NEWSPEAK
The College of Charleston Faculty Newsletter
by Herb Silverman, Speaker of the Faculty

ADMINISTRATIONSPEAK

The primary administrative concern this month has been the mandate by the state that each state agency with more than eleven employees submit a plan to reduce its personnel budget by 7%. The College was among the 235 of the agencies that compiled in time to meet the October 15 deadline. Under such short notice, the plan—of necessity—had to be as tentative and general as possible.

A subcommittee of the Council of Chairpersons is trying to define a procedure to implement academic cuts in personnel, should the need arise. Its members are Jim Abbott, Bill Bischoff, Tom Livingston, Tom Palmer, and Jim Smiley. The President's Budget Review Committee has broader scope; it is expected to examine and make recommendations on institutional priorities.

The electrical power failures of September 24 and September 29 were unrelated. Manhole to manhole inspection determined that the first blackout was due to the failure of a connection fitting of the Library feeder; the second blackout was caused by a failed cable on a branch feeder line from the Science Center manhole to a house on Coming Street. Our outdated utility system could be responsible for future failures, and under discussion are ways to control blackouts so that the whole College is not put out of commission.

Several students have complained to administrators that some faculty members regard it as an imposition when students phone them at home for what students consider to be a valid reason, like whether a test will be given the day after a blackout. There was the feeling on the part of the administration that faculty should be receptive to a phone call at home from a student who has a legitimate reason for calling.

The Humanities Center is sponsoring a round-table discussion by a panel of faculty and students on the trends, processes, and prescriptions for improvement of humanities education, focusing on student experiences at the College of Charleston in freshman and humanities courses, major and interdisciplinary programs, continuing education and work participation, and extracurricular activities. All faculty and students are invited to participate on Wednesday, November 12 from 2-5 P.M. in the Stern Center Ballroom. A reception in the Blacklock House will follow.

The College is now following the AAUP recommendation of granting three years of credit toward tenure to a faculty member who has taught for at least three years at another institution. Only about 14 faculty will be evaluated for tenure this academic year, compared to 32 last year and 37 the year before. This decline in the number of faculty eligible for tenure consideration is expected to continue, with 102 out of a full-time faculty of about 200 already having tenure. There is a November 1 deadline for submitting colleague letters on those being evaluated this year.

The 1980-1981 salary information below is for nine month contracts of full-time faculty members, and excludes visiting and temporary faculty. The ranges have been approved by the Board of Trustees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTORS</th>
<th>Lowest Salary</th>
<th>Highest Salary</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>Approved Salary Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,000 - 19,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14,050</td>
<td>16,727</td>
<td>15,629</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSISTANT PROFESSORS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>$13,000 - 25,900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>15,258</td>
<td>23,317</td>
<td>18,509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,500 - 28,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>18,052</td>
<td>28,206</td>
<td>22,025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,000 - 35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>21,371</td>
<td>30,726</td>
<td>25,877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMITTEE SPEAK

The Committee on Nominations had one meeting and decided to recommend all fourteen faculty who applied for the five faculty positions on the President's Ad Hoc Budget Review Committee.

The Committee on Curriculum and Academic Planning has decided, based on faculty concerns, to gather further information from departments about minimum and maximum hourly requirements for a major and make a future recommendation to the faculty. It was felt that the dearth of new course proposals arriving this year, for the November 1 deadline, was a consequence of the move to a two-year bulletin.

The Faculty Welfare Committee is again discussing distribution procedures for student evaluations of teaching, and has invited John Dempsey and Ellenor Mahon to its next meeting. A new and slightly different teaching evaluation questionnaire is being studied, and a proposal should be ready to be considered for adoption in time to be used next fall. The Committee is working with Sue Desmonde, Dean of Continuing Education, on possible changes in remuneration for teaching evening school courses. Deliberations have begun on the recommendations of the ad hoc committee appointed by the President last spring to review the tenure and promotion process at the College of Charleston. The ad hoc committee recommended that a tenure decision be made in the fifth year and that promotion not be considered before the seventh year. The Faculty Welfare Committee hopes to have a proposal ready in the Spring that could take effect in the academic year 1981-82 if it passes the faculty.

The Student Affairs Committee made suggestions as to what its priorities would be for the year. There seemed to be a consensus that race relations at the College and in the general community was the most important issue, and possible remedies to existing problems will be discussed at future meetings.

The Committee on Athletics is sponsoring a cookout, preceding a basketball game, outside the gym on December 6 at 5:00 P.M. The Committee will also present awards to student athletes in recognition of scholastic achievement. The student on each team with the highest G.P.R. over 3.0 will receive an award as will the team with the highest overall G.P.R.

The Committee on the Library was made aware of the problem of faculty members who occasionally abuse their library privileges by not returning books when requested or by returning them in poor condition. The Committee would like to help promote efficient services in the Circulation Department of the Library, and is planning to meet shortly with members of the Library faculty and staff to discuss the problems.

The Committee on Admissions and Financial Assistance met with Fred Daniels, Dean of Admissions, who distributed packets of information on Governor's School enrollment, basic admissions requirements, and recruitment efforts (more recruit- ment out-of-state than in previous years). A subcommittee of Dick Crosby and Tom Livingston is studying the quantitative predictor that is utilized when determining students who are to receive academic scholarships.

