Administrationspeak

The Board of Trustees of the College met for four hours on Friday, March 20. After two hours, when the topic of the merger between the College and MSC was to be discussed, a member moved that the Board go into Executive Session. Of thirteen board members present, the motion carried by a vote of three to zero, with ten abstentions. President Collins then asked the Board for permission to allow the soon-to-be excluded guests to make a statement about the merger, prior to their departure. After permission was granted, a representative of the students, the alumni, and the faculty (me) conveyed to the Board some of the concerns of our respective constituencies.

Since the Board of Trustees is required by state law to inform the public of any decisions, at a dinner for the Board that evening I asked F. Mitchell Johnson, Chairman of the Board, if any decisions had been reached. He said that the Board had agreed to draft a letter to Senator Dewey Wise expressing the concerns of the Board.

The following 1981-82 salary ranges have been approved by the Board of Trustees for the College of Charleston:

- Instructors: $11,500 - $21,500
- Assistant Professors: $14,500 - $28,000
- Associate Professors: $18,500 - $31,300
- Professors: $22,000 - $38,300

It appears that the State Budget and Control Board will recommend average salary raises for faculty of 10.5%, effective in July. After discussion with Department Chairpersons, Dr. Bevan has made the recommendation to President Collins that at least 5% be allocated for merit raises with at most 5.5% then being used for across-the-board raises.

Because of personnel cuts mandated by the state, it appears that the College might lose as many as six faculty positions next year. Three of these positions are slots for temporary faculty that were to be used to replace faculty on leave next year; these positions will be regained when the faculty members return from their leaves. The other three slots are from visiting positions that are not expected to be filled next year. Should the budget cut for personnel be less severe than anticipated, the restoration of three faculty positions will be the number one priority within the institution.

President Collins will recommend to the Board of Trustees that our current policy of promotion to Associate Professor in the fifth year and tenure in the sixth be changed. It is his intent to recommend either that (1) tenure decisions be made in the fifth year and promotion normally not be considered until the seventh year or that (2) tenure decisions continue to be made in the sixth year with promotion normally not considered before the sixth. Details of a phase-in period are still to be worked out.

Research conducted by the College Skills Lab staff pertaining to use of the Lab by College of Charleston freshmen students during the academic year 1979-80 reveals the following information:

- 32% of the freshmen used the College Skills Lab, though only 27% of those who were placed on probation had taken advantage of the services.
- 62% of those freshmen using the College Skills Lab finished with higher GPR's than had been predicted, compared to 53% who had not.

Of those students who entered with a predicted GPR of 1.21-2.00 (27%), 39% who ended up on probation had used the Lab and 61% had not; for those with a predicted GPR of 2.01-3.00 (61%), only 4% who ended up on probation had used the Lab and 96% had not.
There is a CENTREX charge for incomplete (no answer) long distance calls when the caller allows the number to ring longer than 30 seconds (approximately 7 rings).

Because of expenses incurred while interviewing prospective colleagues and entertaining seminar speakers, it is requested that faculty take guests of the College to dinner at restaurants where the cost of the meal will not exceed $12.50 per person.

After ranking 98 areas of study according to combined mean scores on the Graduate Record Examinations (1977-1980) of students intent on graduate and professional study, the ten highest ranked areas are Physics, Astronomy, Biophysics, Applied Mathematics, Mathematics, Classical Languages, Statistics, Philosophy, Aeronautical Engineering, and Chemical Engineering. The ten lowest ranked areas, starting at the bottom, are Physical Education, Educational Administration, Home Economics, Guidance and Counseling, Social Work, Speech, Education, Spanish, Parasitology, and Fine Arts.

The seven vice presidents approved the document for faculty input into the evaluation of administrators proposed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, but rejected the recommendation that a committee composed of faculty and administrators review the responses and summarize the results for the president. Concern was expressed that confidentiality might be violated should too many have access to these responses. In addition to the seven vice presidents, those expected to be evaluated are Boyce Cox, Clarence Davis, John Dempsey, Sue Desmonde, Paul Fisher, Skip Godow, Paul Hamill, Virginia Herring, Charles Matthews, Ralph Melnick, Jerry Sanders, and Frank van Aalst. Each administrator will choose five faculty members to evaluate him or her; ten additional faculty members will be chosen by President Collins, when the vice presidents are being evaluated, and by the vice president, when administrators in his department are being evaluated. The evaluation process is expected to begin in the fall. Department Chairpersons will be evaluated by faculty in their departments this spring.

COMMITTEESPEAK

The Academic Standards Committee met four times to consider five student petitions.

A petition of a student asking for an extension of his probation period was denied.

A petition of a student asking to receive credit for courses in which he earned a "D" at the University of South Carolina was denied.

A petition of a student to change two courses from "audit" to "credit" was denied.

A petition of a student asking to be allowed to graduate with a 1.97 grade point ratio in his major, because this grade would round off to 2.0, was denied. (This denial came after considerable discussion about whether grades are "measured" or "counted" values.)

A petition of a student asking permission to take eight of his last 30 hours before graduation at another institution in the summer was approved.

Rachel Drake, Secretary
Faculty Committee on Student Affairs — Year-end Report, April, 1981:

The Committee on Student Affairs spent most of its time this year thoroughly studying race relations at the College. We discovered that many Black students feel their professors are insensitive to their cultural differences and needs and that incoming students, White and Black, are often unprepared to relate to each other in an understanding way. We also found that there is much room for improving the College’s image among potential students in Charleston’s Black community.

With this information as background, we made several recommendations to various administrators and campus organizations:

1. We recommended to Dr. Collins that Black speakers be considered for Founders’ Day or Commencement ceremonies. We also suggested that a way be found to incorporate more successful Black professionals from Charleston into the College community to serve as role models and advisors.

2. We recommended to Dr. Bevan that he encourage academic departments to consider bringing Black speakers to the campus, again because of their value as role models to our students.

3. We recommended to Dr. Haborak that efforts to plan orientation activities which would foster understanding among the races be continued. Specific suggestions involved role playing, discussion of pertinent films, and assertiveness training for Black students.

4. We suggested that Dr. Hamill arrange a workshop that would help sensitize interested faculty members to the many needs of Black students.

5. We recommended that Mrs. Whicker look into a means by which faculty members could submit voluntarily to an evaluation by minority students, in order to discover if they are perceived as being prejudiced or not. We also suggested that the Office of Human Relations undertake a campaign to make Black students more visible through articles in various publications.

6. We suggested that the College Union Board offer a wider range of entertainment which would appeal to Black students. We also recommended that they consider sponsoring a series of presentations and panel discussions on minority life.

7. We recommended that the Honorary Degree Committee make it a point to include Black candidates in its deliberations.

8. To the Student Union for Minority Affairs (SUMA), we recommended sponsoring a narrative essay contest, the topic being the Black experience at the College of Charleston. Winning essays could be submitted to the Miscellany. We also suggested that SUMA work more closely with appropriate persons when preparing budget requests, so that they might have more success in getting funds.

9. Our last recommendation is to the incoming Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics. We ask that they follow up on the recommendations made this year.

In other business this year, we toured the new men’s dormitory. While dissatisfied with the crowded conditions there, the Committee made no formal recommendations, our belief being that there was little that could be done. Throughout the year we sent representatives to the regular meetings of the Student Affairs staff and to the College Union Board.

