**NEWSPEAK**

**The College of Charleston Faculty Newsletter**

by Herb Silverman, Speaker of the Faculty

**ADMINISTRATIONSPEAK**

Dr. Freddie Grooms, Assistant to the President at Florida State University, will lead an Affirmative Action Workshop for administrators on December 1. She is past President of the American Association of Affirmative Action. The workshop is primarily for Vice Presidents, although Department Chairpersons and other faculty members are encouraged to attend. For further information, please contact Lucille Whisper, Director of Human Relations.

The information below gives the average 1980-1981 salary, broken down by sex, for nine month contracts of full time faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Faculty</th>
<th>Faculty with Doctorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (19)</td>
<td>25,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (5)</td>
<td>25,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Professors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (75)</td>
<td>22,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (12)</td>
<td>21,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Professors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (41)</td>
<td>18,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (21)</td>
<td>17,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (11)</td>
<td>15,155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All electrical power will be shut down on campus over the Thanksgiving break for the following hours: Friday 8:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M., Saturday 6:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M., Sunday 6:00 A.M. to 12 noon. Work will be done during this period to try to prevent any future unscheduled power outages.

The library will close at 5:00 P.M. on Wednesday, November 26 and will resume regular hours on Sunday, November 30. Because of final examinations, the library will have extended hours on Friday, December 5 from 7:30 A.M. to 11:30 P.M. and on Saturday, December 6 from 7:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. The library will be closed Dec. 13-14, open Dec. 15-19 from 7:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M., and closed Dec. 20 – Jan. 11.

Issues still under discussion concerning faculty input in evaluating administrators are: which administrators will be evaluated, which faculty members will have input into what evaluation form will be used, and who will see the information once it is gathered. I have asked each of the seven Vice Presidents for a description of their duties. Here are their replies.

**John M. Bevan - Vice President, Academic Affairs**

The senior officer responsible for academic planning and development at the undergraduate and graduate levels including: faculty recruitment; faculty development and faculty evaluation; curriculum development and curriculum review; academic scheduling, registration and records; academic research, both disciplinary and instructional; international programs and special academic projects; continuing education programs, Maymester and summer sessions; and libraries and learning resources facilities; academic budgeting.
George E. Habarak - Vice President, Student Affairs

The Vice President for Student Affairs is responsible for the proper financial management and programming in the following areas: Health Services, Student Activities, Stern Student Center, Campus Ministry, Career Development, College Skills, Counseling, Financial Aid, Veterans' Affairs and Athletics. In addition, he serves as Dean of Students enforcing the judicial and honor systems of the College. He reports directly to the President of the College. The day to day management of the areas listed above is handled by department heads in each area.

J. Floyd Tyler - Vice President, Business Affairs

This position has the responsibility and acts as the Chief Financial Officer of the college and advises the president on all financial matters. This position is responsible for preparation and control of all budgets on campus, as well as preparing formula budgets for the Commission on Higher Education and Line Item Budgets for the Budget and Control Board and the General Assembly.

The business office has the responsibility for general supervision of the following areas: Accounting, Bursar, Payroll, Purchasing, and Physical Plant. Major improvements and construction, maintenance of buildings and equipment, Custodial Services, Grounds Keeping, Motor Pool, Campus Shop, Bookstore, Cafeteria and Snack Bar, Dormitories, all financial management, Capital funding, Board Program and Debt Service.

Financial reporting to all levels of State and Federal Agencies is a primary responsibility for this office.

Cermette Clardy - Vice President, Institutional Advancement

Management and supervisory responsibilities of external functions of the College of Charleston and coordination between the College and the College of Charleston Foundation. Areas of management include:

Admissions, college relations, special events, government relations and private support from among all constituency groups. Attempt to generate annual fund support for scholar- ship and other Foundation-sponsored budget matters and to begin longer range deferred giving programs for endowment.

Responsible for the organization and implementation of College/Community Advisory Committee for the President and of Parents Advisory Council and the Parents Association.

Vernon Rivers - Vice President, Institutional Research

Senior officer responsible for Institutional Planning and Research; campus computer operations and the reporting of College management information to external agencies. Administers institutional surveys. Plans, programs, and budgets for the College Five-Year Capital Improvement Program. Provides long-range facility planning and coordinates the architects and engineers in the development of construction plans and campus site development. Provides coordination and liaison with community and state agencies relative to the Capital Improvement Program.