The Committee on Continuing Education and Special Programs will select recipients of Incentive Scholarships for adult students who are returning to college or beginning their college studies in the spring semester. The $150 awards, funded by the College of Charleston Foundation, are based primarily on the student's commitment to earning a college degree and stated financial need. For additional information, contact Donna Pretty x5620.

The Faculty Research and Development Committee is continuing its work on guidelines and procedures for summer grants given by the College. The Committee hopes to finalize the guidelines at its November 7 meeting, and to distribute them to the faculty shortly thereafter.

The Lilly Committee is in the process of evaluating the overall impact that its grants have had on departments and programs. It has asked for comments from past recipients, and would like the opinions of any other faculty affected by the grants. Faculty awarded the following grants will have a reduced teaching load in the spring semester while they complete their projects.

Interdisciplinary Visiting Lectures
Anna Katona and Peter McCandless

Research and Development Fellows
Kathy Alligood, Marion Doig, Bill Gudger, David Mann, and Glen Merrill

Special Projects in Instructional Development
Alice Geiling, Sandy Powers, and Susan Schenck
An ad hoc committee has been formed to study the proposed by-laws changes that substitute motions be ruled out of order and that 33% of the faculty shall constitute a quorum. Its members are Marsha Hass, Roy Hills (chair), Sam Hines, Diane Johnson, and Fred Watts. The committee will make its recommendations at the November faculty meeting.

SPEAKEASY

The College is becoming rank unbalanced, with more than half the full-time faculty at the Associate Professor level and only seven at the level of Instructor. One of these Instructors must serve on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President and two must serve on the Faculty Welfare Committee. It is particularly difficult to choose a slate for the Advisory Committee that satisfies both the distribution and rank restrictions. It might be preferable to drop rank requirements for all standing committees, and trust the Committee on Nominations to provide us with a suitable mix.

Each member of the ad hoc committee to examine the structure of our committees is now responsible for scrutinizing two standing committees. If you have suggestions that pertain to a committee, you may wish to convey them to the appropriate person:

- Academic Standards: Gerald Gibson
- Admissions and Financial Assistance: Tom Palmer
- Advisory Committee on Tenure of Faculty: Tom Palmer
- Advisory Committee to the President: Harry Freeman
- Athletics: Rebecca Herring
- Continuing Education and Special Programs: Ted Weiant
- Curriculum and Academic Planning: Gerald Gibson
- Grievance: Jim Anderson
- Hearing: Nan Morrison
- Library: Nan Morrison
- Nominating: Ted Weiant
- Research and Development: Rebecca Herring
- Student Affairs: Harry Freeman
- Welfare: 

The first meeting of this ad hoc committee is scheduled for November 6.

President Collins requested a recommendation from the above committee by March so that the new structure could be in effect the following year. Unfortunately, March would be too late. Prior to the election of standing committees at the April faculty meeting, faculty members must state in writing their committee preferences. The Committee on Nominations then goes through the long and laborious task of drawing up a slate, checking that the nominees are willing to serve, and presenting the slate to the faculty at least two weeks before the April faculty meeting. Since the recommendation of the ad hoc committee requires a change in the by-laws, the proposal cannot be adopted until the month after it is introduced. Thus, the ad hoc committee report can be presented no later than the January faculty meeting if there is to be a change in committee structure the following year.

How many times have you asked, on a Monday, if there is a faculty meeting today? It's an easy rule to remember: faculty meetings are the second Monday of each month.

Had we followed the procedure of dropping the bottom one-third instead of the bottom one at the election for the Budget Review Committee, we probably would have come up with the same committee in three, instead of six, ballots. David Mann, whose negative vote prevented the unanimous consent that would have allowed a temporary rule change, explains his objections to the proposed change in a Letter to the Editor.

While thinking about different voting procedures, a method came to mind that would solve some problems in Presidential elections. Allow each person to vote for at most two candidates for President, indicating a first and a second choice. If no one in a state receives a majority, discard all first place choices that were not for either of the top two candidates and count the second choice as the first. This could enable a person to vote for his or her preferred candidate, even though a probable loser, and also in effect vote against another candidate. It would eliminate the advantage of a candidate with a minority of support who is fortunate enough to be opposed by two candidates that appeal to similar constituencies.

A proposal to fund the Sherry Hour after faculty meetings has been made to the Board of Directors of the College of Charleston Foundation. If it is rejected, the Sherry Hour will still continue through private donations.
What was an agnostic Jew doing at Grace Episcopal Church on Sunday, October 12 -- in academic regalia, yet? I was celebrating Higher Education Sunday, the annual merging of Church and State. Also attending from the College were Roy Hills, Dave Tudor, and Peter Yann. I would have felt more comfortable celebrating higher education in a less doctrinaire religious institution (Unitarian?). For me, the most moving part of the sermon by Preacher Collins was his report that people in this country spend more on cat food than on higher education. I now plan to donate at least as much to the College of Charleston Foundation this year as I have spent on the care and feeding of my cat Plato.