Paye B. Steuer
Chairperson

The Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid met during the year to:

1. Review and subsequently approve the admissions policy and procedures for 1980-81.

2. Review and make recommendations concerning the applicants for scholarships and financial assistance (Palmetto Fellows and Foundation Scholarships).

3. Review the impact of Governor’s School on the recruitment of outstanding high school students and sent a proposal to the Faculty Advisory Committee concerning this issue.

4. Review the Summer School Option for applicants who are unacceptable for Fall admission and revised the present program so that it now conforms with College policy regarding registration for English 101.

5. Review and revise the current policy governing the renewal of academic scholarships. In the future, the committee will review each case where retention standards were not met.
FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE
Spring 1981 Semester Report

This semester the Faculty Welfare Committee considered the following issues:

1) Salaries--The committee explored the possibility of partial compensation for May semesters or Summer Session classes cancelled because of insufficient enrollment. The administration is studying this proposal.

2) Fringe Benefits--The committee helped publicize a survey on a S.C. state plan on dental insurance. Only 36% of the state's employees endorsed this plan and it has been dropped from consideration. However, President Collins has informed the committee that a bill authorizing general improvements in the disability benefits for all state employees is under study in Columbia. The committee continued lobbying with the administration for automatic deposit of checks. This service is not yet available.

3) Evaluation policies and procedures--The committee met with Dean Dempsey to assess the administration of teaching questionnaires in the fall semester. The dean and the committee were satisfied with the implementation of last year's changes and endorsed the same procedures for this semester.

The committee completed revisions of the quantitative teaching evaluation questionnaire and developed a qualitative teaching evaluation questionnaire. Both proposals will be brought before the faculty at the May meeting.

The committee discussed and approved four recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation. The faculty approved two of these recommendations (that tenure decisions be made in the fifth year, prior to consideration for promotion; that a candidate have the option of appearing before the departmental panel, but should not be required to do so) and rejected the other two (that consideration for promotion to Associate Professor should usually come no earlier than the seventh year; that colleagues should study thoroughly the packet prepared by the candidate before writing working papers and should use a standard checklist of key questions in analyzing the packet).

4) Faculty Welfare Committee composition and duties--The committee recommended that the composition of the Faculty Welfare Committee consist of 2 Professors, 2 Associate Professors, 2 Assistant Professors, 1 Instructor, and 1 At-large. Approved by the faculty.

The committee recommended that tenure and promotion policies and procedures remain a duty of the Faculty Welfare Committee. Approved by the faculty.

5) Miscellaneous--Committee members served as bartenders at the "Sherry Hour" after Monday faculty meetings.

The committee sponsored occasional "Meet the Department" gatherings during regular Thursday "Happy Hours" at the Blacklock House.

As one of his last official acts, the chairperson attempted to secure free coffee for faculty and staff at the Center for Continuing Education, the same benefit enjoyed by faculty and staff at the lounge in Maybank Hall. However, as of this writing, negotiations with the administration were inconclusive.

George W. Hopkins
Chairperson

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

During the semester the Committee has met weekly. Most of our time has been spent on academic regulations, and four proposals concerning them have been submitted to the Faculty. Three proposals for new courses were considered and two have been submitted to the Faculty. There are now no proposals of any kind pending Committee action.

Norman A. Chamberlain
Chairman
Library Committee Spring Semester Report

The Library Committee met four times during Spring Semester 1981. We concerned ourselves mainly with arguing for more money for the Library and explaining to Faculty members why the size of the Library budget necessitated cut backs in periodical and book purchases.

Our pleas for higher funding of the Library included a letter to President Collins which contains the following, "We also want to support the Library's request for $415,000 for a materials budget for the next fiscal year. We realize that this is a major increase (over this year's budget of $150,000), but are convinced that this amount is necessary to fund the Library adequately. . . . We feel. . . that the Library's welfare is so essential to the well being of the College that it is incumbent on us to encourage your consideration of this increased funding."

Respectfully submitted,

John Newell
for the committee
(Bob Dukes, secretary;
David Kowel; David Lawrence;
Beatrice Stiglitz; Pam Tisdale;
Skip Edmunds, student representative
and Ralph Melnick, Acting Director
of Libraries)

FACULTY RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE -- ANNUAL SUMMARY

With the end of Lilly funding in sight, the Committee began early in the year to consider the place of development proposals in the total program of awarding grants to the faculty. Much lively discussion ensued over the months ahead regarding the need to define the boundaries of the two categories of research and development. Differences were aired over the question of whether one category should receive greater funding than the other, and over the possibility of establishing the additional category of major grants, through which larger amounts of money would be awarded for projects deemed to be more innovative and having the potential for long-term impact on a given field of scholarship. Such awards might require outside referees, or at least letters of support from scholars of note in the particular discipline. While awards were made this year for development projects, the larger questions were passed on to next year's Committee with the recommendation and best wishes of those presently serving.

Ralph Melnick
Secretary

Faculty Committee on Athletics
Semester Report - Spring 1981

The Athletic Committee met 3 times during the spring semester of 1981. The general goal of support and enhancement of the program of athletics at The College of Charleston provided a departure point for many discussions and accomplishments.

Discussion Topics

1. Retiring of a jersey
2. Formation of an Athletic Hall of Fame
3. Accomplishments of 1980-81 basketball teams
4. Operational budget of the Athletic Department
5. Academic standards and the intercollegiate athlete
6. Fund raising

Accomplishments

1. Establishment of a procedure for retiring of a jersey for outstanding athletic accomplishment.
2. Selection of winners awards for academic accomplishments.
3. Resolution recognizing the #2 ranking of the 1980-81 women's basketball team. Presented to faculty.
4. Determination of worthy objectives to be considered by 1981-82 committee.
FROM: THE FACULTY COMMITTEE ON CONTINUING EDUCATION AND SPECIAL PROJECTS: DANTON JOHNSON, JOAN JONES, WILLIAM LINDSTROM, JAMES SNYDER, AND VICKI WEEKS

SUBJECT: SPRING SEMESTER REPORT

This spring the committee has been involved in the following activities:

1. In order to promote the quality of offerings in the credit and non-credit areas the committee helped plan and participated in an orientation for adjunct faculty. This participation was video taped for use with future adjunct faculty.

2. The recipients of the continuing education incentive grants were chosen in December, 1980. There were 17 recipients, ten at $150.00 and 7 at $125.00. Follow up data on the success of this project will be available this summer.

The committee has recommended to the Foundation continuation of the incentive grants with a slight increase in number and creation of a number of continuation grants for those who have done well but cannot continue without assistance.

3. The committee made recommendations to the Dean of Continuing Education concerning the College’s involvement in the Higher Education for Adult Mental Health Project. The College has been named as one at six participating institutions.

Among several topics to be considered by the Faculty Committee on Continuing Education and Special Projects in the future, one of immediate importance is the involvement of the College in television and radio courses.

The Faculty Committee should involve itself in a continued pursuit of quality in credit and non-credit course offerings thru continuing education. This should include the concern expressed by the present committee that although in a rapid growth period, the continuing education offerings at the College should enhance and support the liberal arts foundation of the College of Charleston.

