The administration found the Affirmative Action Workshop led by Dr. Freddie Grooms to be very interesting. Additional special efforts will be made to try to hire qualified minorities and women, especially at the upper-level management positions. I have asked Lucille Whippier, Director of Human Relations, to write a Letter to the Editor giving her impressions of the workshop.

The administration expressed concern that continuations by faculty and staff to the College of Charleston Foundation were behind those of last year, and might not reach the $18,000 goal.

COMMITTEE SPEAK

I have asked for the end of semester reports from all standing committees of the faculty. The following committees have not met this semester: Hearing, Grievance, Advisory Committee on Tenure, and Graduate Faculty. What follows are the reports from the other standing committees.

FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE PRESIDENT

The President's Advisory Committee met 6 times during the semester. Topics for discussion were the budget, graduate education at The College of Charleston, parking, and the evaluation of Administrators.

The allocation of the budget was discussed with Dr. Tyler. A breakdown of the amount spent for various programs at the College was presented and note was made of the special needs of The College, particularly the maintenance of the physical plant. President Collins indicated that this was a special area of concern and that he hoped that The College could obtain a special appropriation because of its unique problems in preserving historic, but expensive buildings.

The future of graduate programs at The College was discussed with Drs. Bevan and Matthews. It was noted that there is currently a flurry of activity within the Charleston Consortium aimed at formulating various graduate programs. A concern was expressed as to whether or not graduate programs would drain resources away from the undergraduate programs. There was also some feeling that the State would not look favorably upon the establishment of new graduate programs during times of austerity, but perhaps there could be some process value in formulating programs in a few areas and examining the needs of these activities and seeing what is currently available in the Charleston area.

A thorough discussion of the parking problem, especially the needs of the Faculty, was held at one meeting. It was pointed out that we currently have no parking policy and The College, in effect, provides storage areas for the cars of dormitory students, while ignoring the needs of the people who have the most need for access to The College, the Faculty and commuting students. The problem of providing security in the outlying parking areas that we currently use was also discussed. President Collins agreed to form a committee consisting of faculty, staff, commuting students and dormitory students to seek a more equitable allocation of this scarce resource of The College. It is hoped that a plan can be developed during the spring and put into effect next fall.

The desirability of Faculty input into the evaluation of Administrators was the topic of several meetings. President Collins indicated that he would welcome Faculty input if some fair and workable mechanism could be developed. A sub-committee has identified approximately 40 Administrators as well as Department Chairmen whose performances are critical to the effectiveness of the academic program. Tentative plans have been discussed to administer evaluation forms through each department and have a Faculty committee summarize the information and pass it along to the President and the appropriate Vice-President. Also, if half of the administrators are evaluated each year, the amount of work to be done would be manageable and more thought and information could be put into the evaluation process. The committee would welcome any suggestions concerning this matter.

The committee also solicits topics for discussion during the spring semester.

Submitted by:

W. Frank Kinard
Chairman
Faculty Advisory Committee to the President
REPORT OF ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE
FALL, 1980

The committee met three times. First, the committee deliberated proposals regarding transfer credits from junior colleges and technical schools. Then it was decided that the committee did not have the authority to make such proposals; that authority rests with the curriculum committee.

The committee reviewed one petition from a student seeking credit for a correspondence course in foreign language. The request was denied.

Rachel Drake, Secretary
Academic Standards Committee

The Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid met bi-monthly and conducted the following business:

1. The Committee reviewed and approved the admissions procedures for 1980-81.

2. A subcommittee is studying a quantitative predictor to be used in evaluating scholarship applicants.

3. A proposal was sent to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President regarding the following statement on Governor's School:

"The Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid, having studied the failure of Governor's School to attract impressive numbers of outstanding freshmen applicants to The College of Charleston, agreed that the Governor's School students have not been exposed to typical academic classes nor true college life experiences.

The Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid therefore recommends to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President that the Governor's School program, in its present structure, be cancelled and replaced by summer fellowships for the same deserving students to attend the College of Charleston Summer Sessions, thereby affording the potential college applicants appropriate academic experiences."

4. The Committee is continuing to study possible changes regarding the "Summer School Option" for applicants who are unacceptable for Fall admission.

5. During the Spring semester the Committee will review scholarship applicants for the 1981-82 year.

TO: Speaker of the Faculty
FROM: Faculty Committee on Curriculum and Academic Planning
SUBJECT: Fall Semester Report

During the semester, The Committee has met weekly. While various issues (including the limits on the number of hours required for the major) have been discussed, most of the work has concerned proposals for new courses. The Committee received thirty proposals for course changes or additions. Thirteen of these were approved and submitted to the Faculty. The remainder have been withdrawn, returned for clarification, or are pending Committee action.