Ernie Locklair gave me a complete list of the Campus Communications Committee. The members are Beau Booker, Suzanne Byrd, Gerald Gibson, Skipp Godow, Ernie Locklair, Susan Michel, Cheryl Nichols, John Ulbrych, Steve Peeples, and now Herb Silverman. The committee has met this fall because its members want to have a reason to hold a meeting, not just meet for the sake of meeting.

What's in a name? I was asked if I was being sexist in the previous newsletter when I used "Sue" with respect to Sue Desmond and referred to "President" Collins and Dr. "Bevan. My nomenclature criteria are based on what the person likes to be called, what I usually call the person, and how most refer to the person. The majority of faculty seem to reserve names for Collins and Bevan. Most of the chairpersons call Bevan by his first name, and a few call Collins by his first name. Unless requested by an individual to do otherwise, I prefer to refer to people in writing either by what is most comfortable for me or what is most familiar to others. In any case, no faculty was insinuated toward Dr. Desmond, Ed, or Jack.

**EDITORIALS**

**Professional Development At The College**

In simplistic terms, there are basically three types of academic institutions: (1) universities, usually large, in which professional development is synonymous with research and research is, lip service aside, the only criterion for tenure and promotion, (2) colleges, usually small, in which it is professional development that receives the service of the lips, and (3) schools that attempt to provide quality teaching through a faculty that has high standards for professional development. An institution that strives for excellence in two areas is likely to have more creative tension than one with less diversity. Additional problems can occur when a college undergoes significant changes in size, character, and faculty expectations in a relatively short period of time. This brings us to the College of Charleston.

We, as an institution, have begun moving away from (2) with an eye on (3). The good news is that we are becoming a more productive, vital faculty that occasionally receives some national recognition; the bad news is that some divergent philosophical cliques have emerged with the concomitant loss of camaraderie and unity of purpose. I would like to discuss what I view as the reasons for and problems caused by the changes, with some possible solutions.

No teaching institution can address the question of research without also examining its affect on classroom performance. Are researchers better teachers? This is an easy question to answer. I can state clearly and unequivocally that the answer is -- it depends. It depends on the institution and the school. It also depends on what is meant by research. In some disciplines, the knowledge imparted in introductory courses is essentially unchanged from that of twenty years ago, with perhaps a slightly different emphasis. Moreover, a faculty member might become totally absorbed in a research project to the detriment of his or her students. This is much more likely to occur at a research university than at a college whose primary commitment is to teaching.

In many areas, current research has shown what was being taught several years ago to be false. New developments can be brought to the classroom either by doing research independently or by keeping abreast with the research of others. The involvement and enthusiasm that the teacher displays toward the frontiers of knowledge in his or her field can carry over to the students. In large universities, research projects are shared almost exclusively with colleagues or advanced graduate students, but at the College, the relationship between professor and student as co-learners can be the most intellectually satisfying and creative contact the undergraduate can experience.

The importance placed on research at most institutions, however, is motivated more by a desire for prestige than for improved instruction. With prestige come grants, financial contributions, community support, and students. If prestige is not an end in itself, it is certainly a means to many ends. An institution usually acquires prestige either through its football team or its faculty. The College of Charleston has always had, and I hope always will have, a better faculty than a football team.
Several years ago when, for the first time, there were more new Ph.D.'s looking for academic positions than there were positions available, small colleges recognized that they could attract faculty who in the past might have gone to prestigious universities. Some colleges preferred not hiring faculty interested in research, for fear of having unhappy new faculty who wanted to be elsewhere and unhappy old faculty who wanted the character of the school to remain the same. Some colleges hired researchers because it didn't hurt to have a teacher and a researcher for the price of a teacher, without having furnished the research incentive or support; some colleges, like the College of Charleston, have tried to hire and partially provide for those with an inclination toward research. There are small summer grants provided by the College, limited funds for travel to professional meetings, merit raises and promotions based in part on research, sabbatical leaves, and an occasional course reduction to be replaced with a worth-while research project. Researchers grumble that this isn't enough to make the College competitive with most universities, which the administration recognizes. The hearts and minds of the administrators seem to be in the right place, and it is hoped that someday their budgets will follow.

What about present faculty members who were here when there was no expectation of or support for research? Some have done and continue to do research. Others feel uncomfortable about this shift in emphasis. Here and elsewhere tenured faculty are made less secure by the recognition that they might not have been tenured under the current criteria, that they now feel bound by these new criteria to vote to deny tenure to some with better credentials. Many, if not most, faculty cannot successfully compete professionally with some of the applicants who are rejected for positions here. I view the contributions in the other statement by the College to the faculty member that he or she has been a valuable addition to the institution and is expected to continue to contribute significantly 30 more years. This does not mean that the changes in direction of the faculty member must parallel the changes in direction of the institution; but it also does not mean that a faculty member need not change till death or tenure do him part. It is not fair to expect a faculty member who has not done research in ten years to suddenly begin, but it is also not fair for a faculty member to examine personal academic goals without regard to the objectives of the institution.

Publishable research in refereed journals has not been and need not be the intent of every faculty member. Pedagogical research to improve one's courses, investigating aspects in one's discipline outside of one's specialty, learning more about areas related to one's discipline, presenting papers at professional meetings, refereeing or reviewing papers, and giving departmental or college-wide seminars might also be considered worthwhile forms of professional development. The point is that every faculty member should have some program for professional growth. Trying to convince our students of the importance of scholarship when we have stopped our scholarly pursuits puts us in the same unenviable position as the smoking, overweight physician who tells his patients to do as he says not as he does.