Report From The Honors Program Committee

Courses: The Honors Program Committee has approved the following courses for 1981-1982:

Honors English (Fall and Spring) Bishop Hunt
Honors Calculus with Mathematical Modeling (Fall and Spring) Bill Golightly
Honors Colloquium in Western Civilization John Newell, David Kowal, (Fall and Spring) and Jim Abbott
Honors Colloquium in the History and Philosophy Jim Woodward
of Science (Spring)
Honors Biology (Fall) Mary Berry
Honors Chemistry (Fall) Richard Meyer
Honors Colloquium: Elements of Human Culture Ted Weiant and George Heltsi (Fall and Spring)
Special Topic: Economic Problems of the Eighties Paul Jursa (Spring)

New Students: The Committee has accepted 35 students for admission into the Honors Program as freshmen next fall. Of these, six have decided to go elsewhere. The table below compares the 29 students who at this point have indicated they are coming next fall with this year’s freshman class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entered in 1980</th>
<th>Expected to Enter in 1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAT Verbal Average</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Math Average</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined SAT Average</td>
<td>1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rank in Class</td>
<td>Top 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor’s Scholars</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State Students</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Honors Center: After extensive discussion and after securing some non-state funding, plans for the renovation and furnishing of 10 Green are now complete. We expect to move into the Honors Center this summer.

Current Work: The Committee is working on the following: (1) procedures for evaluating the Honors Program, (2) methods for recruiting adult students into the Honors Program, and (3) plans for Honors Program activities for next year.

The Faculty Advisory Committee met with President Collins on a regular basis during the fall semester and on a more irregular basis during the spring term. The main items on the agenda concerned Faculty input into the evaluation of administrators and a more equitable distribution of the available parking spaces on campus. Discussions on the budget for The College, the status of "merger with M.U.S.C." and the future of graduate programs at The College were also held.

The basic message of the budget talks was that The College is inequitably funded as compared to some of our sister institutions since our net F.Y.E. allocation is among the lowest in the state. Since we are an inner city institution, our maintenance and security costs are far out of line with the other state institutions and yet there is no recognition of this fact in our allocation. President Collins stated that he is intensifying his "education" program to alert state legislators as to the special needs of The College.

The state of the merger study is essentially at the point as reported by the local media. The true paternity of the idea is unknown but Senator Wise has dutifully assumed the role of foster parent.

The state of future graduate programs at The College is apparently static given the current budgetary problems. There has been some discussion by various Consortium committees but there are apparently no proposals in preparation at this time. The doctoral program in Education being discussed by the Consortium appears to be the most advanced at this time.

The parking problem at The College was the subject of several discussions by the Advisory Committee. President Collins has promised to appoint a special study committee to investigate a more equitable allocation of the limited on-campus parking slots. He did restore a temporary parking zone behind the Science Center so that Faculty could load and unload equipment without fear of being fined for doing their job. We hope that all Faculty members would observe the true intent of this limited parking area.

The majority of the Committee's time this semester has been spent in hashing and rehashing a document that could be used to provide some Faculty input into the evaluation of administrators. Long hours were spent discussing what form the evaluation should take, who should be evaluated and how the evaluation should be administered. A major problem encountered was how the evaluation of 40 administrators could be done by 200 Faculty members and not be too unwieldy. It was agreed that some sort of sampling procedure should be followed but there was disagreement between the administrators and the Committee as to the advisability of allowing non-solicited input into the procedure. This subject is left for the new Committee to ponder. President Collins has indicated that he would like the evaluation to be done next fall on a trial basis. Obviously a perfect document and procedure cannot be constructed the first time but there is a feeling that we should run through an evaluation process at least once before the next self-study. The new Committee will continue with this problem.

Respectfully submitted:

W. Frank Kinard, Chairman
Faculty Advisory Committee to the President

During the Academic Year 1980-1981, no business was brought before the Faculty Grievance Committee.

Sincerely,

William Bischoff, Chairman

To the Speaker of the Faculty,

I am a member of, but not a designated spokesman (on a, spokesperson) for, the graduate faculty committee. To my knowledge there were no meetings of this committee for the current academic year.

Sincerely,

Dick Crosby
Computer Science
SPEAKEASY

In a school known for its traditions, one of our finest is coming to an end. After serving for eight years as Secretary of the Faculty, Peter Rowe has decided to take a well-earned rest from this laborious and important task. I would like to thank Peter for his service and wish Bishop Hunt success in the coming year.

Roy Hills is responsible for a new tradition at the College. He has served informally as the first projectionist at faculty meetings, displaying faculty business on an overhead projector. His finest moment was his manipulation of two overhead projectors that showed simultaneously both ad hoc committee recommendations to revise the committee structure. Then, and many other times, he helped simplify complicated faculty business. Roy has asked that I try to find another projectionist for next year; please let me know if you are interested. If there are no volunteers, Roy would be willing to serve again.

I think the end of semester report by the Committee on Student Affairs could serve as a model for all end of the year committee reports. The Committee focused primarily on one important issue and made specific and tractable recommendations to specific individuals or groups. The Committee also provided direction for next year by asking the new committee to oversee the fulfillment of these recommendations by those responsible for their implementation.

Our committees next year will have the following officers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Chairperson</th>
<th>Secretary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standards, Admissions &amp;</td>
<td>Rebecca Linton</td>
<td>Mary Boyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory to the President</td>
<td>Maggie Pennington</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education &amp;</td>
<td>Mike Marcell</td>
<td>Jim Snyder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Academic Planning</td>
<td>Ken Severans</td>
<td>Rosanne Wray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance</td>
<td>Bill Bischoff</td>
<td>Jean Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>Kathy Alligood</td>
<td>Ralph Melnick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs &amp; Athletics</td>
<td>Marsha Rass</td>
<td>Katherine McIntosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>Sue Prasaki</td>
<td>Elaine Simons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following faculty members have been nominated for the Distinguished Research Award: Michael Finefrock, Gary Giamartino, Bill Gudger, Sam Hines, Ralph Melnick, and Mic Norton.

The following faculty members have been nominated for the Distinguished Teaching Award: Bob Cross, Harry Freeman, Becky Herring, Bill Moore, Willard Oplinger, Tom Palmer, and Sandra Powers.

Congratulations to all nominees, who have already received the honor of being recognized for outstanding achievement by one's peers. The winners are to be announced at graduation.

The previous recipients of the awards are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DISTINGUISHED RESEARCH</th>
<th>DISTINGUISHED TEACHING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Glen Merrill</td>
<td>Andrew Parrott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Herb Silverman</td>
<td>Carl Likes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Anna Katona</td>
<td>Susan Prasaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Diane Johnson</td>
<td>Sister Anne Francis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Faculty Research and Development Committee will forward to the President its recommendation for the Distinguished Research Award; a committee consisting of John Dempsey, Diane Johnson, Earl Kline, Tom Livingston, Peter McCandless, and Sue Prazak will forward to the President its recommendation for the Distinguished Teaching Award. Both awards are accompanied by a $500.00 honorarium.

After having served on the Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion of Faculty, Fred Watts is of the opinion that the size of faculty information packets should be limited to fifty pages per candidate. It does seem that candidates who can make good cases for themselves can make good cases for themselves within fifty pages.

I heard from a usually reliable source that pressure will soon be brought on Fred Daniels, Dean of Admissions, to grant an early admission to the College of Charleston. The future student in the class of 1999: Elizabeth Dunreath Collins, the first grandchild of President and Mrs. Collins.

A committee consisting of Frank Petrusak, Peter Rowe, and Herb Silverman is in the process of reviewing the motions passed by the faculty since 1979. An updated edition of The Faculty and Administration Manual, reflecting by-laws and administrative changes, should be ready for distribution to all faculty members in the fall.

