This newsletter is divided into five sections. The first section deals with information I have heard from the administration that might be of general interest to the faculty. Most of it comes from the staff meetings I attend with the President and all the Vice Presidents. Each week the President asks us about problems in the areas that we represent. I would much rather tell him the concerns of the faculty than what I think are the concerns of the faculty. So please let me know your concerns. At the first faculty meeting, President Collins and Dr. Bevan informed you about much of what I would have mentioned in this issue. I will also not discuss topics I believe to be of marginal interest to most faculty members, like whether certain rooms in a dormitory should hold two or three students. While such issues are important to the College, I doubt that they are of vital concern to the faculty. Administrators are also invited to send me information that they would like to pass on to the faculty.

The second section deals with communication from standing committees. Every month I would like to hear from the chairperson or secretary of each committee that has met so that I can inform the faculty of progress and potential proposals or problems. The third section consists primarily of my (and your) ramblings, thoughts, frustrations, and complaints. Basically, it is whatever doesn't fit into any of the other sections.

The fourth section is for editorials, where I will try to address what I consider to be major issues. Rebuttal, responsible or otherwise, is welcome and will be printed if requested. The fifth section, Letters to the Editor, is the most important. Instead of calling Newspeak the Speaker's Newsletter, I am calling it the Faculty Newsletter to more accurately reflect its main purpose—to act as a medium of communication for the faculty to raise and discuss issues, disseminate information, express concerns, and exchange ideas.

ADMINISTRATIONSPEAK

There will be more faculty involvement in recruiting students for next year. Several faculty will visit local high schools and the homes of prospective students and their families. Only six Governor's School students from last year have enrolled at the College. Also disturbing is the news that another Governor's School will begin at Furman, a private institution, and will receive more of a subsidy from the state than we.

There is also concern about recruitment of faculty. In some of the applied fields, it is becoming more difficult to attract quality faculty. Predictions of a possible faculty shortage by 1985 are being made. Suggestions for overcoming this problem include a more comprehensive faculty development program as well as an increase in faculty salaries to try to make them more competitive with those of government and industry. Only 1% of our applicants last year were minorities. A special effort will be made this year to recruit qualified women and minorities.

Much concern was expressed about the lack of communication on campus and the resultant lack of coordination between administrative departments. Campus publications are now under scrutiny. While it does not seem manageable to have just one campus publication that would satisfy all constituencies, progress is being made toward streamlining our publications. Continuing Education has an excellent and informative newsletter; it is hoped that the Alumni Newsletter, too, will add more substance. Currently, it makes very little mention of the faculty or the academic programs. The Meteor, the student newspaper, will be published monthly this semester and hopes to be published weekly next semester. The Green Sheet, an underground student newspaper, has begun appearing at irregular intervals. It seems to be one of the more informative, issue-oriented publications being distributed on campus.

The Center for Continuing Education will again publish The Center to advertise credit and non-credit courses and programs of special interest to adult students and the community. The mailing list contains approximately 15,000 names of persons in the Tri-County area. The mailing date is October 31, 1980 with all copy due no later than October 6. Any items for this publication should be submitted to Dr. Jack Dressler in the Center for Continuing Education (5620) by October 6.
Sue Desmonde would like to pass on the following information from the Office of Continuing Education. This semester more than 700 students have registered for credit courses, of which 31% are married women, and 350 have registered for non-credit courses. Evening classes will not meet on Election Day but will be held on Thursday, December 4, a reading day for day students. Sue is also chairing a subcommittee working on a plan for pre-registration next year. The basic concepts under discussion are (1) elimination of the override system and (2) preregistration of incoming freshmen upon acceptance at the College. If you have any comments or suggestions, please contact her or one of the other subcommittee members—Dick Crosby, Gerald Gibson, Chip Jackson, Nicky Pappas, and Paul Smith.

