive grants. There were 67 proposals from all of the higher education institutions in the state. The University of South Carolina submitted 12 of those proposals and the University of South Carolina will have 12 proposals funded. So we did a great job and my congratulations to the faculty.

In terms of deans searches, this is the time when applications are being processed. All committees have met, advertisements have gone out, and the committees are currently processing applications. We will begin looking at applications and selecting finalists at the first of the year.

That's all I have. I would be happy to answer questions.

III. Reports of Committees.

CHAIR STROBEL - Reports of committees.

A. Faculty Senate Steering Committee, Professor Sarah Wise, Secretary:

No report.

B. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor William Jacoby,

Chair:

PROFESSOR JACOBY - We have a fairly sizeable list of things on the agenda here so I will use my usual strategy and try to do it in blocks to expedite our business a little bit.

To begin the College of Education is proposing deletion of EDUC 203 Classroom Strategies. I would like to move the deletion.

CHAIR STROBEL - Is there a second? Oh, we don't need a second. Any discussion? All in favor say aye. Opposed - no. It passes.

PROFESSOR JACOBY - Section II. College of Engineering, there are two things there. As I said, unless there is an objection, I will do both of these things together. The first is a proposed new course, EMCH 521 and the second is a change in course description for EMCH 527. So I would like to move both of those courses.

CHAIR STROBEL - Any discussion? All in favor - ayes. Opposed. Passes.

PROFESSOR JACOBY - Section III. I confess with a little embarrassment -- you may notice the new course, ENVIR 500, the number of credit hours is not listed there. Some time ago my committee discussed this course but I don't remember what the credit hours were there. Is there anyone from the School of the Environment who can fill us in on that here?

CHAIR STROBEL - Shall we defer that?

PROFESSOR JACOBY - Why don't we go ahead and do that and bring it up at the next meeting. The next item from the School of Music is a change in title and description but there is an editorial change in this as well. This is MUSC 538 and in the new description there--very minor changes, it says "A course on composition" that should be "A course in composition" rather than "on". And then at the very end of the description it says "elements". That should be singular instead of plural, so that should say "production element." Apart from that I would like to go ahead and move this or with those changes I would like to go ahead and move this.

CHAIR STROBEL - Any discussion? All in favor. Ayes. Opposed. It passes.

PROFESSOR JACOBY - Peggy just told me with the ENVIR 500 that they would like to teach that in the spring and she can get the hours tomorrow. Why don't I go ahead and move that?

CHAIR STROBEL - We are going to assume that it is going to be a regular 3 hour course.

PROFESSOR JACOBY - That is what I am assuming. Like I said it was awhile ago when we discussed it in committee so I don't remember off hand. Then I would like to go ahead and move that.

PROFESSOR JAMES BUGGY - MEDC- With the condition of hours not being more than 3 hours?

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - Yes, it would certainly not be more than 3 hours.

CHAIR STROBEL - Is there any discussion?

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - I'm sorry, it strikes me that since this is a practicum, it might be more than 3 hours and so it might be 6 hours instead of 3. I'm not sure, but if we are going to put a limit on it, I wanted to bring that to your attention.

CHAIR STROBEL - That is a good point.

PROFESSOR JAMES BUGGY - MEDICINE - If the omission of the number of credit hours is an oversight in publication of the committee report, then I would hate to see the unit suffer for it. Furthermore, I and I can't imagine that there would be a number of credit hours for the course that would influence my vote one way or the other. So I am going to suggest that we go ahead and vote on it with the understanding that your committee approved whatever the credit hours were listed actually.

PROFESSOR JACOBY - Which we did, but I don't think it was 6. I don't think it was something that high or I would have remembered, since that is unusual. So I appreciate that.

CHAIR STROBEL - Is there any further discussion on this? All in favor. Aye.

Opposed. The ayes have it.

PROFESSOR JACOBY - The next item is from the College of Science and Mathematics, the Department of Biological Sciences and that is a change in curriculum which is listed on pages 20 and the top of page 21. So I would like to move that.