Norman A. Chamberlain
Chairman
Interim Report of the Continuing Education and Special Programs Committee

The Continuing Education and Special Programs Committee met for the first time in May, 1980. The members of the committee for the 1980-1981 year are Danton Johnson, Joan Jones, Bill Lindstrom, Jim Snyder, Vickie Weeks, and Herb Silverman, ex-officio member. Officers selected were Bill Lindstrom, chairperson, and Vickie Weeks, secretary. A search committee was formed to fill the position of Co-ordinator of Non-Credit Programs and Adult Advising, which was being vacated by Erica Lesseme's resignation. This position has been filled by Donna Pretty.

This Fall, the committee has actively pursued the need for increased compensation for those who teach adjunct and overload courses. An increase was announced by President Collins, December 9, 1980. Inquiries were made to the South Carolina Retirement System concerning the possibility of eliminating the retirement deduction from overtime pay. We were quite firmly notified that this was not legally possible.

Incentive scholarships have been established to aid those who are enrolling for the first time in the Continuing Education programs. Since these students are not attending college full-time, there is no other financial aid available for them. The College of Charleston Foundation has committed $1,500 to be awarded for Spring semester, 1981. Ten recipients will be selected for awards of $150 each. There were 65 applicants, 53 of whom are women which reflects the national trend for mature women to pursue an interrupted education. 18 of the applicants were minority students.

The Continuing Education Committee will sponsor an orientation for adjunct faculty followed by a reception at the Blacklock House, to be attended by all evening faculty and department chairpersons, on January 7, 1981.

Respectfully submitted,

Vickie D. Weeks
Secretary

Library Committee Fall Semester Report

The Library Committee met seven times during Fall Semester 1980. The activities of the committee have included:

1) Repeated pleas and requests for additional funds for books and periodicals.
2) Allocation of the limited funds available for departmental book orders.
3) Discussion of guidelines for the cut back on periodicals made necessary by the lack of funds. The committee unanimously agreed to support the Library staff's use of duplication and accessibility as criteria in the retention or cancellation of periodicals.
4) Support of the Library staff's efforts to assure faculty accountability for books.

Respectfully submitted,

John Newell
for the committee

(lob Dukes, secretary; David Kowal; David Lawrence, Beatrice Stiglitz; Pam Tindale; Skip Edmonds, student representative; and Ellis Hodgin, Director of Libraries)
This semester the Faculty Welfare Committee considered the following issues:

1) Fifth course overload compensation--after a subcommittee study of the issue, full committee discussion with Vice President for Academic Affairs John M. Bevan and Dean of Continuing Education Sue Desmond, and further discussions with President Collins, Dr. Bevan, and Mr. Tyler, the committee is pleased to report that the administration will institute the following salary schedule for fifth course overloads:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 Fall Semester</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981 Spring Semester</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981 Fall Semester</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982 Fall Semester</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differential in compensation between full-time and adjunct faculty is attributable to the additional work performed by full-time faculty, such as advising and committee responsibilities.

Compensation for teaching the one credit-hour science laboratory course will be increased from $350 to $500 per semester effective next semester.

The Faculty Welfare Committee expresses its appreciation for the constructive approach and positive contributions made by administration officials, especially President Collins, in the course of these discussions.

2) Medical benefit increases—the committee reminds the faculty that the state has authorized significant improvements in medical benefits, especially the increase of the major medical maximum from $50,000 to $250,000 lifetime benefit per individual. See President Collin's memorandum of November 7 for additional details.

3) Revision of the student teaching evaluation form—after subcommittee and full committee deliberations, the committee has completed a draft of a revised form. We have sent a copy of the draft to Dr. Grace French-Lazovik, Director of the Office of Evaluation at the University of Pittsburgh, who has served as a consultant here. We expect to hear her comments on the draft by mid-January.

4) Report of the Ad Hoc Tenure Evaluation Committee—we are currently studying and discussing the recommendations contained in this document.

5) Faculty Welfare Committee structure—we recommended to the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Faculty Committee Structure that the composition of the Faculty Welfare Committee consist of 2 full professors, 2 associate professors, 2 assistant professors, 1 instructor, and 1 at-large. While the number of instructors has declined greatly in recent years, the committee strongly believes that as long as we have full-time instructors on the faculty, they should be represented on the Faculty Welfare Committee.