Faculty interested in teaching Maymester or Summer courses that (a) are not listed in the Bulletin, (b) involve travel or special problems, (c) involve Lilly planning grants should contact Clarence B. Davis, Department of History. The deadline for submitting courses for Maymester and Summer Sessions is January 19, 1981.

Do you ever get the feeling that your secretary is more indispensable than some of your colleagues? Good News! The administration has set aside funds that enable a department to replace a secretary who is out for two weeks or more because of sickness or pregnancy.

Did you think you were saving the College money by calling a colleague in North Carolina instead of Northern California? Well, you weren’t. The rate for all out-of-state calls is 25c per minute during the day and 15c per minute after 6:00 P.M. Long distance calls within South Carolina are always 15c per minute. So after 6:00 P.M., you can call the other U.S.C. for the same price. Business calls only, of course.

The administration was generally pleased with the care taken by the chairpersons in writing evaluation letters for their departments. Concern was expressed by some department heads that a 7% minimum and 12% maximum raise last year left very little flexibility to reward merit. Of special concern to some of the more well-paid faculty and administrators was the $3,000 ceiling placed on raises.

The latest budget crisis is a mandate that each state agency submit a "plan" by October 15 explaining how it would reduce its personnel budget by 7%. In response the College has placed a freeze on all new positions, at least until the plan is completed. The administration is aware that a lengthy freeze could severely damage departments that are in the process of trying to recruit faculty for next year. There is hope that the plan drawn up will not have to be carried out.

COMMITTEESPEAK

The Committee on Nominations will nominate five faculty members at the October meeting for the important budget review committee that President Collins has instituted.

The Academic Standards Committee met to consider a proposal submitted by John Dempsey concerning graduation requirements for transfer students. After some discussion, it was decided that the committee did not have the authority to recommend policy to the faculty even though past committees had done so. The proposal was then referred to the Committee on Curriculum and Academic Planning.

The Committee on Curriculum and Academic Planning postponed discussion of John Dempsey’s proposal until a later date. To facilitate communication, a liaison between each department and a committee member has been established: Biology and Physics (Norman Chamberlain); Languages, Mathematics, and Political Science (Jeff Foster); English, Honors Program, and Philosophy (Sue Hetherington); Chemistry and Geology (Michael Katuna); Psychology, Sociology, and Urban Studies (Michael Ohr); Business Administration & Economics, Fine Arts, and Physical Education & Health (George Wood); History and Computer Science (Nan Woodruff); Education and Library (Rosanne Wray).

There is a November 1 deadline to submit course proposals for next year and for Maymester. Although the two-year bulletin is in effect, a supplement will be distributed next year to reflect any pertinent changes. Last year there was some concern about the minimum and maximum hourly major requirements as stated on page 81 of the current Bulletin. Please let some member of the committee know your feelings, if any, to help guide the committee in making a recommendation that will reflect the sense of the faculty.
The Faculty Welfare Committee seems to have solved the coffee problem in the lounge and expects to have a hot water urn for those who would like to bring their own tea or instant coffee. There may even be a coke machine placed in the faculty lounge. The faculty will meet in the Mathematics Department at the Blacklock House on Thursday, September 18 from 4:00 - 6:00 P.M., and will meet the History Department the following Thursday. Let George Hopkins know when you would like the faculty to meet your department. George also has a parking message.

Faculty concern about the parking situation on and near the campus is a long-standing matter. The scarcity of parking spaces and/or the cost of parking in the municipal garage continue to upset many faculty members. Some professors believe that past and present College administrations have done little or nothing to alleviate the parking problem. Those professors perceive the parking issue as symbolic of administrators' general lack of respect for and interest in faculty and their concerns. Other professors view parking as a perennial problem that is virtually insoluble, given the number of faculty, administrators, staff, and students attempting to park in such a small area. Others argue that as long as parking is available at Caillard Auditorium, the shuttle bus (although occasionally unreliable) or the actual use of feet for a healthful stroll to campus makes the parking problem a minor issue at best. For those faculty upset about the parking situation, this is your chance to be heard. Send your ideas, plans, or solutions to the parking problem to George Hopkins (History) or J. Parker (Chemistry) and they will present your proposals to the Faculty Welfare Committee.