CHAIR STROBEL - Any discussion? All in favor. Aye. Opposed. The ayes have it.

PROFESSOR JACOBY - Next is the Department of Computer Science. There are changes in prerequisites for two of their courses, 146 and 220. I would like to move those.

CHAIR STROBEL - Is there any discussion on this? All in favor. Ayes. Opposed. The ayes have it.

PROFESSOR JACOBY - And then there is also (I should have done this together in the block like I said I was going to.) a change in curriculum for the Department of Computer Sciences. So I would like to go ahead and move that.

CHAIR STROBEL - Is there any discussion? All in favor. Aye. Opposed. The ayes have it.

PROFESSOR JACOBY - Next is the Department of Geology. It has a very lengthy entry in the report from the committee here. Before I get started on this let me give you one change that we would like to insert as an editorial change. For the new course, GEOL 335, second course from the bottom on page 23. The title of that course should be "PROCESSES OF GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE." So the word "PROCESSES OF" begin at the beginning and then the word "and" should be removed from the title. So it should be "PROCESSES OF GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE." Apart from that there are new courses listed, there are deletions of courses, several changes in title, numbers, credit, and descriptions and then there is a fairly lengthy change to the University Bulletin and I would like to move it as all one item.

CHAIR STROBEL - Is there any discussion? All in favor. Ayes. Opposed. The ayes have it.

PROFESSOR JACOBY - Next we want to skip a page to an addendum that is listed about half way down page 28 before we do the May session and experimental courses.

In the addendum on page 28, there is a new course that is being cross-listed by the College of Education and the Department of French and Classics in the College of Liberal Arts on "TEACHING ADVANCED LATIN IN SECONDARY SCHOOL".

So it is EDSE 580 and LATN 580. I would like to go ahead and move both of those.

CHAIR STROBEL - Is there any discussion? All in favor. Aye. Opposed. The ayes have it.

PROFESSOR JACOBY - On page 27, there are some items for information. There are four classes from English for the May session and then from Southern Studies there are two May session courses, SOST 410M and SOST 411M. There is a listing on the next page SOST 412 that should not be there. So Southern Studies we are just giving you two courses for your information. And then there is an experimental course also for the Senate information, EECE 554X DIGITAL CONTROL SYSTEMS. And that concludes my report.

CHAIR STROBEL - Thank you.

PROFESSOR MACK - (ART) - Generally about the Maymester courses. Has any study been undertaken on the general impact of the Maymester courses and about the coordination of the Maymester courses that are being offered with other possibly affected departments?

PROFESSOR JACOBY - To my knowledge -- no. And that is a frequent topic of discussion in the committee. We are very concerned about that and this SOST 412 is a case in point there since it is a course offered during the regular semester and we are supposed to create new and unique offerings. So it is still open and not very well defined as far as the committee is concerned.

PROFESSOR MACK - (ART) - I guess the next logical question is that going to be done by some committee?

PROFESSOR JACOBY - I am not aware of it.

CHAIR STROBEL - Would you like to have it done?

PROFESSOR MACK - (ART) - I am really not sure. I am aware of a few problems in the past with courses that have not really been coordinated with possibly affected departments. But I don't have anything specific in mind but it might be time to have that done just to see the impact upon enrollments in summer sessions and general sort of coordination. You mentioned a regular course that is being offered as a Maymester offering and things like that. Maybe it should be done.

CHAIR STROBEL - I think it is probably time that we take a look at that whole Maymester situation and see whether we need to do some further thinking about it. I would like to turn it over to your committee to take a look at it.

PROFESSOR JACOBY - My committee will be pleased.

CHAIR STROBEL - Thank you.

C. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Henry Price, Chair:

No report.

D. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Caroline Eastman, Chair:

PROFESSOR EASTMAN- I have a brief report today. The Faculty Welfare Committee initiated the first phase of the faculty self-study. We have sent out this

week a letter to a randomly selected subset of faculty requesting participation in one of a series of focus groups to be held in mid-January. I would like to encourage those of you who may have gotten such a letter to participate and encourage your colleagues to participate. As with those random samples we have sent out more than we expected answers from. This will be followed up by a survey which will go out to everyone. For those of you who are not regular tenure track academic faculty in departments, this list also includes instructors, research faculty, librarians who of course are classified as faculty tenure/tenure track and some administrative faculty. As I said, this will be followed up by a survey later. Any questions?

PROFESSOR INA ROY - (PHILOSOPHY) - What are focus groups going to be focused on?

PROFESSOR EASTMAN - That's a good question. The idea is to get a handle on what our concerns are as faculty, what we like, what we don't like, what we would like to see changed. These are not intended as just gripe sessions. It is easy to organize a gripe session. What are you concerned about?

PROFESSOR ROY - I was hoping parking would be one of the issues.

PROFESSOR EASTMAN - If someone in the focus group brings it up, I am sure it will be.

PROFESSOR ROY - It is a good way to convince people to participate.

PROFESSOR EASTMAN - Yes. You can express your views on parking. They will be moderated by people who are professionals in this who will not allow the entire discussion to be devoted to just one topic. Although I know parking is a concern to many of us, probably all of us, with the exception of one of my colleagues who bought a house right on the edge of campus and walks everywhere. We do have other concerns. We get complaints about salaries. We get complaints about buildings falling apart. We get people who really like some things about the university. Any other questions?

CHAIR STROBEL - Thank you, Caroline. I must add that in the spring we will have a Faculty Senate meeting that will consider parking in more depth. That should wet your appetite for attendance.

PROFESSOR EASTMAN - You will be informed of it. You will not be surprised.

CHAIR STROBEL - We will announce it.

E. Committee on Admissions, Professor Stephen McNeill, Chair:

PROFESSOR McNEILL - I was asked to give a report on the Admission Committee for fall 1999. There is a booklet available from the Admissions Office that has all the facts and statistics in it. For the fall of 1999 freshmen class, we had 10,048 apply of which we accepted 6,780 and enrolled 2,617. That is down just a slight bit but that decrease actually came in the Provisional Year Program. The regular admissions is exactly the same as it was last year. On those who were rejected almost all of them were rejected because they were of the low index that is the 2.35 predictor. Another handful were rejected because of lack of credits or something like that. Others who came to the university approximately 75% are South Carolina residents - 1,971. Another 24% are minorities and 52% are women. The SAT scores for the entering freshman class was 1,101. We really got things up this year. The Admissions Committee really has no plans to make any changes to the admission criteria. This is really because we have raised the requirement to 2.35 and that is being worked with the system right now. There will be a change to the predictive formula which will be coming up to bring it back in line and make sure we have that effect on and then of course we have the 24 credit hour coming into view with the 2001 graduating class. So we are really not making any changes to admissions at this time. Maybe our duties right now are to look at files for students who don't quite meet the admissions requirement but deserve a second look for one reason or another. That is my report and I will be glad to answer any questions if there are any.

F. Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee, Professor

Wiebke Strehl, Chair:

No report.

CHAIR STROBEL - I think there is no report.

G. Other Committees.

CHAIR STROBEL - Are there any other committee reports?

V. Report of the Secretary.

None.

VI. Unfinished Business.

CHAIR STROBEL - Unfinished Business - Professor Charles Mack.

PROFESSOR CHARLES MACK - (ART) - I would like to turn your attention to Attachment 2, page 29, a resolution concerning the Confederate flag about which discussion had started at the last Faculty Senate meeting. I would like to propose this resolution for the Faculty Senate to consider and vote on.

CHAIR STROBEL - Thank you. Do we need to have a second? Discussion?

MORGAN MACLACHLAN - (ANTHROPOLOGY) - Following our last meeting in our discussion of this matter I thought it would be prudent to poll the faculty in my department as to their feelings about it and they have all signed a petition. It reads:

" We the undersigned faculty from the Department of Anthropology of USC-Columbia urge that the faculty senate adopt a resolution favoring removal of the Confederate flag from the Statehouse on the grounds that the flag impairs our ability to host academic meetings and to recruit and retain faculty and students." If any one would like to see this, I would like to have it reported in the minutes that this document does exist.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - If you can give it to Peggy Pickels we will go ahead and include it as part of the minutes.