Thomas Hanby - Vice President, Administration

Senior officer responsible for the College-wide functions of personnel, communications, and public safety. Coordinates administrative functions for the President. Maintains records of presidential correspondence and maintains central files of official internal and external communication. Directs the Campus Post Office and Intracampus mail system, telephone switchboard, and Print Shop. Oversees activities of the Internal Auditor.
Anthony Meyer - Vice President, Alumni Affairs

The Vice President for Alumni Affairs serves as the liaison officer between the College of Charleston and its alumni, working in close association with the Executive Committee of the Alumni Association, the elected representatives of the association.

Up-to-date cards, file folders, and addressograph plates of alumni are maintained in the Alumni Affairs Office.

The College of Charleston Newsletter is published three times a year, and is distributed to some 7,000 persons on the office's mailing list.

The Office of Alumni Affairs is mainly concerned with the following:

1. Area alumni meetings in cities throughout the state, and in such cities as Atlanta, Charlotte, Jacksonville, and Washington.
2. Class reunions - each College of Charleston graduating class is encouraged to reunite every five years.
3. Scholarship program for children of alumni, and for potential leaders.
4. Alumni College Weekend.
5. Homecoming.
6. An annual reception honoring members of the graduating class.
7. An alumni admissions committee which works with the College's Admissions Office.
8. An Old Timers Reception honoring those alumni who have been graduated 50 or more years (usually held on Founders Day).
9. Monthly luncheon meetings involving College administrators, alumni, faculty and students.
10. Assisting various College departments in their efforts to contact alumni; and assisting the Foundation with its Annual Fund Phonothon.

COMMITTEE SPEAK

The Committee on Curriculum and Academic Planning will be recommending the approval of several courses at the December faculty meeting. It has received information from departments concerning the number of hours required of students both within and outside their major areas, and hopes to make a recommendation to the faculty sometime next semester. George Wood resigned as Secretary, and was replaced by Nan Woodruff.

The Committee on the Library has invited all librarians to future meetings in order to facilitate communication. The Committee voted unanimously to endorse the library's request for faculty cooperation on the following three points: (1) The library reserves the right to recall a book from a patron after the book has been checked out for one month, (2) Faculty must renew or return all library books at the end of each semester. A reminder notice will be sent to faculty near the end of the term, (3) Faculty members must pay for lost or mutilated books and for processing fees for reordering and cataloging the replacements.

The Faculty Research and Development Committee approved the guidelines for summer grants, and is in the process of having them distributed to all faculty. Deadline to apply is January 16, 1981.

The Student Affairs Committee visited the new men's dormitory and was generally appalled by the overcrowded conditions; especially deplorable was the lack of adequate study area. The new dormitory, race relations on campus, and the food service is expected to occupy the Committee in the coming semester.

The Committee on Athletics discussed preparations for the December 6 cookout. A motion will be made at the December faculty meeting to present awards to (1) the intercollegiate athletic team with the highest grade point ratio, and (2) the student athlete attaining the highest grade point ratio at or above 3.0 on each intercollegiate team.
The Committee on Continuing Education and Special Programs will be awarding 10 Incentive Scholarships, worth $100 each, for adult students who are returning to college or beginning their college studies in the spring semester. The Foundation has committed the money for these scholarships. The Committee will assist Sue Desmonde in an orientation session for adjunct professors on January 7, with a reception to follow.

The Faculty Welfare Committee continued its deliberations on compensation for faculty who teach a fifth course in the evening, and hopes to have a recommendation at the December faculty meeting. Also still under consideration are 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 Academic Standards Committee met to discuss a student’s petition to receive credit for a correspondence course through the University of South Carolina. The petition was denied.

The Lilly Committee would like to remind past recipients who have not turned in their final reports to do so as soon as possible so that the Committee can assess the overall impact of the program. Comments are also needed from those who have attended NSF Chautauqua Short Courses.

The President’s Ad Hoc Budget Review Committee met once, and will be getting some background information. The Committee is planning to meet regularly to become better informed about the budgetary process, but no future meetings have yet been called.

The Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Committee Structure will propose the following by-laws change under General Regulations on page 29 of the Faculty and Administration Manual.

a. No member of the faculty shall serve on more than one standing committee at the same time, with the exceptions of the Faculty Grievance Committee, the Faculty Hearing Committee, and the Committee on Nominations. Members of the Committee on Nominations may be nominated for faculty committees only from the floor.