The Committee on Student Affairs elected Mary Berry as Secretary to replace Richard Syracuse, who has left the College; Faye Steuer was chosen to represent the faculty on the College Union Board, which is responsible for social, cultural, and recreational programs for all members of the college community. If you have any suggestions about programming, pass them along to Faye. The committee intends to discuss the following topics this year: (1) Improvement of race relations at the College, (2) The special problems of handicapped students, (3) Problems with the food service, (4) Lack of a recreational site on campus (there is no place to throw a frisbee).

The Committee on Athletics was given the suggestion by Jerry Sanders that a faculty athletic representative be selected who could serve in a continuing capacity in order to facilitate compliance with National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics regulations. The President will make the appointment. It was agreed that promoting support of athletic events within the college community and particularly within the faculty should be a primary goal for the committee. In addition, the committee would like to educate the faculty about the athletic programs at the College after the committee educates itself. Some time will also be spent trying to define the role of the committee.

The Library Committee is distributing its meager book budget as equitably as it can. Guidelines and allocations are similar to those of last year. Once again there are no funds for additional periodicals.

The Committee on Admissions and Financial Assistance is planning to undertake the following areas of business during the year: (1) Guidelines for admissions referrals, (2) Percentage of Governor's School students enrolled at the College, (3) Basis of admission requirements, (4) Evening school admissions and enrollment policies, (5) Transfer student admissions policies, (6) Recruitment activities in Admissions Department.

The Faculty Research and Development Committee has set aside 24 carrels in the Library to be used by faculty members who, in their research activities, would find it extremely beneficial to be able to have an individual study carrel. Once assigned a carrel, the faculty member may keep books on his shelf - checked out to him and marked with a colored tape to indicate that they should not be removed. Faculty members, with stated research projects, should apply with a letter to the committee stating justification for needing a carrel. The committee will assign the carrels on a first come - first serve basis, for an October through August period. Guidelines and procedures for this year's Faculty Research and Development Grants are being discussed, and will continue to be discussed at the October 3 meeting when NEH Summer Stipend applications are reviewed.

The Lilly Committee discussed guidelines for the $2500 in-house fellowships for the Spring semester. The committee plans to decide on the recipients of these fellowships at their October I meeting. Never before published is a complete list of the committee, chaired by Paul Hamill: Bob Anderson, Richard Claircraft, Sam Heins, Roy Hills, Diane Johnson, Jeff Johnson, Jay Parker, and Susan Schenck.

To all committee members, in behalf of all committee chairpersons: If you are going to miss or be late for a meeting, please let the chairperson or someone else on the committee know in advance.
SPEAKEASY

Having a faculty meeting end, or not begin, for lack of a quorum is both inefficient and frustrating. One solution would be to reduce the percentage required for a quorum. Michael Tzyack suggests an incentive for faculty members to come and stay the full meeting: free sherry at the Blacklock House for those who want to continue to discuss the important issues of the day. I like the idea, but not the location. We would probably lose too many members during the long walk over. Delicate negotiations with the President are currently under way and I hope to have some intoxicating news to announce at our October 13 faculty meeting.

I don't like to be a stickler for following rules, but there are two in the faculty manual that I would like observed at faculty meetings. (1) When recognized, state your name and department. This will help the new faculty members, and some of the old, and will eliminate the "Who's that ---" murmur that can sometimes be heard. (2) Help make the meetings shorter by not speaking more than twice on an issue. It might be necessary to violate this rule on special occasions, but please let's not desecrate it.

When a secret ballot is taken, I plan to announce the vote count as well as the winners. I feel the faculty right to know outweighs any potential embarrass- ment to an individual.