PROFESSOR INA ROY - (PHILOSOPHY) - We have here a petition more strongly worded that was circulated in my department and it was signed by approximately 20 people in the College of Liberal Arts--mostly from the Philosophy Department stating that we as the members of the faculty and staff at the University of South Carolina believe that the university should make a formal statement in support of the current NAACP boycott and that includes the Faculty Senate in so far as we believe the Confederate flag should be removed and if anyone would like to see it it is available.

We will include that as well.

PROFESSOR ROBERT WILCOX - (LAW) - I am going to do the unpopular thing. I am going to stand and speak against the resolution, and I understand that it may not be the most popular thing. We just heard from two departments who probably did it the right way. They got the individual commitments of their members to an issue that is of individual importance. It concerns me that we need to be clearer on what we are doing today. I won't belabor the political consequences. I think we understand those. I fully suspect that there is a significant group in this university, perhaps everyone in this room today, that is willing to bear whatever political consequences there may be for taking a position on what they believe to be an issue of sufficient importance to merit

the consequence. There may be no consequences. There may be good consequences, that is hard to predict.

But what I want to talk about is what strikes me as our moving away from a principle that is important to this university, and, I think, has been an important part of this university. I thank Professor Mack for drafting the resolution to speak in terms of the impact on the university. I think the way the resolution was worded is important. Nevertheless, I think, as his comments in the paper reflect, this resolution is being introduced to be delivered to the public as a statement of the collective faculty: That the collective faculty has weighed in on an issue of some significant political importance in this state on one side of that issue. What I think is unfortunate today, and what I think some are struggling with, is that with the boycott we have reached a point where it is going to be very hard to come to the middle and do what is right. I join with most of you in saying that what I think is right is to bring down the flag. Unfortunately, today I think we have reached a point where this issue is going to be evaluated not in whether we do the right thing, but in who politically won the debate. We are weighing in as a faculty today on one side of that issue. This faculty has always adhered to a policy of great respect for the individual opinion of our colleagues, respect of the opinions of those who would like the flag removed, respect for the opinions of those who disagree. And it violates that policy for us to pass a resolution that we portray as the voice of the faculty --and that is what we are asked to do -- to express as the words of all of our colleagues our opposition to this flag. That is how it will be played to the public. The faculty of the University has taken this stand. And that is what concerns me today. I would much prefer that we sign petitions like these where we have individually gone on record. Urge those petitions if you wish, urge people to voice their concerns of the matter. But don't purport to speak for them. That's what concerns me. That's why I take what I suspect as an unpopular view in the sense of this group wanting to do something. But when I look at what this resolution will accomplish -- what will be done when the day is done when we walk out of here? Other than feeling better about ourselves -- will we have changed the debate? Will we have closed the gap that exists in the state between various groups? I think a much better form of leadership for this university, this faculty, would not be a resolution like this which will be passed on to the legislature with short term political gain that will be soon spent. Our better object would be to use our intellect and use our knowledge to educate the people of this state to understand their history better, to understand the philosophy of respect for human dignity better, to understand the law and equal protection better. That's what this university can do to lead. That would be leading the state. We are joining an divisive battle on one side of the division. I urge you to think long and hard, but not just about the short term but the longer term implications of what we do today. Do we open ourselves up later to voting on whether lotteries are moral to support state education? Do we vote to open ourselves up later to

taking a stand on prayer in the classroom in the public schools and colleges? Do we get involved in these issues? It is easy today when we like what we are saying. Let's join in and say it. What if we are on the other side next time? That is my concern as I stand here to speak against the resolution.