Another ad hoc committee must next be formed to make a recommendation on this proposal, which will then be voted on at the January faculty meeting. If it is adopted, the Committee on Nominations will be elected under the new regulations. The present Ad Hoc Committee hopes to make its recommendations at the January meeting so that the new committee structure can be put into effect next year.

**SPEAKEASY**

I am an editor who edits his own work, not your work. The Letters to the Editor are not retyped; they are photocopied and appear in Newspaper as they are submitted. If you just wish to raise a point, ask a question, or find some information, you need not put it in writing. Mention it to me and it will appear in this section associated with your name or, if you prefer, anonymously.

I am sometimes asked why I didn’t put a certain piece of information in the newsletter. The reason is almost always the same – I didn’t hear about it. If you are aware of something that might be of general interest, please let me know.

Many meetings are held or talks given at the noon hour on Tuesday or Thursday, when there are no courses scheduled. With travel to and from class, there are at most 45 uninterrupted minutes. Marty Perlmutt said that at City College of New York, his alma mater, no classes were held between noon and 2:00 p.m. on Thursday. Perhaps we might consider some kind of extended time period at the College when students and faculty could plan for guest speakers, seminars, discussions, or meetings.

Concern about the possible consolidation of committees was expressed to me by an untenured faculty member, who was worried that it would become more difficult to satisfy the committee service criterion for tenure. Actually, the criterion is Contributions to the College of an academic or professional character outside the classroom, of which committee work is just one possible form of service. A thoughtful letter to Newspaper, for example, might be a more fruitful achievement than serving on a committee simply for the sake of serving on a committee. It would be desirable, however, if our committees could be restructured in such a manner that worthwhile contributions might be made by all who serve.
Earl Kline remarked that he and several other faculty members feel that
the lunches served at the Blacklock House have declined in quality. Lindsey
Hale, Manager of the College of Charleston Club, commented that there have been
four or five menus rotated this year. An improvement in quality would
necessitate an increase in cost which, he believes, the faculty would prefer
to avoid. The cold plates seem to be popular, with attendance improved over
last year.

Mike Marcell asks why classes are not cancelled for Labor Day, and made up
some other time. The administration, although sympathetic, feels it is bad
pedagogically to cancel classes just as the semester is beginning. The
classified personnel opted to work on Labor Day rather than the day after
Thanksgiving. Election Day would have been a more natural day to hold classes.
A mandate from the state, though, requires all of its agencies to be closed on
that day. Based on the election returns, I would have preferred a mandate that
required all state agencies to remain open.

Regardless of my feelings about a motion under discussion at a faculty meet-
ing, it is incumbent upon me to remain objective and impartial when presiding.
If the faculty can tell where I stand on an issue by my conduct at the meeting,
then I am not performing my duty properly and should have it pointed out. If I
ever feel the necessity to participate in debate, I will ask the parliamentarian
to preside and I will leave the podium until the issue is decided.

Are you bothered by teaching a class in which most of the students sit in
the back when there are many front row seats available—especially when a
rear student complains about not being able to see the chalk board clearly?
After the last faculty meeting, I heard a comment from someone sitting at the
back that a couple of the speakers were difficult to hear. Sitting in the
rear when there is room in the front is one of the parliamentary don'ts listed
in Robert's Rules of Order. Those who have never seen how the front half lives
may find it more involving and more conducive to participating in the discussions.

Amy McCandless, the senior visiting faculty member on campus, asks what
distinction is made between visiting and permanent faculty at the faculty
meetings. According to our by-laws, visiting faculty have floor privileges
without voting rights. The term "floor privileges" is not defined in Robert's
Rules of Order, and thus requires a ruling by the Chair. I interpret "floor
privileges" to mean full participation in debate, including the right to make
a motion. A visiting faculty member may even propose a change in the by-laws
to support suffrage for visiting faculty, but may not vote on the motion.

EDITORIALS

Robert's Rules of Order

Henry Martin Robert, an engineer and general in the United States Army,
published Robert's Rules of Order in 1876. It is based primarily on
parliamentary procedure originally used in the British Parliament. Robert's
Rules of Order provides a group guide to democratic action. But it also
imposes a responsibility on individuals to understand the democratic procedures
so painstakingly provided. I will try to describe what I think every faculty
member should know about Robert's Rules of Order. Those who would like to read
more are referred to the reference section of the library for the newest
revised edition, call number JF 515 B692.