This year an inordinate amount of time has been spent on restructuring committees and other by-laws changes. I hope that our by-laws will remain reasonably intact next year, with our energies focused more on some of the important academic issues.

I would like to thank those faculty who took the time to complete the Evaluation of the Speaker form passed out at the April faculty meeting. The issues that you felt should be addressed next year are the merger, purpose and direction of the College, agreement of priorities in an era of shrinking funds, more influence in the legislature, better faculty benefits (salary, retirement, etc.), role of research at the College, more release time for special projects, improvement of academic standards, rights and privileges of temporary and visiting faculty, evaluation of administrators and department chairpersons, and problems with the physical plant.

My major weakness as Speaker was perceived to be my attire. Some of your comments inspired my first editorial in this issue. Also suggested by several people was that I be more authoritarian when presiding at faculty meetings, especially when faculty get out of hand. Perhaps next year I will try a little less hard to keep my dictatorial tendencies under control.

The Faculty Welfare Committee will seek adoption of the new Student Opinion Questionnaire on May 4, the last faculty meeting of the academic year. Please read carefully this document, which has been in your possession for over two months, prior to the meeting. The Committee has spent a great deal of time deliberating on the fine points of this instrument; I hope the new document will be voted either up or down, without attempting to rewrite the questionnaire on the floor. Any amendments should be submitted in writing, preferably several days before the meeting.

I have additional copies of all back issues of Newspeak for any faculty or staff who would be interested in them.

There will be no honorary degrees awarded at the graduation ceremony this year. While receiving an honorary degree is indeed an honor, I agree with the philosophy of a well-known writer who said in response to a question: "A person who has been presented an honorary degree has the right to be called doctor, and I think it's fine -- for about two hours following the ceremony, in the spirit of fun. After that, it is pretentious and somewhat phony." Perhaps next year the Honorary Degree Committee will consider recommending Ann Landers, who at least would put the award in its proper perspective.

Since there is already a University of Charleston in West Virginia, I am starting a "Name That Institution" contest should we merge with MUSC. The first entry, from Roy Hills, is the University of Chucktown. Marilyn Lewis suggested Chuck U.
EDITORIALS

Form vs. Content

One of the biggest insults one can give to an intellectual is to say that he or she is all form and no content, that there is no depth or substance behind a superficial and pretentious exterior. Our courses are measured by their content; those with little or none are deemed unworthy of academic credit. If form without content is bad, does this mean that content is good and form is bad? Or that content without form is good? Or that each of us owns a form and content pie of the same size, the larger our portion of one the smaller it is of the other?

I used to subscribe in principle to the pie theory, at least socially, thinking that I had to choose between social amenities and in-depth conversations, between warmth and efficiency, and between conformity and creativity. I wanted my slice of content pie to be as large as possible, feeling that the leftover piece of form would only need to be ignored after all the content was gone, which I hoped would be never. Form, I thought, was the artificial flavor needed only when the real flavor had to be disguised, the artificial color that hid the true color from those that could not accept it, the preservative that sacrificed what was natural to what was convenient and marketable.

Recently, I had a born-again experience at a mathematics conference. There I talked to a colleague whose paper I had refereed and rejected for publication because it was not well written. The mathematics, I explained, was original and interesting and worthy of publication if put into a more readable form that emphasized rather than obscured the major results. I discussed at length with him what I had in mind and he begrudgingly agreed that it might be better, but that the time it would take to rewrite the paper could be more productively spent creating enough that he thought the unthinkable, said the unsayable: "You are more interested in form than in content".

He wasn't right, but he wasn't as wrong as I initially had believed him to be. I tend to emphasize, more than do the majority of my mathematical peers, how something is written — perhaps sometimes at the expense of what is written. My justification, aesthetics aside, has been that making a paper as clear and readable as possible (without sacrificing content) also makes the paper more accessible to more people in the discipline, thus maximizing the impact of its ideas on the field. This rationale could not explain my badgering of former thesis students to avoid common errors like writing "which" when "that" was more acceptable or "reiterate" when "iterate" was meant. The explanation, I recognize, is simply an appreciation of form for form's sake.

In some areas of art, music, and poetry form without content is permissible. In most disciplines, especially in mathematics, no style can transform a paper devoid of content into one deserving of publication. Content, in fact, normally precedes form. Good writing and good style flow much more easily from good ideas just as good chess moves follow more naturally from good chess openings.

With the revelation that form is more significant to me than I had thought, I began to discover some nonverbal outlets. I value my physical form, which is why I exercise regularly, avoid tobacco, and try to eat nutritious food. Self-discipline, at least a first cousin to form, has always regulated if not ruled my life, which is why I am writing this editorial instead of playing at the beach. I expect there would be physical and psychological reverberations into the late afternoon if I were to get out of the left side of my bed in the morning instead of the right and put on my right sandal before my left. Most of the procedures I follow without thinking tend to free my mind for what I hope will be more important concepts or forms.

Have I really only been semantically born again or have I actually formed an alliance with form? Probably more the former, but with added tolerance toward those who take a form for form's sake approach in areas that I don't really appreciate. There are three ways that form and content can relate to each other: they can conflict, as with a lawyer whose flamboyance is inversely proportional to the body of evidence; they can complement, as with a golfer whose graceful swing elicits maximum power; and they can be independent, though this is more difficult to recognize because there are those who see conflicts or complements when there are none.

Any of the three relationships may be present in the choice of attire, which — prompted by numerous comments this year — is the purpose of this editorial. Most people in politics and other professions that involve selling to the public could not succeed if they were not mindful of their dress. It was difficult enough for me to sell encyclopedias door-to-door twenty years ago wearing a tie and jacket, but their removal only tightened the bolts and chains on the doors of my potential customers. Also tightened was my resolve to finish working my way through college so that I would be in a position to choose a profession in which advancement came more through ideas than appearance.
What should a faculty member wear? When I began teaching in graduate school at Syracuse University, I wore a tie and jacket the first day, a jacket the next two days, and then returned to what was normal for me. At that time (1963), I was one of the few male graduate students who did not wear at least a jacket. My roommate, who also didn't like jackets, carried one around all day, put it on just before going to his class, and took it off as he began to lecture. By 1968 when I graduated, most of the graduate students no longer wore ties and jackets. Then I got a real job at Clark University in Massachusetts, where most of the faculty still did. I did, too, for a day. As I became more confident in the classroom, I wanted to become more comfortable in my attire. Dressing like a student even seemed to facilitate classroom communication in the turbulent anti-establishment early seventies, though my choice of apparel revealed more a desire for comfort than a tool for teaching.

I came to the College of Charleston expecting to dress somewhat more traditionally in the conservative South. The tolerance of my colleagues was a pleasant surprise that helped dispel some of my Northern stereotypes. The two modifications in my attire, from casual to more casual, were the result of athletic and climatic changes. I became addicted to jogging, in a climate warm enough for me to be comfortable in running shirts and sandals all year round.

I don't think my attire in any way affects my teaching at the College. Nor do I believe it affects my performance as Speaker, though some faculty would prefer that their representative dress in a more representative fashion. I do not think that clothes make the person, nor do I have any points to prove with my garments. So for the sake of those who see dignity in places that I don't, I will try to dress in what is considered a more appropriate manner at faculty meetings. I will even occasionally forsake running shirts at other times during the semester, if I find a suitably comfortable alternative. I might remind my colleagues, though, that a person can look like a professor, walk like a professor, and sound like a professor — yet still not be a professor. That is how professors are different from ducks.