PROFESSOR ROY - (PHILOSOPHY) - I would like to respond to the comments. I am not so much concerned about the unpopularity of what you said as the argumentation. First, it seems that as the resolution is stated this is an expression of the collective belief of the members of the Faculty Senate, not of all the faculty. Second, as I understand it, what we do here we represent the faculty members; we do that regularly all the time and no one brings up the issue of have we petitioned every person in our department to do so. Third, this isn't a statement about the morality or immorality of the flag; it is simply a matter of its being detrimental to the mission and ambitions of the university. I will speak to this personally. I almost didn't come here two years ago. The one main reason I didn't come here was the second day that I interviewed somebody pointed out the flag. In subsequent conversations with our then department chair I asked him repeatedly if there were going to be problems with racism. My worries were based on that flag. Now I took the job but that was because frankly my department offered me a lot of money to be not scared of the racial tensions here. I am going to be blunt about that. They knew it was an issue and they have been very good about protecting me from it. I am not even African American and I can only imagine how much worse it is in that case. To say that we are taking a moral stand here while not a practical one I think is not what the resolution says and also is really diverting the issue from what the actual issue is. The issue is as faculty members are we affected by that thing being up there, and yes, we are.

PROFESSOR MACLACHLAN - (ANTHROPOLOGY) -I would also like to clarify my earlier remark. I had no slightest doubt about the opinion of my faculty of this issue. I didn't need to ask them. I know them. I asked them because I wanted to make sure that you understood and that everybody here understood the breadth and depth of their feeling on this matter. That's why. I also would like to second what Professor Roy just said. Yesterday at the faculty meeting of our department I polled the faculty members and held many conferences in the next year or so are you involved in that will be jeopardized by this situation. They enumerated five. Another faculty member told me that she had already postponed planning for a sixth meeting pending the resolution of this issue. Frankly, this is the type of problems that seriously impairs our ability as a faculty to make progress towards becoming an AAUP institution. We vitally need to be able to host most of those meetings. It impairs the ability of our faculty to become officers of the professional organizations that are vital to their careers. That is the fact. It also frankly impairs our ability to recruit and retain faculty and students. This coming week we will interview a very talented young African

American scholar who is looking at a job offer from an institution in California. I don't need to explain what this situation creates for us in limiting our ability to recruit such persons. So yes I agree that I don't think that we are this is a kind of thing that the Faculty Senate has been doing for years.

PROFESSOR RICHARD HULT (EDUCATION) - I would like to offer a friendly amendment to the resolution. "In anticipation of the discussion we are having today, the College of Education met on Monday, November 29th for a special called meeting. At that meeting we adopted an informal resolution and it states the following: "The Confederate flag should be removed from the top of the South Carolina State House by the end of the 2000 legislative session." Our discussion focused on many of the reasons that were expressed by the previous two speakers.

PROFESSOR ROY - (PHILOSOPHY) - This is an amendment you are making?

PROFESSOR HULT - (EDUCATION) - This would be in addition to what is already stated in the current resolution. It puts a time limit in terms of when the action should be taken.

CHAIR STROBEL - Is there a second to this motion?

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - Seconded.

CHAIR STROBEL - Do you have that in written form?

PROFESSOR HULT - (EDUCATION) - Yes, I have handed this to Madam Secretary because we wanted this officially expressed in the Faculty Senate minutes.

CHAIR STROBEL - Is there discussion on this amendment?

PROFESSOR MACK - (ART) - This is just a friendly amendment that I can add on to this without -- does it need to go to a vote or

CHAIR STROBEL - It would have to be accepted by you.

PROFESSOR MACK - (ART) - I would accept it as friendly.

PROFESSOR DON WEDLOCK - (LAW) - It was offered and seconded as an amendment. Friendly or not it now belongs to the body and must be voted on. I would

suggest that we add it as a clause at the end of the resolution and a comma after the university by the end of legislative session 2000.

CHAIR STROBEL - So is there any discussion on this? I would like to get a copy if I could get a copy please because I would like to be able to read it again so that people know what they are voting on.

Let me reiterate this so that everybody can hear. "That the members of the Faculty Senate of the University of South Carolina express a collective belief that the continued display of the Confederate flag above the State House of the State of south Carolina is detrimental to the mission and ambitions of the university, and the Confederate flag should be removed from the top of the South Carolina State House by the end of the 2000 legislative session.