There are three criteria at the College on which faculty are evaluated: teaching effectiveness, professional growth and development, and service to the College community. While teaching is the most important criterion, I should hope that each faculty member would try to make meaningful contributions in both areas. This need not be accomplished by uniform expectations enforced by a uniform grading procedure. Perhaps department chairpersons, keeping in mind institutional goals, could discuss with each individual how best he or she can contribute to the department.

I would like to see more flexibility in weighting the importance of the three criteria to account for individual differences and objectives. Recognition should be given for aiding colleagues in achieving their goals, either by helping them directly with their undertakings or by assuming additional responsibilities that enable them to devote more time to their projects. We can all work more efficiently with every faculty member sharing and producing according to his or her ability, training, and academic interests. Each department, and consequently the College, can then come closer to fulfilling its potential in a spirit of cooperation.

The Faculty Meeting Debacle

How did the latest faculty meeting go wrong? Let me count the ways. First, the Committee on Nomination shirked its duty. If it had recommended five people for the Budget Review Committee, as was its responsibility, they would have gone more smoothly. Its abdication created confusion, resentment, and the possibility of an unbalanced Budget Review Committee. The faculty, without benefit of the written statements that all fourteen candidates submitted to the committee on Nomination explaining their qualifications, took six ballots to produce a committee. If three people had not withdrawn, nine ballots probably would have been necessary.
I asked Clarence Davis, chairperson of the Committee on Nominations, for an explanation. He said the Committee was in a quandary because of the absence of explicit criteria and general confusion over the duties of the Budget Review Committee. At least ten faculty members that did not apply were contacted, but all declined the opportunity to serve. The Committee found it more difficult to disappoint applicants at this meeting than at the April meeting when all the standing committees were elected because faculty then denied their first choice were at least given their second or third choices.

President Collins must also share some of the responsibility. While he is to be commended for requesting faculty input on the budget, it would have been helpful to have given more guidelines to the faculty as to the duties of the Budget Review Committee. He certainly should not have waited until just before the balloting was to begin to announce that the term would be for three years. My preference would have been for staggered terms, to insure continuity.

The major responsibility, and blame, for the confusion and disorder at the meeting must rest with me. I would like to apologize to George Haborak and Ellis Hodgins for allowing the balloting to continue during their reports. Trying to save time is no excuse for rudeness. I should not have allowed balloting for the Budget Review Committee and debating of evaluation procedures to occur on the floor simultaneously. It was not, as one member suggested, simply a case of the faculty not being able to walk and chew gum at the same time. Each issue was sufficiently important to deserve our undivided attention.

I would like to go beyond catharsis and confession to some suggestions that might help avoid similar debacles. Replacement of faculty is made promptly on all committees except the Committee on Nominations. The present Committee on Nominations has been functioning this semester with five, instead of seven members. In past years, replacement on this committee has not appeared crucial because it normally has no business after the first faculty meeting of the fall semester. Perhaps, in future elections, the two with the highest vote totals that are not elected to the Committee on Nominations can serve as alternates. This would require a change in our by-laws.

A standing rule of the faculty, which has never been enforced, prohibits voting on any business not received in writing by the faculty at least one week before the faculty meeting. The intent of this rule is to allow adequate time to think about the implications and consequences of specific proposals prior to a faculty meeting. If strictly enforced, this rule could put motions at the mercy of the mailroom. I plan at future meetings to follow the spirit, if not the letter, of this rule.

I am requesting that prime motions coming to a deciding vote be distributed to faculty at least one week before the faculty meeting, and that amendments be distributed at least three days in advance. Some self-restraint must be exercised when the temptation arises to propose an amendment that has not received much prior deliberation. Please reserve an amendment that has not been circulated for an occasion when, during the course of debate, it becomes apparent that the amendment is really needed. In accordance with Robert's Rules of Order, I am requiring that any such amendment be presented in writing to the Chair. With more careful planning, I hope we will be able to say in May what we can all say now -- that the October faculty meeting was the worst of the year.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Herb,

The procedure for initiating a new program at the graduate level is identical to that used at the undergraduate level, except for the fact that the graduate faculty acts for the institution. There may be institutions where it's done differently, but I'm not acquainted with any.

The commitment to a graduate program in Fine Arts was made some time ago and the lack of facilities was the primary deterrent to developing the program. When new facilities became available the members of the Fine Arts Faculty moved to define a program.
After the program proposal was elaborated and approved by the members of the Department, it was forwarded to the Graduate Council of the College. This body will make a judgment after it has scrutinized the program, raising questions about academic soundness and financial feasibility. If the decision of the Council is supportive to pursuing the program, the proposal is forwarded to the graduate faculty for its evaluation. Copies go also to the President and the Vice President for Business Affairs who study it, raising questions and passing on judgments to the Academic Vice President for referral to the graduate faculty. If the graduate faculty votes to endorse the proposal, then it is sent to the Charleston Higher Education Consortium to be reviewed by its Academic Affairs Committee which is composed of the academic vice presidents of the member institutions and a representative from the staff of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education.