6) "Happy Hours"—we have continued the Wednesday and Thursday "Happy Hours" at the Blacklock House with the assistance of the Board of Governors of the College of Charleston Club. At the Speaker's suggestion, this committee has also assumed responsibility for staffing the "Happy Hour" held after each regular faculty meeting. However, the College of Charleston Club cannot finance this event because it is not held at the Club; therefore, faculty donations to help defray the cost of sherry and pretzels are welcomed. An appropriate receptacle for donations will be placed on the bar in the gallery of the Pine Arts Center during Future post-faculty meeting "Happy Hour." It should also be noted that the Speaker has borne most of the cost of these "Happy Hours" so far—a sign of his genuine concern for the faculty.

7) Coffee and soft drinks in the Faculty Lounge—last, but not least, the committee has taken steps to insure that an adequate supply of coffee is available in the Faculty Lounge. A soft drink machine and a snack machine have also been placed in the Faculty Lounge. Unknown to the public, this institution largely runs on caffeine and sugar. Our thanks to Mr. Joel Lake in the Business Office for his help in securing these improvements.
Next semester the Faculty Welfare Committee will:

1) Submit recommendations based on the Ad Hoc Tenure Evaluation Committee’s report for faculty consideration.

2) Submit a revised student teaching evaluation form for faculty consideration.

3) Meet with Dean Dempsey and Helenor Mahon regarding the administration of student evaluation forms. Recommendations may be forthcoming.

4) Begin a study of faculty salaries at state colleges and universities in South Carolina.

George W. Hopkins

FALL STUDENT 1950
REPORT FROM RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Committee has revised the Guidelines for Research Grant applications in order to include several categories of funding related to Development. The new application forms and guidelines have been distributed, but if for some reason you failed to receive copies, please stop by Paul Hardill’s office in Randolph Hall and pick up a set. Applications are due on January 15, 1951. Please feel free to ask any member of the Committee for further information if you need it.

We also established, with the cooperation of the Library Staff, an opportunity for any faculty member who so desires to have a fixed carrel in the Library assigned to him/her for the year. Please contact Veronica Antil at the Reference Desk for your carrel assignment.

Please Chairmen Johnson, Chairman

Report on the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs:

The activities of the Student Affairs Committee have been primarily "exploratory" during the fall semester. After getting a rather late start, due to the necessity of waiting until our student members were designated after SGA elections, we began to consider the issues upon which we might work this year. Among issues considered were the need for an outdoor activity area on campus, racial problems among students, the problems of handicapped students, food service, the new men’s dorm, and study areas. After much discussion and fact-finding, we designated racial relations on campus, the new men’s dorm, and the food service to be the major objects of our concern in the year to come.

Several members of the committee were given an extensive tour of the new dorm by Buddy Bay, the new Residence Counselor there. We also had Lucille Whitter come to one of our meetings to give us her view of relationships among the races on campus. At another meeting we met with the Student Affairs Staff and learned of the programs and activities being carried out by the various divisions within that area.

The committee members have learned a great deal from the activities we have undertaken to date. We will be collecting more information and making specific recommendations in the spring semester.

A member of our committee has regularly attended meetings of the Student Affairs Staff throughout the semester, and we have also sent one of our members to the College Union Board. We plan to continue both of these practices next semester.

Faye B. Steuer, Chairperson
Faculty Committee on Athletics
Semester Report - Fall 1980

The Athletic Committee met 5 times during the fall 1980 semester discussing a wide variety of subjects. A significant portion of committee discussions dealt with defining the role the committee should play. The discussions led to the formulation of a goal, objectives, and accomplishments as outlined below.

Goal:

To support and enhance the program of athletics at the College of Charleston.

Objectives:

This committee will initiate and implement activities which will:

a) Improve communication among faculty, students, administration, and those responsible for and involved in the athletic programs.

b) Directly lend support to athletic events.

c) Support and strengthen the place of scholarship in the athletic programs.

d) Seek alternative methods of financial support for the athletic programs.

Accomplishments:

1. Meeting with Dr. Collins which aided in defining the scope of committee activity.

2. The Cougar family cookout.

3. Resolution to the faculty acknowledging the number 1 ranking for our Women's Athletic Program.

4. Presentation of a motion to the faculty concerning presentation of awards for academic excellence by student athletes.

SPEAKEASY

On December 2 and 3, I attended a Faculty Evaluation and Instructional Development Seminar in Columbia, which was led by Dr. William Gashn, an educational development specialist from Kansas State University. The seminar focused on the assumptions, concerns, and methods of approaching evaluation and instructional development, with possible solutions to some of the common difficulties. I came away from the seminar with the impression that any problems in evaluation or communication at the College are minor compared to those at the majority of institutions. Most of what seemed new and innovative to many of the participants were ideas that had been discussed at length here in committees, departments, retreats, and faculty meetings. I think several faculty members at the College could be capable of running such a seminar if they would gather an attractive set of materials to place in an information packet for participants.