Roger Stough asks if our budgetary problems would be less severe with a paid lobbyist in Columbia. President Collins thinks not, that we might ultimately lose more than we would gain with the advent of such an adversary relationship. It is unfortunate that not one of our state legislators is a College of Charleston alumnus. Now you know where to tell your mentees to go.

Bill Bischoff would like to know why the policy on midterm grades was changed without faculty approval. Dr. Bevan commented that the faculty voted to have midterm grades and left to the administration the procedures for distribution. The bureaucratic cost did not seem warranted in view of the low participation (20 faculty members).

My three-piece suit accompanied me to a dinner at the Sheraton with the Board of Trustees on September 9. I had the opportunity to speak with President Jackson of Lander College and President Smith of Francis Marion. The Board governs all three colleges. I got the impression that the concerns and educational philosophies of both Lander and Francis Marion are considerably different than are ours. Little is expected, or gotten, from the faculty at these other institutions in terms of professional development. I would rather that the Colleges have its own Board, which would look primarily after our interests and needs.

Have you ever heard of the Campus Communications Committee? It met twice last Spring and has not yet met this Fall. Its purpose is to improve communica- tion on campus. It was chaired by Maxine Martin until she resigned from the College. I don't think anyone has a complete list of the committee members.

In order to improve communication with its majors, the Mathematics Department last year instituted a weekly Friday Afternoon Seminar held at the Piccadilly Club entitled Aftermath. Alice Gelling then began an Afterfrench Seminar. Members of the Chemistry Department have also been seen in Piccadilly with their students, but it wasn't known if they were having official seminars or even if they restricted their meetings to Friday afternoons.

EDITORIALS

Whatever happened to the standard normal curve?

Before the days of grade inflation, it was expected that roughly 10% of the students would receive a grade of A, 10% F, 20% B, 20% D, and 40% C. The distribution of A and F grades by discipline for Spring 1980 that was distributed this summer showed more than 20% of the grades were A and 6% were F. For disciplines with enrollment of at least 100, the largest percentages of A's were given in Education (58.4%), Music (52.5%), and Library (48.2%); the smallest percentages of A's were in Economics (10.4%), History (11.7%), and English (12%). The smallest percentages of F's were in Health (0.4%), Education (1.7%), and Drama (23%), while the largest were in Computer Science (16.1%), Mathematics (14.9%), and Geology (10.8%).
I think that lenient grading is no service to our students; giving 20% A’s can hurt the top 10%. Recently I was talking to Dr. Jo Anne Simon, Associate Professor of Anatomy at MUSC, who has been interviewing and making recommendations for admission to the medical school there for the past five years. It was her opinion, as well as that of some of her colleagues, that the only school in the state at which an A grade really means something is Furman.

Certainly grade inflation is not unique to this institution. I think that two major causes nationally are (1) declining enrollments and (2) more weight placed on student evaluations. The standard unit of panic measurement at the College is F.T.E. State funding for the College depends on the number of full time equivalent students. Departments fear that their future size will depend more on their F.T.E.’s than on the quality of their programs. Applying more rigorous standards might indeed reduce our F.T.E.’s. What should we do, if anything, to upgrade our expectations from our students?

In 1968 I was part of what was called the GREAT DEBATE in the Mathematics Library at Syracuse University. Every afternoon the fire marshal would remove the ashtrays because smoking was prohibited and the ashtrays only encouraged it; every evening the janitor would return the ashtrays because people continued to smoke and the ashtrays made it easier to clean up the mess. The graduate students took the side of either the fire marshal or the janitor, usually according to their smoking preferences.

Since I have been at the College, the only legislation in recognition of grade inflation has been janitorial in nature. To compensate for (and tacitly condone) grade inflation, we have raised the G.P.A. requirements for graduation with honors and we have raised the retention requirements at the College. I don’t see how we can reverse a national trend. I don’t even see how we can legislate a uniform grading system at the College. Some disciplines probably should have different distributions of grades than others; some faculty members do inspire their students to produce much higher quality work than do others. Still, we have put our enough ashtrays for our students. I can think of two consciousness - raising fire marshal suggestions.