Next it goes to the State College Board of Trustees and then on to the Advisory Committee of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Commission on Higher Education. The Advisory Committee is composed of the academic vice presidents of the South Carolina State Colleges and Universities. Matters of program and finances are reviewed. From this point on it goes to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Commission on Higher Education and, if passed, to the Commission on Higher Education. A favorable vote by the Commission authorizes the program.

It would appear to me that such a procedure is protective of the interests of academic; the judgment of the 40 graduate faculty members should be comparable in concern and competence to that of the 200.

On other note is appropriate. The faculty approved the present procedure in its meeting of December 15, 1975, after appointing on November 24, 1975, an Ad Hoc Committee to consider a change in the by-laws concerning the jurisdiction of graduate courses. "The motion carried."

Sincerely,

[Signature]

J. M. Bevan
Academic Vice President

Editor's Note:

The motion approved by the faculty at the December 15, 1975 meeting states that "Undergraduate departments initiating new graduate programs inform the undergraduate faculty of the fact when the department forwards the program to the Graduate Council for action."

Dear Herb,

Thank you for the invitation to describe the organizational structure of the Graduate Office and the procedures for modifying programs of instruction at the graduate level. The College presently operates graduate programs in Elementary Education and Early Childhood Education leading to the M.Ed Degree. In cooperation with the Charleston Higher Education Consortium, the College offers the M.S. in Marine Biology and the M.Ed in Special Education. In cooperation with the Charleston Higher Education Consortium and the University of South Carolina, the College offers the M.P.A. in Public Administration. Each program area has its own Admissions Committee and Graduate Steering Committee to make recommendations to the Graduate Council and its parent body, the Graduate Faculty.

When it was established in 1973, the Graduate Council was given responsibility for all matters pertaining to graduate policy, curriculum, and instruction. By charter it is obligated to make a continuing study of degree requirements and of graduate courses, and to initiate recommendations for dropping, for combining, for altering, or adding courses or new programs. It reports directly to the Graduate Faculty.
The Plan of Reorganization of the Graduate Council approved by
President Collins in September 1980 establishes membership on the Council
as follows: Vice President for Academic Affairs, ex officio; Dean of
Graduate Studies, Chairperson; Director of Graduate Program in Marine
Biology; Director of Graduate Programs in Early Childhood and Elementary
Education; Director of Graduate Programs in Special Education; Director
of Graduate Program in Public Administration; an Elected Representative
from each of the departments of Biology, Education, and Public Adminis-
tration; and the Chairpersons of Biology, Education, and Public
Administration.

All voting members of the Graduate Council serve as members of the
undergraduate faculty at the College of Charleston as well as members of
the graduate faculty. It is highly unlikely that this body would
consider any action that might be detrimental in any way to the College
of Charleston. However, if it should recommend programs or policies
which could interfere with the educational mission of the College as a
whole, the Graduate Faculty, with representatives from all departments
on campus which have graduate programs and the elected representatives
from the undergraduate faculty from departments which do not have grad-
uate programs, could immediately cancel the action.

In fact, it is because of its potential role as communicator with
the rest of the undergraduate faculty and representative of their special
interest on the Graduate Faculty that I strongly recommend retention of
the At-Large Graduate Faculty Committee which has been threatened with
abolishment in recent months.

Thank you again, Herb, for providing the opportunity to communicate
with faculty who might be concerned about graduate studies at the College.
If there are additional questions or concerns please call me at 941 or
stop by the Graduate Office.

Sincerely,

Charles E. Matthews
Acting Dean of Graduate Studies

Dear Herb,

In the report on the proposed graduate program in fine arts that appears in
the Annual Report, 1979-1980, a balanced budget is projected in 1983-84 and subsequent
years. The balanced budget is obtained by a projection of 36 FTE students
in the third and subsequent years at $2,500 per FTE student for a total of $90,000.
The 36 FTE student enrollment is obtained in part through a projection of eight new
full-time students per year for a total of 24 full-time students enrolled in the
third year. A more reasonable estimate of the cost to the College of the graduate
program would be obtained with a projection that does not assume that full-time
students will be in residence for three years.

Sincerely,

William Golightly
Associate Professor of Mathematics

Dear Herb,

I would like to take this opportunity to express my deep disappointment at
the recent action regarding the administration of teaching evaluations which the
faculty approved at our October meeting.

Many faculty were upset by Dean Dempsey's memorandum of October 7 which
stated that, in his opinion, the logistical problems involved in implementing
the procedures adopted last spring regarding administration of teaching evalua-
tions would be virtually insurmountable. Apparently a trial run of the system
on eight sections of the half-semester Library 101 course had brought mixed
results. Some Peer Mentors had not met their classes as assigned, causing some
confusion. A number of faculty wondered whether the procedures adopted last
spring were really an impossible bureaucratic monstrosity or whether lack of
administrative coordination and planning were really to blame. Other faculty
were upset that there was so little time for consideration of alternatives
before the October faculty meeting, especially when some departments did not
receive Dempsey's memorandum until October 9 or 10. The issue could not be
defferred until the November meeting because the evaluation period would have
already begun by then. To some faculty, a crisis seemed at hand,
Dean Dempsey's memorandum had urged that faculty colleagues or departmental secretaries administer the evaluations. This proposal actually received little serious consideration at the October meeting. Instead, a substitute motion urging a return to last year's system, the system used at the College for quite some time, received most of the attention. The faculty, seemingly faced with an unwieldy bureaucratic student proctoring system on the one hand, and a possibly more efficient but to some perhaps more threatening proposal of colleague or secretary proctoring, opted instead for the old system amended to take place during the last three weeks of class instead of the last day of class. During the debate, numerous ballots for election of faculty to the Budget Review Committee distracted many professors.