A principal or main motion is a motion brought for consideration on any
particular subject. No principal motion can be made when another question is
pending. The terms motion and question are synonymous; when first stated it is
a motion, and subsequently is referred to as a question. The other motions may
be classified into three categories: privileged, incidental, and subsidiary.

Privileged motions have nothing to do with the pending motion, but are of
such urgency and importance that they are allowed to interrupt the consider-
ation of other questions, and take precedence over them. They are not
debatable. The most popular privileged motion is a motion to adjourn. A ques-
tion of privilege relates to the rights and privileges of the assembly, and
may interrupt a member's speech if it requires immediate action. For example,
a member might feel that his or her health is being impaired or character
maligned by another member.
Incidental motions are those that either arise out of a pending question and must be decided before any other business is taken up, or are related to business that must be attended to and requires a temporary interruption. They usually are not debatable. The two most frequently used incidental motions concern information and order. A point of information is an inquiry as to facts affecting the business at hand - directed to the chair or, through the chair, to a member. When the chair fails to enforce the rules, attention to the breach may be called by making a point of order; the effect is to require the chair to rule on the question involved. Although the duty of ruling on all questions of parliamentary procedure rests with the chair, any member may appeal immediately (with a second) the decision of the chair, which requires the chair to submit the matter to a vote.

Another incidental motion, suspension of the rules, must have a stated purpose and requires a two-thirds vote. One makes a motion "to suspend the rules that interfere with", etc., stating the object of the suspension. It can be used to enable the assembly to circumvent an impasse and accomplish the purpose for which it has gathered. By general consent, that is, if no one objects, the rules relating to the transaction of business can at any time be ignored without the formality of a motion.

The subsidiary motions are the most frequently used motions in parliamentary procedure. They are made while a motion is pending, and are intended to assist, modify, delay, or otherwise dispose of the main motion. Subsidiary motions must be dealt with before action can be taken on the main motion. However, all subsidiary motions must yield to privileged and incidental motions. The most common subsidiary motions are amendments.

An amendment is introduced to assist in changing, modifying, or helping to complete a motion in such a way as to make it more acceptable to the assembly. Amendments must be germane to the subject of the motion - directly relating to it, even if taking an opposite point of view. Not more than two amendments to a motion are permitted on the floor simultaneously - it would otherwise become too complicated. The first amendment is called the primary amendment - the second, the secondary amendment. When an amendment is made, the vote must be taken on the amendment first; if adopted, the original motion as amended must be stated and discussed, then put to vote. If there are two amendments, the first amendment is then open to debate and one possible amendment. A vote is taken on the substitute amendment first; if adopted, the main motion as substituted is then open to discussion and vote. If the substitute motion fails, debate continues on the main motion.

When a main motion or its amendments seem to require more deliberation or information than the assembly can provide at that time, a move to refer to a committee or postpone to a definite time is in order. If a member wishes to close debate on a motion, he or she may move the previous question (more commonly referred to as call the question). This is not debatable and requires a two-thirds vote. Some care must be taken to recognize that a yes vote indicates a desire to shut off further debate, not necessarily to adopt the motion pending.

Observance of these most frequently employed rules should normally enable our meetings to be both efficient and democratic. There has been some sentiment in the faculty to enforce strictly all of the parliamentary procedure. I believe that rigid enforcement can do more harm than good if an assembly is unaware of some of the strategies and nuances of parliamentary procedure. General Robert advised those chairing meetings to "never be technical, nor be any more strict than is absolutely necessary for the good of the meeting. Use your judgment." If the interpretation of Robert's Rules of Order were completely objective, there would not be an American Institute of Parliamentarians that regularly discusses the fine points. I would hate to see us create an atmosphere that could lead to spending more time at meetings debating the interpretation of rules that govern debate instead of debating the issues that brought us there in the first place. I hope we can agree with the sentiment expressed by General Robert that "the great purpose of all rules and forms is to subserve the will of the assembly rather than to restrain it; to facilitate, and not to obstruct, the expression of their deliberate sense,"
Apples vs. Oranges

After a full-time student has been here for a couple of years, he or she should not have to be graded in all courses. A student should submit to grades in at least two courses every semester, just to make sure that satisfactory progress is being made. To be fair to students, we should allow them to request grades in all courses, and then decide which two grades they would like the registrar to place on the official transcript. A student who has the initiative to take all courses in Maymester or some school should, upon receiving a grade, have the option of making it part of the official record. Every student should request written comments from each of his or her teachers that could be used, if desired, to enhance post-graduate opportunities. Since faculty members would not have to distribute as many grades, more thought and care would be given to those requested; potential employers, too, would appreciate the time saved from only having to look at this representative sample of grades.