(1) Have department heads ask their faculty in the end of the year reports to discuss the circumstances that led to giving A’s to more than 20% of their students.

(2) Have the grade distributions included on the form that summarizes the student opinion questionnaires.

A Change in Committee Structure

Some committees have two much work, some have too little, and some have no work at all. Some committees don’t do what they’re supposed to do and some don’t know what they’re supposed to do. Some have overlapping functions and some have no functions at all. After six years with the present structure, it’s time for a change.

It is easier to say that changes are needed than it is to say what changes are needed. Some suggestions follow.

(1) Call the Committee on Curriculum and Academic Planning the Curriculum Committee and give the duties of academic planning that are not directly related to the curriculum, like recommendations for graduation requirements, to the Academic Standards Committee. This would create a more equitable work distribution between the two committees.

(2) Combine the Faculty Hearing and Grievance Committees. Both committees meet infrequently but require sensitivity in personnel matters when they do meet.

(3) Combine the Student Affairs and Athletics Committee, whose members could also serve on the Judicial Board. None of these committees meets frequently and all require a sensitivity to and understanding of student needs.

(4) The Graduate Faculty Committee, which almost never meets and almost never does anything when it does meet, should either be abolished or strengthened.

(5) If the College honors its moral commitment under the terms of the grant from the Lilly Foundation (as I assume it will) to continue full funding annually ($75,000) for faculty development, then what is now called the Ad Hoc Lilly Committee might become either a standing committee elected by the faculty or have its duties absorbed by the Research and Development Committee.
Whether this or some other structure would best serve the current needs of the College requires some study. That is why I am asking the President to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee of the faculty for the purpose of re-examining our present committee structure and recommending suitable changes. If all goes well, the committee would make a recommendation at either the November or December meeting that would be voted on at the following meeting. The changes could then take place in the committees elected next year.

Thanks go to Harry Freeman, who is disciplined enough to save committee reports each semester and orderly enough to locate them in a finite amount of time.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Herb Silverman asked that I make a few short comments to the faculty at large based perhaps on my observations as Speaker during the past two years.

I am pleased to respond to this request and contribute in a small way to the first faculty newsletter. The need for increased communication within the College is of long standing and I commend Professor Silverman for his initiative in this area. In addition to the problem of communication it also seems to me that we as faculty should think more in terms of our diverse roles within the College as well as the overall goals and aspirations of the College. We often appear fragmented and uncertain of our collective direction within the institution. Indeed there are times when the faculty generally seems to lack confidence in its ability to contribute to overall policy and shape courses of events at the College.

It is never easy for over 200 faculty members with diverse interests and perceptions to move toward common objectives. Still, at a minimum it seems that we should have pride in what we have accomplished in building this institution and understand in a positive fashion our ability to influence its future.

It is perhaps trite, but nonetheless true, that no academic institution is greater than its faculty. Proliferation of administrative staff and agencies cannot change this fact. It seems important therefore that the faculty also play a larger role in the distribution and allocation of resources. These resources must be allocated equitably within the institution at large and indeed within the faculty itself. Certainly the creation of the President's Budget Committee is a positive step in that direction as well as increased faculty involvement in the areas of counseling, recruitment and student affairs.

Any discussion of the corporate faculty inevitably raises the issue of benefits and compensation. This faculty is not alone in its concern in these areas. In a period of rising inflation and reduced college budgets throughout the nation such problems are endemic. There are, however, areas involving compensation, insurance, travel, research and morale which deserve attention. It is true that much has been done - more is possible.

The College of William and Mary, an institution with which we have much in common, addressed these questions some two years ago through a blue-ribbon faculty committee which ultimately presented its finding and recommendations to their Board of Visitors. Perhaps we could effect liaison with William and Mary with a view toward seeing how they dealt with areas of common concern.