While the decision to return to the old system of administering the evaluations was perhaps predictable as well as pragmatic, it also reflected a retreat from the reforms adopted last spring. Contrary to popular belief held in some quarters, the old system has not been implemented in any uniform or standard manner. Some professors have made prejudicial comments to their classes before asking a student to administer the evaluation. Other professors have administered the questionnaire themselves; some have remained in the classroom during the evaluations. Some professors have reviewed and edited the questionnaires before turning them in. These and other abuses and inconsistencies were precisely the reasons why the Faculty Welfare Committee spent much time last year working on a uniform system for administering the teaching evaluations. On short notice, Dempsey's proposal of colleague or secretarial proctoring seemed preferable to the haphazard old system.

After surveying the wreckage left by October meeting, Dean Dempsey and I distributed a memorandum to the faculty, suggesting uniform procedures to be followed in the administration of evaluations under the old system. We also included a suggested set of standardized instructions to be read in each class. We hope the faculty will find these suggestions acceptable; they're widespread use will minimize the irregularities of the old system noted above.

This issue will be brought before the faculty again. The importance of a uniform system of administering teaching evaluations cannot be overstated. Such a system is fundamental to guarantee the integrity of the questionnaire data as well as to maximize the objectivity (or to minimize the bias) of that data. Whether a student proctoring system, a faculty proctoring system, or a standardized version of the old system is permanently implemented, it is our responsibility as professional educators to adopt and support a uniform system of administering teaching evaluations.

George W. Hopkins
Associate Professor
Department of History

Dear Herb,

The show put on by the faculty at the October meeting was disorderly and embarrassing. While I applaud an attempt to save time, both you and the faculty who conducted the election demonstrated poor judgment in continuing the election while Mr. Raborak and Mr. Hodgyn were addressing the faculty. Clearly the faculty owes them an apology for the rude manner in which they were received.

The lengthy election would not have been necessary however, had the Nominating Committee carried out its responsibility and presented a slate of five candidates. While I support the practice which allows faculty to request certain committee assignments, it seems to be bad practice to allow faculty to nominate themselves. I hope the Nominating Committee does not choose to use the same nominating procedure when regular committee elections are held next year.

Sincerely,

Brian Wesselink

Dear Herb

Congratulations on a first successful edition of "Newspack." It is a good idea to present a forum for dialog between and among faculty and administrators at the College. It seems incumbent for me to remind my brothers and sisters on the faculty about democracy. This would appear to be the appropriate time and place to review some basic concepts.
Our faculty assembly is a democratic process. It is not designed to be an efficient fast, expeditious railroad. A democratic process is designed to take into account the plurality of interests and points of view necessarily extant. Debate may seem slow, cumbersome and incremental. It may not proceed the way we wish. It may even appear crazy to some.

As faculty members, our responsibilities are diverse, our points of view divergent. But we come together periodically as A FACULTY. We decide matters of business, according to the by-laws, as ONS. In no small way, WE ARE the College of Charleston. It is not any one committee's function to decide matters for the faculty at large to ratify. Committees function to recommend, to screen, to placate divergent views. The faculty AS A WHOLE decides. As the by-law states, "The faculty shall be the legislative body of the College for all academic matters." (p. 26)

If efficiency is the objective of our body, then the system we would choose would not be democracy. To be somewhat trite, during Mussolini's Italy the trains ran on time. But look at the price paid. We would pay a similar price to install a faculty senate.

The by-laws also specify voting procedures. With all due respect, the role of the Speaker is to preside over faculty meetings, not to expedite the by-laws. The role of the Speaker is to ensure the by-laws be executed faithfully. It is not for the Speaker to suggest changes in the by-laws; it took too long to adopt them carefully to substitute for them the will of the day.

For the good and welfare of the College of Charleston,

David S. Mann
Political Science

To the Editor
NEWSPEAK

I wish to bring to the attention of the Editor of Newspeak a matter which many of the faculty will consider of no consequence, but about which I have strong feelings.

When the current speaker of the faculty campaigned for election to this distinguished position, a promise of more dignified dress was made. I now understand that this campaign promise was intended for Board of Trustees' meetings only.

However, I fear that the faculty at its meetings is deserving of as much dignity of dress by the speaker of the faculty as is the Board of Trustees. In my opinion jeans and T-shirt fall somewhat short of dignified dress on the part of the speaker. I do not wish to indicate that a three-piece suit is necessary, nor do I propose a change in the by-law calling for the establishment of a speaker's dress code. But, I do appeal to the speaker's sense of dignity in publicly representing the entire faculty.