Sound silly? Faculty evaluation of students would then be similar to student evaluation of faculty at the College of Charleston. After the first two years, full-time faculty may choose to be evaluated in all courses and select two of those evaluations to submit to the Department Chairperson and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Faculty also have the option of producing data from Maymester and summer school, as well as furnishing some — but not necessarily all — of the written comments by students. Faculty evaluation committees will not know whether the two courses submitted by a faculty member for a given semester were the only two courses evaluated or were the most positive two out of four. In distinguishing between evaluations of different faculty members, the committees may — in effect — be comparing apples with oranges.

I do agree that students might become jaded from having to fill out evaluations in all courses every semester. Unfortunately, instead of alleviating this problem, we have developed a system in which the optimal “strategy” for a faculty member concerned about tenure, promotion, and salary raises, is to request evaluation in all courses and present only the most propitious for examination by colleagues. We are not being honest with a student when we imply that his or her views will be seen by someone other than the teacher; on the contrary, members will not choose to show their colleagues a thoughtful, well-documented negative student opinion, since this type of criticism is the most damaging of all.

In looking at information packets of faculty being considered for promotion or tenure, I have often found written comments by students to be at least as valuable as some numerical score on a scale of 1 to 5. I understand that quantitative data is more objective than qualitative data (and is viewed more favorably in a court of law, should the occasion arise), but no significant information should be overlooked in an institution that takes pride in its high standards for teaching excellence.

I have no quarrel with reducing the number of evaluations given each semester. I would hope, however, that we would think about modifying the part of the proposal adopted last spring that allows a faculty member to selectively censor teaching evaluation data. Give faculty members the option of seeking formal student feedback in two, three, or four courses; but assure the students that their input will not be buried by their teachers. Some of us have already expressed concerns about grade inflation for students; I am now worried about grade inflation for faculty. Just as an A or B for a student might not mean as much as it once did, so may a 4.5 or a 4 in “overall quality of instruction” become less meritorious than it once was.

Much time has been spent discussing systems for administering student evaluations of teaching. Perhaps we should now reflect on how enlightening these results are and what significance they should be regarded. Our student opinion questionnaire is not the only, or necessarily the most reliable, instrument available to measure teaching effectiveness. But as long as this is one of its purposes, every effort should be made to follow procedures that enable us to use the information judiciously.
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Herb,

Just wanted to let all my friends (and enemies) know that I am improving each day and am looking forward to leaving the hospital this weekend. Pat and I are truly grateful for all the support and comfort that the faculty offered during the past weeks.

With appreciation and love,

Ken Bower

Dear Ken,

There is almost never an issue on which the faculty is unanimous. But as Speaker of the Faculty I know that I can speak for the whole College in wishing you a speedy recovery and quick return.

Harl

Dear Herb:

Once again thanks for the opportunity of meeting with you and your faculty. With the business-like way that matters were handled, one might find it hard to believe that things get turbulent at times. I know from exciting, if not bitter, experience that the going can be rough indeed. I would imagine that in such circumstances there is some threat to your good humor and fire but not too formal control of the meeting. This is just another way of saying that I like your style. Incidentally, the custom of each individual identifying himself is an excellent one. Just don't let them get into conversations (or shouting matches) on the floor... it can wreck a meeting if they address anyone but you.

One of your members expressed concern that the faculty assembly might at times appear inefficient, ineffectual, or indecisive. I don't remember the exact term...maybe none of the above. This has always been a concern, but I find it seldom warranted. We have our troubles at times and I have yet to hear of a faculty assembly that wasn't embarrassed or downright appalled by something that it didn't do or did do...or by the way it was done. In the final analysis though, there is a collective wisdom in a faculty assembly that overrides any passing difficulties or awkward moments.

I am especially glad to see a faculty meeting chaired by a faculty member. For all their volatility and courage, the faculty often tends to hold back when an administrator is in charge. The Rules of Order may also take a beating under the chairmanship of an administrative officer. Incidentally, I appreciated your efforts to find a substitute parliamentarian. No matter how knowledgeable, a speaker who doubles as parliamentarian is like the proverbial lawyer who, handling his own case, has a fool for a client.