A Lilly proposal, anyone?

The President will continue to appoint ad hoc committees of the faculty as the need arises and I will sometimes suggest names to him, as I have done in the past. An ad hoc committee has just been formed that will make a recommendation on the proposed by-laws change of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Faculty Committee Structure. The change would allow a person currently serving on a standing committee to be elected to the Committee on Nominations without having to resign from the standing committee. The members of the new ad hoc committee are: Jim Anderson, Clarence Davis, Michael Ohr (Chair), Lala Preble, and Faye Steuer. A vote will be taken on this proposal at the January faculty meeting just prior to requesting nominations for the new Committee on Nominations.

The changes in the by-laws that were proposed by Jim Hagy have been withdrawn, thereby obviating the need for an ad hoc committee to study them.

The next faculty meeting will be on January 12, the first day of classes. As usual, motions to be made at this meeting should be distributed to the faculty at least one week in advance.

The Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Committee Structure also plans to recommend that the following committees be merged: Student Affairs with Athletics, Academic Standards with Admissions & Financial Assistance, and Curriculum & Academic Planning with Continuing Education & Special Programs.

In addition, it plans to recommend that the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President be abolished.
The above committee, in making its recommendations, is looking more at the long-range needs of the College than at the way specific members have handled their committee tasks. No slight is intended toward any faculty member who has served well on committees that might be merged or abolished.

For those interested in learning some of the finer points of Parliamentary Procedure, Frank Petrusak has consented to lead a discussion on Tuesday, January 27 at 4:00 P.M. in Room 200, Maybank.

Faculty Project of the Month: Construct a sentence in which the first half and second half are identical, but in which the first half alone does not constitute a complete sentence.

EDITORIALS

Breadth vs. Depth

Of the numerous comments I received after initiating the faculty newsletter, my least favorite was "You write very well — for a mathematician." My response was, "You speak veryrationally — for a woman." The purpose of this editorial is not to start a "mathematician's lib" movement; rather it is to discuss academic compartmentalization and stereotyping, and whether changes in direction and outlook are needed.

Perhaps the Renaissance Man was buried with the Renaissance. The closest in recent memory was the late C. P. Snow, outstanding writer and scientist, who deplored the existence of two cultures; he worried about the physicist whose idea of modern literature was Dickens, and he chided the poet who could not state the second law of thermodynamics. The split is probably deeper and more pervasive today. Even some physicists have forgotten the second law of thermodynamics because it does not enter directly into their specialties, and the specialist in Dickinson may not have read Dickens since high school — unless, of course, his or her thesis was about the influence of Charles on Emily's poetry. An academician who knows enough to converse about each of the many areas of concentration within a chosen discipline is considered, for that reason alone, to be well-rounded.

It seems that all fields are becoming more technical and abstruse. The more one specializes, the more likely one is to make an impact — if only for the benefit of those other few with the same specialty. Interdisciplinary work is in vogue now, but that may be a change in form rather than substance. The study of the relationship between mathematics and music might become a field more narrow than most branches in either mathematics or music. Further, those whose specialty is mathematics or music most likely would not respect the interdisciplinary work if the worker did not have proper academic credentials in either field, and — even worse — there would not be an appropriate journal in which to publish any findings.

We are continually forced to make choices between learning a lot about a little and learning a little about a lot. Both depth and breadth, taken to their extremes, become empty — in the first case one ultimately learns everything worth knowing about nothing, and in the second case one learns nothing worth knowing about everything. The proper medium must, of necessity, be largely personal — based on one’s abilities, interests, motivations, and pressures. To me, an ideal well-rounded academician should be a publishing Ph.D. with a Master's level training in a field other than his or her specialty, should have a Bachelor's level background in a discipline totally unrelated to the specialty, and should attain and retain the knowledge necessary to pass a final examination in all of the core curriculum courses that satisfy the minimum degree requirements at the College of Charleston. How many of us, certainly not I, could meet even the last criterion?