**Editorial on Editorials**

In a year replete with committees on committees and amendments on amendments, it seems only appropriate that my last editorial of the academic year be an editorial on editorials. In the previous issue of *Newspeak*, I took the advice of the song title and decided to "hit right down and write myself a letter". In it, I gave what I considered to be honest and constructive criticism of myself. Most of the comments I heard from faculty were about their thoughts while reading the letter. The opinions on the author of the letter usually included various expletives (deleted), until discovering that the "obnoxious" critic of me was me. Such harsh criticism in print of a colleague, however well meaning, is usually considered to be in poor taste.

We have chosen professions in which our minds are exercised more than our bodies, where emotional outlets are more likely to be verbal than physical. A case could and should be made for trying to achieve a closer mind-body balance, for choosing recreational activities that are more athletic than intellectual. Such a case will not be made here. I would like instead to try to make a case for sharpening, refining, and directing our verbal skills, and using them well and wisely.

In each of our disciplines we try to encourage our students to examine critically the written and spoken word, to recognize and correct sloppy thinking, and to communicate frequently and affectively. Our best students realize that these skills, and not the regurgitation of facts, are essential to education and prerequisites to creativity. Many of these students select professions in which they, too, can educate and demonstrate the creative process to others. Unfortunately some of these very students, who excelled in high school and responded to all challenges in college and graduate school, eventually choose to evade rather than overcome new challenges. Armed with knowledge, methodological skills, advanced degrees, and experience, it becomes easy for these students to dazzle or sidestep the unarmed without fear of retaliation. We have met these students, and they are us.
What does this Pogo-like excursion have to do with editorials? Perhaps nothing, but perhaps something. My major disappointment concerning your responses to editorials has not been your criticism, your disagreement, or your anger; it has been your lack of response and your lack of specificity. Most of the comments I hear about Newspeak are "Hey! I liked your last issue" or the more detailed "Hey! I liked your editorial about ---". I do appreciate hearing when you like something I write, and hope you will continue to tell me when you do; but I also want you to tell me when you don't like something I write, and what you dislike about it. Even though what I write is written in large part for myself, it is only my diary that is meant to be exclusively for myself. Sometimes I feel that a point I make might be weak, and I would expect someone to bring out its deficiencies. When no one does, when colleagues do not force me to exercise my mind, I fear that both my writing and my thinking might become flabby.

When I say "I", I really mean "We", those who have also contributed letters to the editor. The only difference between an editorial and a letter to the editor is that an editorial is written by the editor and a letter to the editor is not (except in the previous issue). When I ask other contributors about responses they have received, I invariably hear that they, too, are disappointed by the small number. Sometimes several months after an editorial or a letter is written, I am asked if anything has been done about the issue that was raised. It is easier to accomplish something if I know that a significant number of faculty agree (or disagree) with a suggestion that is made.

There are a variety of reasons that most faculty avoid giving constructive criticism to their colleagues. Some refrain because they feel the criticism would be unwanted, and construed to be neither warranted nor constructive; some do not wish to invite return criticism, or risk turning friends and allies into foes and enemies. Still others do not want to waste energy that could be channeled more effectively into teaching and research. A lot of energy, though, is wasted talking about some of the problems at the College without suggesting or working toward solutions.

While I was pleased that the replies on the evaluation forms distributed at the April faculty meeting were chiefly positive, I was disturbed that only 201 chose to sign. I consider it to be a failure either on my part or yours that 80% of you see a barrier between you and your representative that makes anonymous replies preferable to signed replies. I hope I can help to create an atmosphere more conductive for you to discuss with me, either in print or in private, what I have done, said, or written, and what you would like to see accomplished in the coming year. Peer communication should be no less an activity practiced by us with our colleagues than a philosophy taught by us to our students.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Herb:

Thank you for your generous offer to allow me to set forth my thoughts regarding the Task Force to create a university here in Charleston. I greatly appreciate your offer to have this information printed in the faculty newsletter and I am here-with submitting that article.

Very Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dewey Wilk
Senator
I welcome this opportunity to communicate my thoughts regarding the Task Force that has been set up to create a university here in Charleston. The concept of a comprehensive university in Charleston is not a new one. It was first recommended in modern times in 1968 with the publication of a report by Cresap, McCormick and Padgett which was done under the auspices of the Higher Education Commission. The report considered at that time various options of linkages between the existing institutions of higher learning in the Charleston area. For several reasons, the recommendations were not implemented and the College of Charleston ultimately became a part of the State-supported public institutions and began its expanded role in higher education.

In 1973, the Cresap firm updated its report and again recommended the study of a State-supported university here in Charleston. That recommendation was endorsed both by the State College Board of Trustees as well as the Charleston County Legislative Delegation. At various times in succeeding years other organizations endorsed the concept including all of the Deans of the various Colleges at the Medical University in 1978.

My reasons for initiating the study at this time are very simple. I believe that higher education in South Carolina is in for some difficult financial times. There is intense competition for State dollars in Columbia and I believe that federal funds will become increasingly scarce.

This means that we must utilize more effectively the funds that are available and strengthen our ability to compete for those funds. I believe the College of Charleston is at a distinct disadvantage in competing for funds at the State level because of the fact that it does not have a separate board of trustees. Being linked with two other colleges, both of whom are significantly smaller than the College, in my judgment, restricts the College's role in expanding its horizons.

I also see other institutions in the Charleston area coming under increasing pressure. For instance, I believe that within the next few years, we are going to see continued growth in the medical school at the University of South Carolina which is going to ultimately mean more competition for the Medical University for medical education dollars.

All of these factors indicate that the time is ripe to at least take a close look at the advantages and disadvantages of creating a comprehensive university here in Charleston which would include the College of Charleston and the Medical University of South Carolina.

From my position as a member of the State Reorganization Commission, I secured authorization from the Commission for the formation of a Task Force and the assignment of staff personnel as well as funds to conduct this study. We anticipate concluding the preliminary aspects of this study by mid-summer and reporting our findings to the Reorganization Commission as well as the Commission on Higher Education. Obviously, any recommendations of the Task Force will have to be implemented by one or both of these organizations as well as the General Assembly.

We have tried to balance the Task Force between the Medical University of South Carolina interests and the College of Charleston interests. I have invited faculty, students, and alumni to participate in this study as well as interested members of the business community.

We have divided the Task Force into six subcommittees to cover the major categories of interest that might be generated in such a study. The individual subcommittees are currently meeting and we expect to have reports from them within a matter of weeks on many issues which must be considered in such a study. Some of those issues are as follow:

(1) What additional graduate studies are needed in the Charleston area?
(2) What savings, if any, can be derived from linkages of maintenance, security, library, administration and other aspects of the various institutions?
(3) What additional research funds and grant monies would be available to a comprehensive university that are not available to the institutions separately at this time?
(4) What role, if any, should the other institutions of higher learning in the lowcountry play in the consideration of a university concept?
What additional cultural, educational and industrial benefits might be available to the lowcountry provided a comprehensive university were located here?

(6) If a comprehensive university were created, how would you preserve the unique historical heritages of the institutions involved?