Let me urge you again to check Robert's Rules for that peculiar institution called the "Good of the Order." So often important matters, or individual concerns or frustrations are never aired because they don't lend themselves readily to a motion. Under the "Good of the Order" the normal rules of procedure still operate except that it is not necessary to speak to a motion...although a motion may grow out of the discussion.

Speaking of motions, one final word of wisdom which I don't really think that you need: You can never repeat a motion too often. Keep it in front of you and repeat it...especially when the gang starts to get off the subject. I must admit, though, that it can be fun to let somebody wander on for awhile and then ask him to which motion he is speaking. If he doesn't know, of course he is out of order.

Thanks again. I learned a lot and confirmed once again that the College of Charleston has an excellent faculty.

Sincerely,

Stephen H. Ackerman
Associate Provost

P.S.: In all the foregoing wherever I have said he, him or his, you can read also she, her and hers. I'm not really a chauvinist, I'm just too old to change.
Dear Herb:

The letter Katina Strauch submitted for your last issue has relevance beyond her particular experience with staff of the News and Courier. It reflects the continuing problem we have in obtaining the quantity of media support and coverage we feel the College deserves.

However, we have, over the past year, established some new and regular contacts with several persons at the Courier and The Evening Post. Ernie Locklair and Susan Michel are meeting with staff of both papers often and are hand-carrying most of our releases to these contacts. (Incidently, we are doing the same with radio and television contacts). This personal approach is important both for the media and for the College. Moreover, the one-to-one contact between the College Relations office and the media staff ensures that we comply with deadlines and expedite established by media management. Often deadline information and the interest of individual reporters can make a difference in newspaper space and air times given to a particular activity or event.

Finally, we have initiated regular meetings between College Relations staff and division and department heads in order to cover activities appropriate for release. Since we have not been able to replace Maxine Martin, our departmental contacts are not as formalized as we intended. However, the procedure is still sound.

We appreciate individual effort to promote and interpret the College to our constituency but we need to coordinate these efforts carefully.

Cordially,

[Signature]

Cerquette J. Clardy, Jr.
Vice President
Institutional Advancement

Dear Herb,

In the first issue of Newspeak you indicated that a section of your newsletter would be devoted to "communication from standing committees." While this is certainly worthwhile, it seems to me that it might also be useful and informative to have the minutes of these committees available for interested parties. The logical repository for the collected minutes would be the Robert Scott Small Library. I have contacted Martha Ball, Head of Public Services in the library, and she has assured me that it would be possible for the library to keep current minutes at the Circulation desk, provided that copies are forwarded to her by the secretary of each committee.

As a new member of the College faculty, I feel that access to this type of information would be of great help to me in learning the natures and duties of the various committees and would enable me to be better informed about matters of concern to the academic community. I hope that this proposal can become a reality in the near future.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Marilyn L. Lewis
Marine Resources Librarian

Dear Marilyn,

I think your idea of providing access to committee minutes for all interested faculty members is a fine one. I am requesting committee secretaries to send copies of the minutes to Martha Ball, in the Library, after they have been approved by the committee; it would be appreciated if back copies from this year could also be sent to her. Ralph Heimlick, the College Archivist, has a very sketchy collection of committee minutes from past years. He would like faculty members to bring old minutes to him for photocopying. On file now are all the minutes from past faculty meetings as well as the complete run of Newspeak. I am especially pleased to see a new faculty member show such an interest in faculty governance.
"I'M O.K., YOU'RE O.K." versus "WHY DON'T YOU LEAVE?" and "IS IT RIGHT OR LEGAL TO BE HUMAN?"

The recent controversy over the attire of the Speaker of the Faculty (Is he more competent in a Tux or a Birthday Suit?) rekindled thoughts on evaluation processes and those involved in them. How is the attire of the Speaker related to his competence? Could we legally require the Speaker to dress in a chosen manner?

Our current evaluation system seems to place a premium on what is objective and quantifiable. Of course, we are also concerned with what is legal. Unfortunately, for those who must make judgments, important components of faculty evaluation often defy quantification and legal interpretation. With evaluations forthcoming, I wish to call attention to two dilemmas in the process that always cause problems and must be considered.