No discussion of benefits is complete without an attendant look at responsibilities.

Greatest faculty concern should be, and I believe is, the academic excellence of the education offered at our institution. Our collective work in the classroom is the greatest guarantee of this excellence. At the same time there are peripheral actions that can be taken. I would suggest, for example, that a faculty cup or other appropriate award be granted annually to the student organization that compiles the best academic achievement. The important thing is that we collectively think about this issue. Many of you undoubtedly have other suggestions that would be useful in achieving this goal. They should be enunciated.

Under any circumstances I believe this faculty is moving to play a more pronounced, more significant role at the College. This trend should be continued.

Tom Palmer
Dear Herb:

You and I have chatted briefly once or twice about how things might be changed in the interest of getting faculty business done more expeditiously—and responsibly. If I may, I'd like to say a little in writing on that subject.

Few of us are ready to point to our faculty meetings as a paradigm of rational discourse and decision-making. Typically we faculty members criticize various administrative failures to deal with small and large challenges, while being at least as guilty as they are of fumbling opportunities and facing responsibilities. As with the administration our failures come less often from a lack of good intentions than from a lack of good translation of those intentions into effective action. I see no reason why we should feel at a loss to improve our effectiveness as a faculty. In particular, I would suggest that an initial step in that might be taken by changing the procedures for conducting faculty business.

How we might reasonably and profitably change how we do business is, I think, suggested by a scrutiny of the problems that have arisen from how we have done business in the past. For example, it is inexcusable that faculty meetings taking place when they have to be cancelled for lack of a quorum; it is truly absurd to enact legislation as a faculty that is a patently put together in a committee of the whole—many of whom have done no homework on the problem—when a standing committee of the faculty has studied the problem for months by the hand and discussed it thoroughly. In the former case the business of the faculty is actually halted because so many of our number are apathetic about it; in the latter it generally is determined at least as much by emotion and rhetoric as by rational consideration, and has nearly always the echo of "we're committee" qualities which are expected when a motion becomes no more than a hastily sewn together collection of amendments.

The quorum problem could be dealt with by either of two approaches (probably more, but these occur to me): (1) establish a faculty senate; or (2) redefine our quorum as 35-40% of the faculty. Option (1) has previously been considered and voted down by our faculty, but we may now be ready to consider it. Option (2) would certainly not penalize anyone who wanted to participate in deliberation and decision making, but would allow both to go on in the absence of a technical majority; quorum does not mean majority unless we choose to make it that.

The problem of patched-together faculty legislation may be less simple to deal with. Again, may I suggest two options: (1) Amend the bylaws to (a) outline any amendment to a prime motion that has the effect of creating a substitute motion, and (b) require all prime motions to be published in writing with a rationale for at least a week before formal consideration—which is supposed to be the case now—and all amendments to be published in writing with a rationale at least three days before formal consideration; or (2) amend the bylaws to require that (a) any recommendation made by a standing committee of the faculty have the support of at least two-thirds of that committee and, (b) in the absence of a two-thirds vote against the recommendation by the general faculty, it becomes faculty legislation. (Though proposed as options, it would, of course, be possible to do both (1) and (2).) Option (1) should at least discourage the inadvertent creation of "camels" by providing more time prior to formal faculty discussion for consideration of the full impact of amending a particular motion in a particular way, and should decrease the confusion as to what, in fact, is to be voted on—the published motion or its inverse. Option (2) should assure that what is enacted has the broad support of the faculty both within committee and on the floor of the faculty, should give encouragement to good committee workers that what they have tried to have crafted carefully will not be mutilated capriciously once brought to the faculty, and, indeed, should encourage the faculty to elect the very best people possible to serve on faculty committees. Both options should have the practical result of having more motions voted either up or down rather than playing parliamentary games with them.