More often than not, I have chosen depth over breadth. I am as guilty (successful?) as anyone else in finding a narrow area of specialization that I enjoy, and then devoting most of my professional development time to it. I have tried to encourage colleagues to strive to become experts in some field, however small and insignificant. I worry about faculty members outside the mathematics department teaching statistics. I was concerned that a mathematical colleague might want to "count" her playing in the Charleston Symphony Orchestra as service to the academic community; she neither sought nor received departmental recognition for her performances. Isn't it more admirable, though, for a mathematician to have developed and displayed this additional talent than for a musician similarly to exhibit his or her skill, which I would be inclined to count as a worthwhile service to the academic community?
Sometimes we act more as if our professions chose us than that we chose our professions. When I was a teen-ager with ambitions of becoming a major league baseball star, I marvelled at some of my idols so more gifted athletically than I that they had the opportunity to play either professional baseball or basketball. Talented entertainers frequently move from comedy to drama to singing to dancing. Most of us probably had, and still have, the ability to succeed in some other field. I am not proposing that we go through some scholarly mid-life crisis, and change fields. What I am proposing is something far less drastic and less time-consuming, yet still addresses the lack of knowledge both about substance and methodology of the different disciplines.

In the previous issue of Newspeak, I asked each of the vice-presidents for a description of their duties. More important than what administrators do, even more important than what committees do, is what you and I do professionally. There are two reasons, a good one and a bad one, that we as a faculty know less about each other's work than ever before. The good reason is that we are doing more; the bad reason is that we no longer take the time to find out what each other does. Most of what I have learned about different fields in recent years has come not from an insatiable quest for knowledge, but from conversations with friends enthusiastic about their work. Discussing similarities and differences in methodologies for diverse fields has taught me much, in a painless way, about other areas and how my area is perceived by outsiders. So take a mathematician to lunch, go to dinner with a geologist, or have a drink with a philosopher -- and speak professionally of topics other than institutional goals, listless students, and faculty gossip: talk about your respective disciplines.

In a liberal arts institution, we should at least become acquainted with all of the liberal arts. I would like to hear from faculty in every department, describing either their disciplines in general terms or their research projects in language suitable for the non-specialist. Better to make ourselves understood departmental letters, though any letters are welcome, if not twice as good. The purpose of Newspeak is to provide a forum for improving communication among faculty. What better way to improve communication than to give our colleagues and friends an overview of what we enjoy doing, what we have spent years doing, and what we are trying to do?

And to get things going, I offer

What Mathematicians Do

Before telling you what a mathematician does, let me tell you what a mathematician does not do. A mathematician has very little to do with numbers or balancing checkbooks. You can no more expect a mathematician to be able to add a column of figures rapidly and correctly than you can expect a painter to draw a straight line or a surgeon to carve a turkey; popular legend attributes such skills to these professions, but popular legend is wrong. There is a branch of mathematics called number theory, but even that does not deal with numbers in the usual sense -- a number theorist and a calculator would find little to talk about. A calculator might enjoy taking the square root of the product of a pair of seven digit numbers, which would bore any self-respecting mathematician; a mathematician might like the proof that every positive integer is the sum of not more than four squares, whereas the infinity involved in the word "every" would frighten and paralyze even the most sophisticated computer. In any case, such a theorem is not what the person who teaches mathematics to numbers has in mind.

The mathematician Kronecker once said, 'God created the integers, all else is the work of man.' This is a statement more about the axiomatic approach than about numbers or theology. It means that to build a system one has to start somewhere, to accept something. All mathematical systems begin with certain assumptions -- whether they be called axioms, postulates, hypotheses, premises, or laws. A mathematician is interested in the conclusions that may be deduced from the assumptions, regardless of the truth of the assumptions. Thus, a mathematician may have a perfectly valid, logical proof that has nothing to do with reality. The conclusion must, however subtly, be contained in the hypotheses; part of the beauty of mathematics is seeing the strange and mysterious places that some apparently simple and innocuous assumptions may lead.
As an illustration, every high-school student "learns" in a Euclidean geometry course that the shortest distance between two points is a straight line. Keep all of Euclid's axioms the same, except allow the shortest distance between two points to be some curve, and you develop a system known (appropriately) as non-Euclidean geometry. Is this hypothesis changing merely a useless game? Even if it is, mathematicians justify it on aesthetic and artistic grounds if the subsequent reasoning is deep, innovative, and creative, and the conclusions that follow are surprising and interesting. This particular story has a happy ending even for the more practical individual. The shortest distance between two points in outer space is not a straight line. Einstein applied some of the results of non-Euclidean geometry to develop his theory of relativity. All this could make one wonder about the nature of reality, more a subject for philosophers than mathematicians.