Nade Creasy

Dear Dick,

My intention has been to dress in a more dignified manner when acting as a representative of the faculty in a community that would find offensive my usual apparel or might discover reasons in my attire to deny me credibility. In addition to wearing my suit for the Board of Trustees, I wore it at a gathering for parents of incoming students.

No slight was intended when I chose to dress for my colleagues as I do for my students. I had hoped that my selection of garments would not be a criterion used by the faculty to measure whether I carried myself with dignity. Here I am not a representative of the faculty, I might think of a request to dress more suitably as an infringement on my academic freedom. However, as your representative I feel an obligation to follow the wishes of the faculty. I know some faculty members find my attire amusing, but did not think they considered it offensive. May I suggest circulating the following petition:

We, the undersigned, find the dress of the current Speaker of the Faculty inappropriate for conducting faculty business and request that he preside at meetings in more dignified attire.

Should twenty faculty members sign the petition, I will come to faculty meetings in what you consider to be more proper apparel.
Dear Herb,

I read with interest your editorial on grade inflation and wholeheartedly agree with your concern and the need for examination of this problem at the College. I wonder if the issue has ever seriously been raised at the departmental level; certainly department heads (and evaluation panels) should take more responsibility in this area, particularly at the time of the third year evaluation.

In addition to the F.T.E. factor, I think that grade inflation stems from the desire to be popular and avoid the problems that sometimes develop from strict grading. Ironically, I have been able to observe at the College that students, while taking advantage of grade inflation where it exists, do not in reality have much respect for "easy" professors. With regard to the statistics you mentioned, it is not clear whether or not you took into consideration the attrition rate. Most students who withdraw from a course represent potential F grades which are not seen on a grade distribution chart. On the other hand, classes do vary greatly (in size and quality) at an institution such as ours and to conform blindly to an expected curve could lead to injustices either in favor or against individual students.

Nonetheless, your raising this issue is courageous and commendable. We owe it to the students at this College to instruct them well and judge them fairly, and grade inflation runs counter to those goals. I hope that your comments signal a necessary and healthy reappraisal of a matter that affects not only the quality of work in the classroom but the reputation of our academic programs as well.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jorge A. Marban

Dear Herb,

After three years in the Registrar's Office, I have acquired views on "grade inflation" that I wish to pass on. Grade inflation has turned out to be a slippery phenomenon, nationwide: if one deducts the effects of new non-punitive grading systems, and liberalized withdrawal policies, it is hard to show an enduring rise in grades given for specific courses.

There is a problem of definition. We use grades in three ways: 1) to record individual mastery of course material, relative to peers. 2) to record average success in a series of courses (student g.p.r.). 3) to characterize large groups of students (graduates; honors students). These uses are not necessarily commutative. There is a tremendous difference in the perceptions expressed by: "I got a 'C' in Organic Chemistry"; "She is a 'C' student overall"; 'Most College of Charleston Seniors earn B averages."

The first statement simply tells us the student passed a difficult course. We know nothing about his or her general grades or ability. We also know nothing about the course grading curves, or the peer group among whom the "C" was given.

The second statement implies competent mediocrity. It is the standard that has been inflated.

The third statement sounds good outside. If I hire a graduate, I want him or her to be better than average, don't I? (The truth is that graduates' overall averages range around 2.80, but the last year they do earn B's. Inspection of g.p.r.'s at most prestigious colleges will show the same, or higher grade patterns.)

So one has shown general inflation on a course-by-course basis, after the effects of liberalized withdrawal, and uncounted "F's" in some institutions, are factored in. The problem is not that curves are too high, but that the competency demanded to pass may be too low. This shows up in grade-average inflation, when a "C" student is seen by teachers or employers to have less than average competence. People argue about "inflation" because the measuring the competencies required of a given course or major is a difficult and (some think) privileged task for the departments.

Granting that the question of definition is unsolved, faculty may still find the following observations useful:

1) Freshman g.p.r.'s stayed fairly stable from 1971 to 1976, when I last inspected them. Average freshman g.p.r. ranged from 2.03 to 2.16, peaking in 1976 and then declining.
2) After first semester (in 1977-78), 66% of non-returning freshmen who could have returned had averages below 2.00. Nevertheless, averages for spring did not rise sharply. This argues that freshman courses are about as difficult as we can afford. In fact, since six-tenths of our freshmen come from the top half of their high school classes, the drop from easy C's and B's to hard-to-get C's at the college may increase our attrition. (I'm not in favor of a change, however.)

3) In courses such as Spanish 103, the withdrawal rate averages around 25%. If we assume, say, that half of these students would receive D's or F's, the "inflation" that occurs, if any, is a product of policies, not of academic judgments.

b) Students make better grades in upper level courses. Some departments teach almost all upperclassmen, and therefore expect higher grades.

c) Courses of grades are fairly normal (i.e., tough) in required courses, but courses that students do not enter unless they have been encouraged on the basis of apparent talent give high grades: upper-level art and music; drama beyond 176; perhaps practice teaching at Calhoun, too.

5) Given the certainty that most students with averages below 2.00 leave by senior year, the average senior grade is expected to be a "B."