It has distressed me that a number of persons feel that this study will in some way impact adversely on the College of Charleston. Some have even indicated that my view of the role of the College of Charleston in the future would be as a "seventh college" of the Medical University of South Carolina. Nothing could be further from the truth. I recognize the unique historical heritage of the College of Charleston, and I would never take any action which would adversely impact upon the mission and role of the College as it is presently constituted. Between 1973 - 1980, the College of Charleston received $23,000,000 in capital improvement funds from the State of South Carolina. As a State Senator, I was active in each of these bond issues in terms of lobbying, voting and otherwise supporting the College's position. The most recent of these bond issues involved funds for an additional parking garage which was approved within the last two months by the General Assembly. I can assure every member of the College of Charleston faculty that my desires for the College are to enhance every opportunity and give the citizens of the lowcountry of South Carolina a viable and competitive higher education structure.

What recommendations will emerge from this study will in large part be up to the faculties of each institution. You and your representatives on the Task Force can and should play a vital role in formulating our recommendations.

Various options are available ranging from the status quo to strengthening the Charleston Higher Education Consortium to creation of a Graduate Center to formation of a comprehensive university. I personally think that higher education in the lowcountry would be best served by a comprehensive university.

We cannot afford to duplicate professional schools already in existence in other areas of the state. But there are educational opportunities needed in the lowcountry that such a university could respond to that would be cost-effective.

I would hope that talk of "being swallowed up" and "merged out of existence" would be put aside and we would examine with a critical eye the opportunities and benefits of a university structure. I do not see the role of the College of Charleston diminished in such a configuration, rather, it will be enhanced.

Dear Herb,

The Student Issues Committee of the University of Charleston Study Task Force held its second meeting Monday, April 20. In the first meeting the committee discussed its purpose and reviewed/amended a draft outline of student issues. In the second meeting the committee discussed the first section of its four-section outline. The first section, entitled "Background Information: Current Student Profile," included topics primarily statistical in nature such as: current enrollment, percentage of applicants accepted, percentage of part-time and continuing education students, and so forth. Two major concerns (if a merger of the College of Charleston and MUSC were to take place) were expressed and are to be noted in the final report. They are:

1) concern about the possible de-emphasis of the liberal arts at the College
2) concern about the changes in the science curriculum -- possibly less attention given to non-medically oriented science courses.

At the next meeting on Monday, May 11, the committee will discuss recruitment, admissions and financial aid at each institution and will assess student advising and counseling. The student members from the College of Charleston are: Ben Roberts, Barry E. Miller, Gary Heims, Nancy Hitt, and Susan Olson. Dr. George Raborak and Dr. Theodore Stern are also members of this committee.

Susan Olson
Dear Herb:

I read with appreciation your thoughtful editorial on Affirmative Action Programs, March 20, 1981. Without belaboring any one point, I would like to respond to a few of your statements.

Except for a few academic disciplines which you cited, the greatest affirmative action problem with women in higher education exists in the placement of females in upper level administrative positions and in the higher academic ranks. This is true for faculty and non-faculty positions. An area that should be of concern to us is the number of female faculty placed as "temporary" visiting professors or visiting professors. Although the vacancies may be of this nature, we are suspect if a high percentage of persons filling these positions are females.

Your example of a department's efforts in ranking candidates for interviews is an excellent one for affirmative action commitment, not guidelines. If all four candidates were considered qualified by the department and if there were no minority or female faculty within the department, AA commitment would determine that the underrepresented class be given the first consideration. Evidently, AA was not given priority in the ranking of qualified candidates. The difficulty, not because of AA, is always that of selecting from among qualified candidates.

The one argument for affirmative action that I believe to be important that was not presented is the ethnic, racial, and cultural diversity which results from a successful Affirmative Action Program. The smaller college environment becomes more like the "real" world and individuals within that environment learn that "different" is not negative, but enriching.

Being an eternal optimist, I appreciate most your statement that affirmative action is transitory. I apologize for the personal reference, but as a member of the Avery Institute, Class of '44, (not to be used to determine age), I applied for admission to the College and was rejected on the basis of race; presently, I serve on the administrative staff at the College. Affirmative action assures us that this time span would be shortened or that the example could one day be irrelevant.

Our constitution is color-blind. But until our society translates that ideal into everyday practice, the decision-maker who is color-blind is blind to injustice.

U. S. Supreme Court Justice John Marshall Harlan (1896)

Peace and love,

Lucille S. Whipple

Dear Herb

At the May meeting of the faculty, Dr. Bevan and I will be addressing a proposed change in the procedures students use to withdraw from courses. It is our aim to reduce the number of students who withdraw from classes, especially those who do so without proper advisement. Consequently, next year we will insist that students withdraw from courses only with the consent of their advisors. To ensure that this procedure is complied with, we are permitting students to withdraw from classes only after they have met with their advisors during the pre-registration advising periods. During this period, students may withdraw with the consent of their advisors. After this period withdrawals will be permitted only for extenuating circumstances (medical problems, etc.) and only with the permission of the professor and the Undergraduate Dean.

As I mentioned above, Dr. Bevan and I will address this matter more thoroughly at the May meeting, and we will be glad to answer any questions the faculty may have concerning the new procedures. It is extremely important, however, that the faculty and students understand that this new procedure is being proposed for the Fall Semester.

Sincerely,

John J. Dempsey
Dean of Undergraduate Studies
EDITOR'S NOTE: The following speech was delivered by Tom Palmer at the Founder's Day Ceremony.

FOUNDER'S DAY 1981

I was privileged to be asked to make this address. Some years ago I was equally pleased when the graduating seniors asked me to give the commencement address. My talk on that particular occasion centered on the joys and benefits of a Liberal Arts education. After some reflection it occurred to me that every Founder's Day and/or commencement speech has examined this proposition.

It is an ideal I heartily endorse but today I think we might be happier to take a look at our past from the standpoint of how students and faculty coexisted at the college in years gone by.

Among the sources I examined for this information were the faculty minutes commencing in 1840 through the remainder of the 19th century. This lode of information offers much in the way of comparison with today's college. My first surprise was the size of the faculty. For well over a century there were only six, sometimes seven, professors.

This, of course, included the President who was expected to carry out his share of classroom instruction and indeed was always known as the President of the Faculty -- not the President of the College. There was no core of professional administrators, rather the faculty was absolutely in charge of the day-to-day operation of this institution and the expenditure of college funds.

Indeed in 1851 the upkeep of the College was provided for in a faculty resolution outlining the duties of the Janitor. This sainted individual whose name is not readily available was charged in part with the following duties:

Resolved 1st That the Janitor be required to devote his undivided time and attention to the duties of his office.
2nd That he shall hereafter open the College at 7 o'clock A.M. from the 1st Oct. to 1st April, and at 6 o'clock from 1st April to 1st Oct.
3rd He shall close the College at Sunset every day unless otherwise ordered by the Faculty or one of the Professors.
4th Every window in the building shall be properly bolted, sashes lowered, and doors locked at that time.
5th The Chapel and all the rooms in College shall be daily swept and cleaned immediately after College hours and the grates prepared and filled with coal for use on the following day.
6th All tables, chairs, benches and desks shall be dusted and fires lighted in each Professor's room before 9 o'clock A.M.
7th The Chapel shall be kept locked until the hour appointed for morning or other exercises and be closed immediately afterwards, and shall not be used as a lobby or thorough fare.
8th As soon as a Professor leaves his room, it shall be locked and the key retained in possession of the Janitor or the Professor.
9th During exhibition hours, he shall be in attendance, near the south or principal entrance to the College, to direct visitors & strangers to the Museum.
10th He shall be at all times within call subject to the order of the several Professors.