Mathematics, though deductive in its final formulation, is almost never deductive in its creation. The mathematician at work makes vague guesses about incompletely posed questions, and jumps to unwarranted conclusions. He or she arranges and rearranges ideas, and becomes convinced of their truth long before a logical proof can be written. Months of labor often result in showing that a particular method of attack cannot possibly solve the problem, and a reformulation with more experimental work is needed. By "experimental work", I mean thought-experiments rather than test-tube experiments. When a mathematician wants to prove a theorem about an infinite dimensional space, he or she examines its finite dimensional analog, and looks in detail at the two and three dimensional cases — thereby hoping to gain some insight that will generalize to infinite dimensions. Once the insight desired has arrived, the proof may begin. A rigorous proof is given — free of sloppy thinking, verbosity, and polemic; these certainly are not encouraged in other disciplines, but are probably easier to detect in mathematics.

Just as a mathematician does not need the equipment that a scientist needs (a paper and pencil will often do), so a mathematician does not require the number of books required of a humanist. With mathematicians, as with musicians, inspiration and insight may often substitute for experience. This is why a child prodigy is more likely to exhibit talent in mathematics or music than in history or sociology. This is also why anti-social behavior or an inability to function in the real world is less of a detriment in mathematics or music. Yet mathematics is still a sociable science, in that mathematicians gain insights by discussing problems and concepts with one another. Most mathematicians can be classified either as problem solvers or theory builders, according to whether they try to find solutions to specific questions or try to fit the results in a general framework and point it in a definite direction. Each mathematician does some of both, but each is stronger in one than the other. A problem solver and a theory builder will often communicate with each other to produce mathematics whose significance is greater than the sum of its parts.

People study mathematics for two reasons: because it is an art and because it is practical. Corresponding to these reasons, there are basically two areas (with many sub-areas) of mathematics: pure (or theoretical) mathematics and applied mathematics. The pure mathematician takes a "math for math's sake" approach and the applied mathematician attempts to utilize pure mathematics to serve the needs of society. If there were only pure mathematicians, mathematics would become a game played by a small group of people that would get no more financial support than chess or bridge. If there were only applied mathematicians, mathematics would eventually dry up and consume itself. The creative tension between the pure and applied has enhanced both areas. The pure mathematics of one generation often becomes applied in another generation, as was the case with non-Euclidean geometry. The extent to which a culture tolerates pure as opposed to applied mathematics is roughly comparable to the value it places on the arts as opposed to the sciences.

Why does mathematics occupy such an isolated position in the intellectual firmament? Why is it considered good form for intellectuals to shudder or giggle and announce that they never could understand it? One reason, perhaps, is that mathematics is a precise and subtle language designed to express certain ideas more briefly, more accurately, and more usefully than ordinary language. It is more concise and more complete to say that \( x^2 - y^2 = (x+y)(x-y) \) than to say that if each of two numbers is multiplied by itself, the difference of the two results is the same as the product of the two given numbers by their difference. It takes years to learn to speak the language of mathematics fluently.
Mathematicians, too, are not very well-known. Albert Einstein, considered by many non-mathematicians to be the greatest mathematician of all time, was a great physicist who used mathematics in his work, but was no more a great mathematician than a great violinist. Of those generally regarded to be the most eminent mathematicians (Ruler, Gauss, Hilbert, Newton), only Newton is well-known—and primarily for his discoveries in physics. Descartes, Pascal, and Bertrand Russell—all fine mathematicians—are probably more acclaimed for their contributions to philosophy. The most famous, and certainly best paid, mathematician in this country in the past twenty years was Frank Ryan—who also happened to be the quarterback for the Cleveland Browns. The relative anonymity of even the prominent mathematicians might be due in part to Mittag-Leffler, the outstanding mathematician of his day. Legend has it that after Mr. Nobel found out about the affair between Mittag-Leffler and Mrs. Nobel, he excluded mathematics as one of the disciplines in which to award his prize.

And now the time has come to stop gossiping about mathematics and mathematicians, and to start doing a problem in mathematics—or, more precisely, showing how a mathematician deals with an arithmetic problem. Since mathematics is not a spectator sport, I invite you to join in the solution of the following problem:

A tennis tournament has 100 participants. Each pair off with another, with only the winners of the first round participating in the second round, only the winners of the second round participating in the third round, etc. If there are an odd number of winners in a given round, one player sits out that round and joins in the next round. The process continues until there is a champion, the person left with no one else to play. The question is this: how many matches must be played altogether, in all of the rounds of the tournament?

There are several ways of attacking the problem, and even the most naive one works. The first round has 50 matches; the second, 25; the third, 12 (with one person sitting out); the fourth, 6; the fifth, 3; the sixth, 2; and the seventh, 1. Since 50 + 25 + 12 + 6 + 3 + 2 + 1 = 99, it follows that 99 matches are needed.