Is there discussion?

We will vote then on the amendment. This is now accepting the amendment that we are voting on. All in favor of the amendment. All opposed. Oh, all in favor say aye. Ayes. Opposed - no. Shall we count - is it that close? I think the ayes have it. So we have now added this amendment to the resolution. Is there further discussion on the resolution?

PROFESSOR CONSTANCE HENDRICKS - (NURSING) - After leaving the Faculty Senate last month we, the three faculty senators from the College of Nursing, also polled our faculty and staff and we stand here today to say that the College of Nursing is in full support of the resolution to condemn the flag flying over the capital dome. Thank you.

PROFESSOR EDWARD BODIE - (ENGLISH) - I would like to substitute "majority" in place of the word "collective".

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Is there a second to that amendment? Alright the amendment is to substitute "majority" for "collective." So it would express a "majority" belief.

PROFESSOR BRAD SMITH - (PSYCHOLOGY) - I would suggest of you are going to put in majority that might minimize the support for this resolution. If you put in majority I think you should put in substantial majority. Followed by that to make it more clearly

.

CHAIR STROBEL - We haven't gotten a second--yes, we did. Is there further discussion on this?

PROFESSOR EASTMAN - In this country and under *Robert's Rules of Order* the default is majority. If something is passed you don't insist that it be unanimous and you don't quibble over with majority, plurality or what. This is completely unnecessary. If we are going to see a lot of amendments, we would like to move that we go to a quasi-committee of the whole.

CHAIR STROBEL - Are there any amendments?

PROFESSOR BODIE - I would like to defend my own amendment.

PROFESSOR EASTMAN - I think my motion.....

PROFESSOR BODIE - I wish to reply to what you said.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Are you making a motion of a quasi-committee of the whole?

PROFESSOR EASTMAN - Yes.

CHAIR STROBEL - Yes, is there a second?

PROFESSOR BODIE - I asked to be recognized first.

CHAIR STROBEL - I think I was trying to clarify that she was making a motion.

We could then go in with a quasi-committee of the whole where you can express your opinion regarding your amendment.

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - Could you quickly explain the effect of the motion?

CHAIR STROBEL - Yes. Don Wedlock, our acting parliamentarian, will explain this.

PROFESSOR DON WEDLOCK - (LAW) - A quasi-committee of the whole is a parliamentary device where a body can engage in wide ranging discussion on a number of issues without the encumbrances of formal motions, seconds, amendments, subsidiary motions, etc. After the meeting in the quasi-committee of the whole, you would come out fully informed by the discussion therein ready to take up the resolution as amended and the amendment that has been suggested. We will proceed accordingly but it would allow us to talk about the merits without necessarily talking about all whether or not this is in order or that is in order at that particular time. It is a

very efficient mechanism. We used it two years ago when we were talking about post-tenure review.

CHAIR STROBEL - Do we need a second on this?

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - Second.

CHAIR STROBEL - There has been a motion that we go into a quasi committee of the whole. It has been seconded. All in favor - aye. Opposed - no. I think the no's have it. So we will not be in a quasi committee of the whole. We will have a division. Sarah and Don. All in favor raise your hand--to go into a quasi committee of the whole. We are now voting by hands so that we can get a count. Ayes - 27. No's 44. The no's have it. We will not go into a quasi committee of the whole. I now call on you to defend your motion. We are discussing the motion to amend by substituting "majority" for "collective."

PROFESSOR BODIE - (ENGLISH) - I am glad for the delay. Otherwise I might have been somewhat less than polite. I will try to modify. I have taught English composition in this university for 40 years. I do not have to need to have the words explained to me.

CHAIR STROBEL - Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - I call for the question.

CHAIR STROBEL - The question has been called. All in favor - ayes. Opposed - no.

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - We are voting to amend the question.

CHAIR STROBEL - We are voting on the question. That's right. There was a call for the question which means debate has ended and we vote on this motion--this amendment to the resolution which is on the floor.