First, since subjective evaluations are not "legal" or preferred, we are in a bind; we can either not allow such comments to "figure in" to the evaluative process, or we can "come up" with "objective" data which will give the desired result and with which we are more comfortable. Either decision begs the question, one is a compromise of a total evaluation and the other is a compromise of the evaluative process. We agree on those things which are to be evaluated and hope they are objective, quantifiable, and correct. At the same time, there is always a human or personal modifier which we try to eliminate, but which may be very important in the evaluation. Examples:

1. "I know that you meet all the requirements that are expected of you and I know that you are a good teacher, but you do not "fit in" and you are not well suited for this department and in this College."

2. "Although he does not impress the world as a teacher and is not a researcher and is not outstanding in college and community service either, you will never meet a nicer person."

3. It has been suggested by one of my colleagues that "the best time for formative evaluation is at the time of hiring." Since objective and quantifiable data rarely can tell the story regarding informal organizational relationships, what is wrong with saying to someone, "I don't like you. Why don't you leave?" Secondly, we are further in a bind because we are concerned with what is legal in the sense of "What would hold up in court?" We dare not say what we want to say because that is legally weak and we come down harder in another area which is "legal" to be "fair". Examples:

1. "Damn the legality of it, I am going to call the shots as I see them and I can't really be worried about whether some lawyer will agree or not."

2. "...and furthermore, if you try to come into my class to evaluate me as a teacher, I'll sue you for infringing on my academic freedom."

3. "I never thought that what I said could have cost me so much, I never thought I'd get sued."

So, what is the punch line? I don't know for sure, but I am sure that evaluation is necessary. The trick is for evaluators to be both honest and "correct" in making evaluations. I think at the College we need to include both formal and informal, subjective and objective evaluations, since the success of organizations depends upon the interaction of both. We need to be concerned about what is legal, but more concerned about what is true and what is right. Perhaps a good lawyer will be able to defend such things. 

Roy H. Mills
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 his birthday suit.

Dear Herb,

The letter from David Mann in the second issue of *Newspaper* raises some points worth consideration by all of us. It might be worthwhile to consider also some alternative views on these points.

The assertion that the faculty is the College is one with which I could not agree more, one that has only come to need defending since the takeover of American academe by managers who confuse organization with essence. That is not a statement of arrogance, not a claim that faculty are intrinsically "better" than other citizens of the campus. It is just a reminder of an ancient—though not obsolete—definition.

To leap from that self-evident truth to a conclusion that direct democracy is the only appropriate form of faculty governance I find more difficult. While I hold no strong preference for a faculty senate, that representative form of democracy cannot be a self-evident evil. Nor does appeal to our by-laws, as much as we respect them, answer the question of whether direct or representative democracy is better for our faculty in the 1980s.

The implication that we must choose between inherently chaotic democracy and inherently fascistic efficiency seems to me obviously wrong. In fact, the analogy between a college and a political state is hardly more valid than the analogy between a college and a factory. The latter has led to such absurdities as setting quotas for PTE production; the former can trick us into forgetting that, unlike a political state, a society of scholars has the responsibility to do something other than to "form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves." We have, I believe, an obligation to seek efficiency in the interest of serving responsibly. Not efficiency at any price—but why must the price be so great?
The framers of our by-laws are not to be blamed for our chronic second-Monday silliness. They must have assumed that we would engage in appropriate contemplation and rational debate, then vote our convictions about whatever proposition was under consideration. They might even have supposed that we would use our committee system to good advantage. Having demonstrated beyond dispute the basis those authors have for disappointment, it is time to consider changes. It is being neither critical of the authors nor anti-democratic to adopt modifications in the by-laws that might improve efficiency and effectiveness. Somewhere along the spectrum between Michael Bakunin and Benito Mussolini there must be a method of governance that gives both moderate efficiency and ample voice to the governed, something that would suit us at the College of Charleston.

Professor Mann is correct, I think, in asserting that the Speaker has a special duty to assure that the by-laws are followed on all occasions. I would add to that a similar obligation to enforce the Standing Rules of the faculty, which alone, we might discover, would suffice to produce a semblance of sanity on the second Monday of each month.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gerald W. Gibson
Professor of Chemistry

Thanks to all contributors to this issue of Newspeak. In order to have the next issue out before people leave town, all letters and pieces of information must be submitted by December 11. I would like all committees to send me their end of semester reports, so that they can be published together in the next issue. The reports should include accomplishments of this semester and goals for next semester.