The matter of the Physical Plant put to rest, the Faculty as a matter of routine turned to the ongoing problems of student discipline and the preservation of academic rigor. Various improprieties such as laughing, eating in class, neglect of studies, failure to perform exercises in composition and elocution, or exploding fulminating powder in one's room -- all these led to public reprimand by the president in the Chapel.

But do not suppose this was the extent of mischief on the part of our high spirited students. A certain Mr. Boykin in March of 1843 was charged with making a "rude noise" during the President's speech. The nature of this noise is not recorded but Mr. Boykin received a severe reprimand for his actions.
Again some years later a stir of excitement pervaded the campus as "Mr. Bell of the Junior Class, was summoned by Prof. Holmes on a charge of breaking glass by pistolshooting, and breaking a new chandelier just brought to the college. Mr. Bell admitted that he had brought a pistol to the College and with other persons fired it several times at the windows." But he maintained indignantly that the chandelier had been broken "unintentionally."

Perhaps the most heinous crime during these tumultuous years was the introduction of a "strolling musician" to the campus during evening hours — an act of infancy which led to the temporary suspension of the entire Junior Class.

But these matters were, of course, not the main preoccupation of faculty and students. Academics were the main concern. Students were not admitted to the College unless knowledgeable in Greek, Latin, ancient Geography, German and French, English and Math.

These same studies comprised the college curriculum for four years. Advanced proficiency was required in 3 languages (4 were encouraged) in order to graduate. No one was advanced to sophomore, junior or senior level until examined and passed by the entire faculty. There was a certain disdain for other institutions and on occasion we are told that transfer students from Yale or Princeton College encountered some difficulties with their entrance examination. Admonitions not to emulate the practices of "norther colleges" were occasionally given.

The Civil War brought severe troubles to the College and it was rather plaintively pointed out in November, 1861, at a faculty meeting, that only two students were in attendance at the College.

The lack of tuition income led by 1866 to the College's first excursion into continuing education when it was resolved that evening courses would be conducted for the public. The only fee for a single lecture was $0.50, for the entire course $8.00, although the entire family could attend for an additional $2.00.

As the 19th Century drew to a close these difficult days were replaced by the inspired leadership of Dr. Harrison Randolph.

He was not only a splendid academician but a brilliant recruiter and public relations man as well. His early catalog contains the following inducements to prospective students, worthy of the finest that Madison Avenue offers today.

The climate of Charleston is unsurpassed; mild, and yet invigorating, it is conducive to best results in the expanding and growing life of the student. The sea breezes laden with ozone from the broad Atlantic, act as a continual tonic. There has not been a case of illness among the students in the College Dormitory since its opening.

That he was also a man who would brook no assault of his dignity is found in a vignette from the student magazine of the period.

Freshman B-I-c-e went up to President Randolph's office, and greeted him with "Say, old man, can you tell me where the President is?" That is why he was seen to emerge from the office via the keyhole.

Finally, no word of the function of the college could be complete without a mention of the Boards of Trustees. They have been distinguished for their public accomplishments and for their contributions to the institution. Perhaps a short excerpt from the college catalog of 1896 gives some indication of this.

The same general comment holds good of the Boards of Trustees, who from time to time, have been charged with the administration of the College. Upon their records may be found the names of Robert Y. Hayne, the brilliant and dauntless antagonist of Webster, John Rutledge, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Stephen Elliott and a long array of others who have been conspicuously identified with all that is noblest and most ideal in the political, social, intellectual and scientific development of this State.
It is today, then that we perhaps have a special feeling of comradeship for the faculty, students and trustees that have proceeded us and over the span of a century and a half and longer. We can appreciate and sympathize with their problems, many of which have a strangely contemporary ring, and the sacrifices they made in the resolution of these problems.

In conclusion I must quote

Professors are the most uncontrolled order of human beings, the most difficult people to satisfy—with their eternally conflicting interests, jealousies, envy—their desire to dominate others, their one-sided views according to which one thinks that only his field deserves support and advancement.

William van Humboldt

Based on what has been said today this evaluation could not apply to the faculty of our institution past or present.

Surely van Humboldt must have been a beleaguered dean in one of those "northern colleges."

Dear Herb,

Let me report briefly on the "Lilly Fellows" program. As you recall, Dr. Bevan had written articles encouraging an arrangement through which faculty could show special expertise they had developed, and you (with members of the Research Committee) had urged creation of "in-house chairs" for active researchers and special projects in teaching. So we tried an experiment, offering to "match" one release time that departments could provide, with compensation for a second release time and some expense money.

We received excellent nominations, and decided to "stretch" the funds by splitting some awards, since we could not fund every good project. Funded primarily for research were Glen Merrill, Kathy Alligood, Marion Doig, David Mann, and William Gudger. The two Interdisciplinary Visiting Lecturers chosen were Anna Katona and Peter McCandless. Special Project support in Teaching Development went to Susan Schenck, Sandra Powers, and Alice Geiling.

I wish I could describe each project, because so far the experiment is a success. The research projects are proceeding apace, and one investigator has submitted two large grant applications. The Interdisciplinary Fellows have been well received, and in fact have commitments to co-teach or lecture with colleagues through next year. The Teaching Development projects will result, we think, in a consortium-wide cooperation to diagnose learning-disabled college students; in formalized computer/math programs for middle-school children; and in a resource center of some sort for foreign-language teaching materials.

Let me list the main points of my preliminary evaluation of the experiment:

a) Although we speak of "faculty development", the chance to carry through a particularly good project or to share expertise with colleagues is one of the rewards of faculty life that should be made available more regularly. It is difficult, but the department chairpersons deserve credit for making this round of fellowships possible.

b) At the level of these fellowships, a lot of Shibboleths (e.g. research vs teaching vs service) do not hold. The "teaching" fellowships have challenged the scholarly talents of the holders, who are keeping up to date with national and not merely local developments. And the "research" fellowships have produced benefits in inter-institutional cooperation, grants written, projects for advanced undergraduates, and so on.

c) To our pleasant surprise, almost every Fellowship has widened extra-collegial contacts (with MUSC, with legislators, with the university of Maryland, etc.) I suspect that the mere fact that the College is endorsing the Fellow's project helps in looking for new resources outside.

d) A half-load, scheduled right and perhaps coupled with a change of office, can free almost as much time as a semester sabbatical. The same release time, unfortunately, can be filled with expanding committee or adviser duties. A plan for managing time is needed to hold a successful on-campus fellowship.
e) Faculty don't wish to appear to teach their colleagues, but do enjoy sharing new approaches, and learning as they share. I wish we could help more faculty to do this, because what really occurs is that faculty learn by observing each other's strengths. To call this sharing "teaching improvement" or some such phrase turns a few people off — but the process is exciting, regardless of what it is called.

f) Neither I nor some of the Fellows foresaw clearly how their work would serve the whole college, or how their experience could help others. One early theme that came up was the complaint by the researchers and innovators that they are isolated because no colleagues shared their subspecialties. Only a few partial solutions were suggested, but it may have been useful to say that the problem is widespread.