Now I recognize that there are faculty members who would disagree with all the options above, feeling quite seriously and sincerely that the principle of "democracy" would be impinged upon somehow by the enactment of any of them. In response I would submit that democracy suffers only if we mean by that word that any and every legislative act must be by a greater-than-50% direct vote of all the members of the group, and if one ignores the fact that much of our legislation results now from a 50%+ favorable response by whatever 50% of the total faculty happens to be at a given faculty meeting. Further, I suggest that how we try to do business has become a great enough embarrassment that even if so laudable a principle as pure democracy must be nipped at a bit, it is high time to consider how serious the swap-off is that we would be making.
Two more suggestions I will lump together as brief statements in this one paragraph: (1) We should reduce substantially the number of standing committees of the faculty; too many have no real business to tend to. (2) The Speaker should publish the semester reports from each standing committee as one package at the end of each semester; this would provide a neat summary for each faculty member in a form less likely to be lost.

May I add as an aside that I think your "Speaker's Newsletter" is a good idea. An informed democracy is certainly better than an uninformed democracy, and the newsletter should help those who want to be informed to keep up with what is going on.

Thanks for taking time to read this. If you see any merit in any of it, I'd be happy to discuss further with you how it might be effected.

Sincerely,

Gerald W. Gibson
Professor of Chemistry

Dear Gerald,

I hope to hear from other faculty about the many fine points that you have raised. I would certainly be willing to publish the end of semester standing committee reports in one package. I will ask that each committee send me its report. This semester, in addition to accomplishments of the committee, I would like to see the report include goals for the following semester, with an approximate timetable for achieving them. In the end of the year report, the committee could then state what progress was made and also make recommendations to next year's committee.

I do not like the idea of a faculty senate that would exclude people who are interested in discussing and voting on issues that affect us all. As you know, I am very much in favor of a reduced percentage for a quorum so that interested faculty members would not be prevented from continuing to discuss faculty business and setting policy. I hope that either you or someone else will propose such a change in our faculty by-laws. Thank you for taking the time to share your thoughts.

Herb

Dear Herb,

Communication is never easy. It is even more difficult when factual data are distorted.

At the recent Chairperson's Retreat there was some mention of the Library's "L" Account. Indeed, one individual approached me stating that he understood from the Retreat that the Library had a "large slush fund." I wish to assure you that we have no such "slush fund." We do have an "L" account and the facts and background of this account are as follows:

A. For four years running, despite repeated requests and documentation, the Library received no money - not one penny - for capital equipment. This meant that no planned replacement or preventive maintenance program was possible for any of our equipment. Our microform readers and printers, not to mention other heavily used equipment, were literally falling apart. With 35 to 40 percent of our collection in microform format this meant that this large percentage of our collection was inaccessible.

B. In desperation I approached the Xerox Company and asked them if there was any way other than renting the two xerox machines which would reduce the monthly and/or annual costs. I was informed that I could purchase the machines over a five year period, reduce the costs by fifty plus percent, and still receive the copy discount and maintenance service.

C. Although it was a risk, I chose to purchase these two machines and worked out the particulars with the Business Office and the Purchasing Department.
D. As I had no money to purchase any equipment, I established an "L" revenue account whereby the money taken in from the machines would in effect pay for the machines. This is now the case with all paper, toner, supplies, photocopy expenses and the purchase price paid from this "L" account.

E. There was also the understanding that after all purchase and photocopy expenses had been satisfied that I would be able to use the remaining money, if any, to purchase much needed capital equipment.

F. Dr. Bevan is, and has been, aware of this arrangement and has approved purchase of such equipment.

G. The price per photocopy has not increased as it is still the same - $.05 for faculty and staff, the same as the Duplicating Center.

H. All monies taken in as fines or lost book costs are deposited in our "book fund" for purchase of additional material - not an "L" account.

I. We need to continue the use of this "L" account as we still have not received the needed monies for capital equipment replacement and the prospects for the future are not bright.