PROFESSOR MACK - (ART) - We are voting on the full question.

CHAIR STROBEL - All in favor - aye. Opposed - no. Alright now we will vote on the proposed amendment of substituting for "collective" "majority". All in favor. All opposed. - No. Alright. Is there further discussion on the resolution as amended?

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - I call for the question. Is there a second?

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - Second.

CHAIR STROBEL - The question has been called. All in favor -aye. Opposed. No.

The question has been called. We have to vote on whether to stop debate and that's what the issue is here. We are calling for the question that is to close debate on the topic.

I will vote again since people may not have known what they were voting for. All in favor - aye. Opposed - no. The ayes have it. It requires two-thirds. We will have to count by a show of hands. All in favor raise your hand. Opposed - please raise your hands. 60 - 20 The debate has been closed. We will now be voting on the resolution. Would you like me to read the resolution again?

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - Yes.

CHAIR STROBEL - Resolution: That the members of the Faculty Senate of the University of South Carolina express a collective belief that the continued display of the Confederate flag above the State House of the State of South Carolina is detrimental to the mission and ambitions of the university, and the Confederate flag should be removed from the top of the South Carolina State House by the end of the 2000 legislative session.

All in favor. Point of order.

PROFESSOR JAMES BUGGY - (MEDICINE) - I would like to request the 'division of the house' to record the number of yes and no votes on the flag proposal so it would be evident whether it was a narrow or wide margin in voting.

CHAIR STROBEL - I will ask for a show of hands and we will count.

PROFESSOR BUGGY - Thank you.

CHAIR STROBEL - All in favor please raise your hand and keep it up so that we can get a count. Hold up your hands again. The counters were not able to agree.

PROFESSOR WISE - Are the people in the back senators?

CHAIR STROBEL - Please come sit in front so that we can be sure we are including you. The senators are supposed to sit in these two sections here. There's lots of seats.

You can all put your hands down. 76 - ayes. No's please raise your hands. 12 -no's.

76 to 12 is the vote on the resolution concerning the Confederate flag.

PROFESSOR HARRY HANSEN - (ART) - I would like to suggest that (the gentleman's remarks whom I don't know) that this resolution be submitted as a petition to the faculty and ask faculty to endorse it and then submit a list of the faculty who would say "yes, me too." and put that with it. I think if it is a 51% vote that is one thing. If it is an 80 or more percent vote saying yes that gives it great weight. As I betting man, I suspect it is going to be more like 80% so I would like to suggest that the Faculty Senate submit it to the faculty saying "that this is a resolution that we passed and we would like your endorsement of this resolution."

CHAIR STROBEL - Is that the pleasure of the senate? It was not a motion. It was a suggestion. We will move on to New Business. It wasn't a motion and I indicated that. Are you interested in making a motion?

PROFESSOR HANSEN - (ART) - I am not a senator. I cannot make a motion!

CHAIR STROBEL - But it wasn't in the form of a motion.

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - I don't want to belabor the point I've already taken enough time.

CHAIR STROBEL - Onward then to New Business.

VII. New Business.

No report.

VIII. Good of the Order.

CHAIR STROBEL - Do we have a report from the students?

LEIGH ANN TRAVERS - (PRESIDENT PRO TEM OF THE STUDENT SENATE)
-No report. We will after the beginning of the new year.

IX. Announcements.

PROFESSOR RICHARD CONANT - (MUSIC) - Point of order. Did we ascertain whether or not we also passed a resolution similar to this about 18 months ago or say.

CHAIR STROBEL - Oh, I could report to you because we did look that up--Peggy was able to find it. It was in 1994. A resolution was brought to the floor of the faculty senate concerning the flag. The Faculty Senate did not pass the resolution at that time for two reasons: (1) it was felt that it was not within the purview of the faculty senate

to do so and (2) it was felt that there was too many historical inaccuracies in the resolution which was fairly long. It ran about two pages.

There being no other business, I declared the meeting adjourned. (4:03 p.m.)