This is the answer to the question, but not a very satisfying approach for a mathematician. The mathematician would then want to know how many matches would be needed if there were 5479 participants (or any other number) instead of 100. A good guess (conjecture) would be 5478, one less than the number of participants, because that is what it was in the case of 100. One could go through the same laborious process to try to confirm the conjecture for the special case 5479, or one could stop and think—and perhaps find the insight to ask the right questions. How many losers are in each match? (1). How many losers are there with 100 participants? (99). With 5479? (5478). With n? (n-1).

This is the solution that the mathematician seeks. It is general because it can be adapted to any number of participants, and it is elegant because it avoids the use of arithmetic. There are other questions that can now be posed, to try to put the problem in a still more general framework. How many rounds are needed for any given number of participants? What if there is a double-elimination tournament? What if ...?

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION WORKSHOP
December 1, 1980

Approximately thirty-five administrators, the President, all Vice Presidents, department supervisors and directors participated in the Affirmative Action Workshop on December 1. The consultant, Dr. Freddie Gromes, Assistant to the President at Florida State University and Past President of the American Association of Affirmative Action, approached the subject from the aspect of institutionalizing affirmative action. She emphasized the need for top level commitment to ensure the success of an affirmative action program and the further translation of this commitment through a result-oriented program in each division or department.
The consultant displayed a thorough knowledge of the subject and had no problems in holding the interest of the participants for the four-hour session. She shared her experiences in developing a successful Affirmative Action Program at Florida State and demonstrated that commitment and planned effort can make a difference in achieving affirmative action goals.

In the final hour of the workshop, Dr. Groomes attempted to relate affirmative action goals to the objectives of each of the College's divisions, i.e., Academic Affairs, Business Affairs, Institutional Advancement, etc.

Some of the points which provoked considerable thought, if not discussion, were:

1. Each division should develop an Affirmative Action Plan to reach goals within the division.
2. Affirmative Action should be one of the management objectives and as such administrators should be evaluated on their achievement of AA goals.
3. Significant minority role models are needed for the successful recruitment of minority students and also for the recruitment of additional minority faculty.
4. Persons appointed to the faculty should receive contracts which list specific expectations for the position. Tenure and promotion evaluations will be based on the success of the individual in meeting the terms of the contract.
5. Career development or training programs should be a vital part of the institution's AA plan.

Although there was general agreement that the consultant was highly capable and the workshop helpful, the participants offered very little challenge to or discussion of the information presented.

Sincerely,

Lucille S. Whippner
Office of Human Relations

Dear Herb,

In your November 21 editorial, "Apples vs. Oranges," you questioned several aspects of the policy concerning the frequency of teaching evaluations adopted by the faculty last April 14. That policy stated that for the first two years of employment here, faculty will have every class evaluated every semester in order to provide sufficient teaching evaluation data for the third year review. Thereafter, faculty are required to have a minimum of two courses per semester evaluated. This would supply enough valid, reliable data for promotion and tenure committees while reducing the number of evaluations conducted. I would like to comment briefly on the points you raised about this policy.

Your first paragraph satirized the current policy with a scenario of students choosing the grades which they would like to put on their transcripts. This analogy is provocative but flawed: students are required to take courses in different disciplines while faculty teach in only one field. For a student to decide to omit grades in natural sciences, humanities, or any other major field, would greatly distort the overall picture of the student's performance. However, faculty usually teach introductory and upper level courses on only several aspects of one discipline. Requiring evaluation of at least half of a professor's semester course load still gives an accurate picture of the professor's performance. Moreover, the current policy requires that "over the two-year period, each different course taught should be reflected in the representative sample of courses in the individual's packet." In addition, non-teaching factors are weighed in evaluating faculty: professional growth and development, service to the institution, etc. Nor are these factors considered "extra-curricular activities" by administrators.

While your analogy was probably facetious, it is also worth noting that some students do influence their transcripts by "shopping" for "easy" professors, registering for six vs. seven courses and dropping the difficult ones, and securing late "withdrawals" from courses. Professors are usually unable to shop for or pack their courses with "easy" students, drop difficult courses or students, or secure a late withdrawal for themselves.
Your second paragraph reiterated the current policy with one error; faculty do not have the option of "furnishing some—but not necessarily all—of the written comments by students." For summative (administrative) evaluation purposes, faculty are to furnish only quantitative data regarding teaching. This policy was adopted partly because of the great variation in procedures among departments regarding the security of the data. More important, though, were expert studies which concluded that written student comments do not constitute reliable data for use in summative evaluations. Articulate and/or glib comments can significantly bias an evaluator's assessment—positively or negatively. The gain in objectivity in using only quantitative data more than offsets any loss in insight from excluding written comments. Such comments do provide good formative feedback for the faculty member only. Hopefully, this also answers your fourth paragraph on student written comments.