J. This account should not be raided to provide for other activities. Every penny of this account has gone to improve the quality of library services and resources. In this era of austere budgeting it is the only bright spot that the Library has been able to perceive.

Hopefully, this will clarify the matter of Library "slush funds." If you have questions or comments, please contact me at 5530

Sincerely,

Ellis Hodgins
Director of Libraries

Editor's note:
And Dr. Bevan responds

Dear Herb,

At the department chairpersons' retreat I referred to "L" accounts, indicating that our library had such a fund. No reference was made to these funds as "slush funds." In fact, I mentioned that the monies had been used primarily for library equipment.

The actual accounting of such library monies are recorded in our business office as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number 31000-L100</th>
<th>Fines and Xerox</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance July 1, 1979</td>
<td>$6,454.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79/80 Receipts</td>
<td>$19,795.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$26,249.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services (Xerox)</td>
<td>$5,210.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$3,903.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Charges</td>
<td>$100.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$5,233.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Books</td>
<td>$221.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$542.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$15,211.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance as of July 1, 1980</td>
<td>$11,037.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cash receipts deposited in 1979-80 by the librarian to the Library Book Expense Account, Code No. 50614:
Dear Herb,

As a suggested change in the school calendar, I propose the following:

- That we not end classes with less than one full week after the Thanksgiving break.
- That the reading day be on a Monday OR that there be 2 reading days, the second of which would be used for departmental exams.
- That the last exams scheduled be for the "late in the day" classes to cause minimal disruption for December graduation.
- That a list of students who plan to graduate in December be circulated to professors who could then, if necessary, schedule earlier exams for those students only.

Sandra Povera

Dear Herb:

As I understand it, a new graduate program in fine arts is currently under consideration by the Graduate Council. I have two concerns about this.

My first concern is about the program itself. The fine arts undergraduate program is one of our most expensive; fine arts has one of the lowest ratio of FYE to faculty of any department. Won’t a graduate program be even more expensive? Won’t it require significant increases in our library holdings in fine arts, and thereby even further deplete our already insufficient library funds? Questions like these make me wonder about the feasibility of adding such a program, given what seems to be shrinking resources from the state each year. Now, I am not claiming to know the answers to these questions. I am told that there is some sort of formal proposal; I presume that these questions are dealt with in the proposal. But, like most of the rest of the faculty, I will never see a copy of this proposal. This leads me to my second, and more important, concern.

I have been told that this new program will not come before the faculty; the faculty as a whole is to act only on undergraduate programs. This seems to me to be a bad policy. I realize that, strictly speaking, graduate programs are part of the consortium. This, however, does not change the fact that graduate programs have an important impact on the nature, the quality, the priorities, and the budget of the College. Each of these is of vital interest to every member of the faculty. This leads me to the conclusion that ALL academic programs, graduate as well as undergraduate, should come before the faculty. Moreover, this seems to be what it says in our own by-laws: "The faculty shall be concerned with all matters relating to the academic program, the curriculum, ... and the uses of the intellectual resources of the College" (Faculty and Administrative Manual, p. 26. Underlining mine).
I do not know how the present policy came about. Nor do I know how to go about changing the policy, since there is nothing about graduate programs in the Manual. Yet, I would hope that the policy could be changed, and that we will act in accordance with our own by-laws. Perhaps, writing this letter and having it appear in your newsletter will begin the process of change.

Sincerely,

Ship Godow
Rev. A. Godow, Jr.
Associate Professor of Philosophy

I would like to thank all contributors to this newsletter. The deadline for submitting letters and pieces of information for the next issue of Newspeak, and all subsequent issues, is the second Friday after a faculty meeting (11 days later). The earlier the letter the better. If you want a response from an administrator, please submit at least one week before the deadline.

Keep in mind, before throwing this newsletter in the trash, that a first edition of Action Comics can cost as much as $9200, a first edition of Superman $5600.