My conclusion is that surprisingly little overall grade inflation occurred at the College, on a class-by-class and course-by-course basis. Withdrawal policies and the use of g.p.r. for retention obviously have contributed to some increase. More important, the more diverse curriculum has meant that an "A" or "C" student might have fairly unequal abilities in different majors. I suspect that the chemistry major thinks his "C's" would be "B's" or better in Education; the Education major replies that different competencies are being graded.

I propose that we measure competencies, both in general liberal arts and in the major, and let the grades rest with the Professor. Personally, I hope to see a slight upward "creep" of averages, if we attract better students over the next five years as we have over the last five.

Sincerely,

Paul Hamill

Dear Herb,

On last Wednesday, October 2, 1980, I called the News & Courier office regarding information relating to an Acquisitions Conference being held in Charleston on October 9-10, which would complement the 2nd Antiquarian Charleston Book Fair. I thought they might be interested in reporting on the Conference for two reasons: First, I had been told that a feature article was being done on the Book Fair, and this complemented such an article nicely, and second, because there were eight noteworthy speakers coming to Charleston to speak at the Conference. The most noteworthy speaker was Mr. Jacob L. Chernofsky, Editor and Publisher of A.B. Bookman's Weekly, a noted source for rare, antiquarian and out-of-print materials. It was suggested that I speak to Betsy Moye, the Features Editor, by the operator on the line. I was connected with Ms. Moye's office and spoke with a very nice and helpful young man who told me that the paper was doing something on the Book Fair and that I should call back later when I could speak with Ms. Moye, who wasn't in at that time.

Some hours later, I again called the paper and was allowed to speak with the illustrious Ms. Moye. In a succinct, overbearing and disgusted manner, Ms. Moye told me in no uncertain terms that she was not at all interested in knowing about the Conference. Never once did she even so much as ask the names of the people who were speaking at the Conference. She said that the features page was prepared months in advance and that there was no reason that something could be inserted at this late date. I explained that I was under the impression that newspapers worked pretty much day to day and that if something noteworthy ensued they could change their copy at will. She told me,
however, that this was not the case with her features articles. I neglected to tell her that I could of course appreciate that, given the outstanding quality of the features page. Furthermore, she asked me if I was a public relations person with the College. When I said no, she said she had suspected as much since she did not like being contacted by individuals at every turn. This was a pain in the neck to her. I explained that I was going through appropriate channels at the College, but I did want to call personally as well. I then asked Mrs. Moyer if she was telling me that the News and Courier was not interested in knowing about noteworthy guests to Charleston. She asked if I was trying to pressure her into putting information of the Conference in the newspaper. I assured her that this was not the case, that I had merely thought the newspaper might be interested and that I was surprised at the treatment I was getting. At that point, we said goodbye.

I deplore this treatment of College of Charleston personnel by our most respected local newspaper and urge all of us to speak up so that we are not treated in such an arbitrary and demeaning manner.

Sincerely,

Katina Strauch
Acquisitions Librarian

FROM THE DESK OF:

The Department Chairman of Physical Education and Health

1. Several persons have complained to me about the closing of the temporary parking lot adjacent to the College gymnasium. I share their concern. I do not believe that people should have to walk to the gym in order to exercise.

2. If the gymnasium were closer to the campus, it wouldn’t be so far away (I don’t know whether this is to be taken literally or figuratively)

3. The Fine Arts Faculty would probably agree with me that the FMCA annex can never be replaced; student experiences with plaster, water, and electricity will likely not be possible in the new Fine Arts Center or Physical Education Center.

4. This needs to be cleared up once and for all. Although we gained additional space in the new building, no one in this department had anything to do with the collapse of that house they were moving to make room for the new building.

5. Because the new Physical Education Center extends some 226’ eastward from the existing College gym, it will be closer to the campus.

Editor’s Note:

Last, and least, we have
Dear Herb:

I readily endorse your efforts to restructure our committees. I would further suggest, however, that certain new committees be created, and that they be staffed with faculty who have, shall we say, a natural affinity for the committees’ respective subject areas.

To wit:

Committee on Campus Facilities
Kitty Kaybank
David Hall

Committee on Faculty Housing
Paul Holmes

Committee on Faculty Preferences
Carl Likes

Committee on Faculty Food
Vernon Cook, Chair
Rose Hans
Subcommittee on vegetables
Edwin Roman
Richard Logum
Subcommittee on Condiments
Sam Hines

Committee on Faculty Cocktail Parties
Gerald Gibson

Committee on Payment of Dismissed Faculty
Ken Severens

Committee on Faculty Responses to Directives from the President
Vice President and Dean
Peter Yaun

With these new committees, we can all move forward to an even greater future.

Sincerely,

John Dempsey, Dean of Undergraduate Studies

Editor’s Note:

We could also have the

Committee on Marine Studies
Paul Fisher, Becky Herring, Michael Ohr, Peter Rowe

committee on avicultural Research
Mary Boyd, Suzanne Byrd, Rachel Drake, Bob Fowler, Jim Hawkes, Betsy Martin, Andree Parrott

Committee on Religious Instruction
Bob Cross, Skip Godow, Richard Godsen, Bishop Hunt, Jack Parson

I would like to thank all contributors to this issue of Newspeak. The deadline for submitting letters and pieces of information for the next issue is Friday, November 21.

COMING NEXT WEEK

The Vice Presidents: Who are they, and what do they do!