You also question making Maymester and summer session data optional for administrative review. Maymester data is optional because faculty teaching in this concentrated format, especially "experimental" courses, should have the right to fail as well as the right to succeed. Mandatory summative evaluation of Maymester may significantly inhibit the freedom to experiment with new teaching methods and techniques—which is one of the major rationales for Maymester. Summer session courses are regular offerings already evaluated during the normal academic year. Daily, longer classes and a somewhat different student body also make comparison with regular semesters problematic. Still, faculty have the option to present Maymester and summer session evaluations.

While you agree in the third paragraph that many students have become "jaded" from filling out evaluations in every class (especially on the last day of class under the old system) and that evaluating every class every semester is unnecessary (fifth paragraph), you express concern that many faculty will develop an "optimal strategy" of having four courses evaluated and presenting only the two "most propitious" for administrative review. Given the primary importance of teaching evaluations here, your concern is well-founded. Faculty anxiety about teaching evaluations has remained fairly constant; the current policy attempts to alleviate that anxiety to some extent by allowing the faculty member some role in determining which data are presented for summative evaluation. Other schools using the procedure have found that it provides statistically reliable data on the individual while also reducing faculty anxiety about evaluation after the procedure has been implemented for two or three years. Hopefully, that will be the case here.

You also worry that evaluation committees will not know if an individual is submitting all or only some of his/her evaluations. The committee need not know; the committee should assume the individual is presenting the best data possible on him/herself. To contrast those who may turn in all evaluations with those who turn in the minimum as "apples vs. oranges" is misleading. Departmental committees compare specialists in one branch of a discipline with specialists in another branch for promotion and tenure. Administrative and tenure review committees weigh departmental recommendations but also try to keep in mind a relative equivalency in evaluating, for example, historians, biologists, and musicians. That is why we have general criteria for promotion and tenure.

Your suggestion in the fifth paragraph that faculty be allowed to choose how many courses they want evaluated but be required to submit all evaluations requested raises another problem. Cynics have argued that some professors may concentrate on the courses they know will be evaluated to the detriment of the others. This could be more likely under your proposal.

I share your concern about "grade inflation for faculty." The new policy has not been operating for a year yet. Perhaps the Office of Institutional Research can keep us informed on this topic. I also understand your concern that a course evaluation not submitted for summative review has "buried" student input. But that evaluation may have greater usefulness to the professor as formative feedback.

I did not intend to write such a lengthy response, but your editorial touched on a number of important topics in a brief space. Assuming some of our colleagues have read this far and take these issues as seriously as we do, perhaps our "dialog" will stimulate other ideas, comments, and proposals for consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

George W. Hopkins
Dear Herb,

Since we are in the midst of the College of Charleston Foundation’s Annual fund drive, I want to let you and the faculty know how supportive the Foundation has been toward some of the academic efforts with which I am familiar. In addition to the Foundation’s support of academic scholarships, and of faculty research projects, there has been considerable support of our study abroad program, and of various other projects for which worthy students needed assistance. In fact, it is my experience that the Foundation is unflaggingly cooperative and supportive of all academic programs and projects at the College. Theirs is a very positive attitude, and they are always ready and willing to do whatever possible (within the limits of their resources) to assist the College’s academic program.

The College of Charleston Foundation needs our support to continue its important work. In my judgement, that support is well-merited.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John Dempsey

Dear Herb:

The Center for Continuing Education will offer more than fifty non-credit courses during the Spring semester. Many of these are taught by members of the faculty. We encourage faculty to share their knowledge and expertise with the community through non-credit courses. Anyone interested in offering a course should call the Center (5620) to obtain a course proposal form.

In addition to the fifty-plus courses already scheduled, we are considering offering several others which would be of particular interest to faculty:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Art of Losing Gracefully: How Not to Become a Has-Been</td>
<td>Marsha Hass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poison Penmanship: Un-Doing the Charleston</td>
<td>Paul Hammill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressing for Success: The Clothes Make the Man</td>
<td>Herb Silverman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Seven Percent Solution</td>
<td>Ed Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Analysis: How to Pick a Winner</td>
<td>John Dempsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposing Yourself to the Liberal Arts Through the Library</td>
<td>Ellis Hodgkin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interested persons are encouraged to enroll in these courses early since they will probably fill up fast!

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Donna Richter Pretty
Coordinator of Non-Credit Courses & Adult Advising

Thanks to those who contributed to this issue of Newspeak. I look forward to letters from you in the next issue describing your disciplines, projects, or academic involvements. The next deadline for submitting is Friday, January 25.