There are negatives, including the burden on departments, uncertainty as to what aid Fellows can expect from unfunded colleagues, the creation of need for follow-up support, the alternate (and worse) possibility that there will be no long-term results, and so on. But on the whole, the Lilly Fellows represent the creativity of the faculty very impressively, and they deserve great credit.

We have submitted a grant proposal for continuation (with modifications) to the Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education. The proposal is a "long shot", but we have high hopes.

Sincerely,

Paul Hamill  
Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs  
for Faculty Research and Development

1981 marks the centennial of the birth of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, who in 1923 established the Republic of Turkey and served as its first president. Though it is now more than forty years since his death, the visible image of the founder of the modern Turkish state is today as omnipresent in the nation he created as it was during his lifetime. A military leader, political revolutionary, peacemaker, educator, social modernizer and secular reformer, Atatürk became, to a greater degree perhaps than any other leader in the history of the free world, a hero to his own people. Indeed, it is fair to say that Atatürk's quite positive image as father of his country not only has survived the years, but has grown larger over the course of time.

Thanks to a $15,500 grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities and a matching grant of $3,500 from the Ford Foundation, the College of Charleston is organizing an Atatürk International Research Conference under the sponsorship of the Turkish Studies Association. Scholars from Egypt, France, Great Britain, Israel, Japan, the Soviet Union and Turkey have been invited to participate in the three-day interdisciplinary conference which is to be held October 9th to 11th, 1981, in the Education Center of the host institution.

Michael M. Finke  
Project Director

Dear Herb,

The National Endowment for the Humanities has awarded me a Summer Stipend to complete my work on the history of the family in colonial Mexico. The object of my research is the history of parental authority over children in Mexico between 1610 and 1620. The study, which is nearly complete, examines the conflict between parents and children over the choice of a marriage partner. Rather than using normative and prescriptive literature to determine the acceptable range of behavior, my study has examined the actual range of behavior employed by both parents and children to impose choices of a marriage partner. It studies both the formal and informal limits on parental authority for the majority of Mexico's colonial era.

Original research for this project was carried out in Mexico between 1976 and 1878 under a Fulbright Fellowship and a Social Science Research Council International Doctoral Dissertation Fellowship. The final phase of research being funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities will examine the Spanish legal and cultural roots of marriage practices in colonial Mexico.

Sincerely,

Patricia Seed
TO: Dr. Herb Silverman
FROM: Jill E. McGovern

Thank you for your kind words about my receiving an American Council on Education Fellowship. I was most honored to be selected to participate in the ACE Fellows Program in Academic Administration during the 1981-82 academic year. The program provides the opportunity for direct involvement in academic administrative processes and for observation of a wide variety of institutional activities. During the Fellowship year, I will work at a host institution under the guidance of a mentor; arrangements for this challenging year are being made now.

Herb, you may also be aware of the recent honors received by the Department of Education. The S.C. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development recognized our department for three annual awards: Project SEEK (Self-Expression for Enhancing Knowledge) and its originator Dr. P. Ken Bower were cited for honorable mention as a noteworthy program of a college or university; Project INSTREME (Inservice Training for Regular Educators: Mainstreaming Education), and its originators Dr. Pamela C. Tisdale and Dr. Frances C. Welch were cited as the outstanding federally funded program; and I was given the Personnel Recognition Award as outstanding educator. All of the awards represent the cooperation and dedication of all members of the Department of Education as it strives to improve education in South Carolina.

Thank you for your interest and support of our efforts.

Dear Herb:

During the past year the Center for Continuing Education has sponsored numerous activities to encourage adults to return to college for credit and non-credit courses. A series of orientation sessions, Discovery Night, the Brown Bag lunch series, a variety of non-credit courses as well as the new publication The Center have been initiated to bring reentry students to the College of Charleston. I believe the faculty will be interested in the following information related to the enrollment of continuing education students.

1. First some national statistics to put the College of Charleston information in a broader context.

   a. More than 18 million people, or 11.8 percent of the total adult population are enrolled in adult-education programs.

   b. Participation in adult learning activities has been increasing more than twice as fast as their numbers in the population.

   c. Since 1972, the proportion of college students over 25 has increased from 29 percent to 35 percent, the majority attending part-time. By 1983, older students are expected to represent 40 percent of all college students and by 1986, 44 percent.

(From the National Center for Educational Statistics as reported in The Chronicle of Higher Education.)

II. College of Charleston Enrollments

These figures provided by the Office of Institutional Research represent the number of students coded as Continuing Education students enrolled in credit courses at the undergraduate level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTINUING EDUCATION ENROLLMENTS FOR CREDIT COURSES</th>
<th>Fall 1980</th>
<th>Spring 1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Students</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Students</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditors</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizens</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Head Count at College of Chas.

5227

Continuing Education Student

Percentage of Total Enrollments

132

162
additional notes:

1. Of the 732 Continuing Education students enrolling Fall Semester, 240 or 33% indicated that they intended to earn a degree from the College of Charleston. As they become degree candidates (after successfully completing 15 credits and applying for admission as a degree candidate), these students will not appear in Continuing Education enrollments. Our goal is to assist the adult become a degree candidate as soon as possible.

2. The Continuing Education enrollments for Spring Semester increased by 7% over Fall Semester while the total head count enrollments for the College decreased by 8%.

3. Over 650 prospective adult students participated in the orientation sessions and Discovery Nights. Adults may require several months to prepare to register after obtaining information about enrollment.

4. The average number of credits taken per Continuing Education Student: Fall Semester 5.53 credits per student, Spring Semester 5.58 credits per student.

I. Distribution of Time Courses are taken:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Percent of total Continuing Education enrollments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day Courses Only</td>
<td>Fall 30.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Courses Only</td>
<td>Fall 56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Day and Night</td>
<td>Fall 12.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most of the Continuing Education students who take only day courses include women returning to college after their children are grown or in school, retired military personnel or adults who work swing shifts to allow for daytime enrollment.

IV. Continuing Education enrollments for credit courses (sex, marital status and race)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married Male</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Male</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Female</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Female</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: White</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Minorities</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Age Distribution for Continuing Education Students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage of total Continuing Education enrollments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 25</td>
<td>Fall 32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>Fall 24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>Fall 18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>Fall 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>Fall 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>Fall 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>Fall 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 13.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age for total College of Charleston enrollments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 21 years of age</td>
<td>2581 - 49%</td>
<td>2245 - 44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and over</td>
<td>2646 - 51%</td>
<td>1540 - 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 and over</td>
<td>1346 - 25%</td>
<td>1214 - 24.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the behalf of The Center for Continuing Education staff I wish to thank all of the faculty and the staff who have contributed to the programs this past year. Only with the cooperation and willingness of the faculty to offer courses at a variety of times can the adult learner be served.

Sincerely,

Sue Sommer Desmonde, Dean
Continuing Education and Community Services

Dear Herb:

The College of Charleston has been selected as a participating institution in a National Institute for Mental Health project entitled "Higher Education for Adult Mental Health". The project is designed to assist institutions in meeting the educational, developmental and mental health needs of the adult learner.

The Center for Continuing Education serves as the administrative unit responsible for implementation of the project. We will be assembling a team of faculty members who have an interest in addressing the needs of adult students in terms of new curricular designs, new teaching/learning practices, or improved advising models.

Funds are available through this project for research and/or released time for faculty participants. Interested faculty should contact the Center (ext. 5620) for additional information.

Sincerely,

Donna Richter Pretty, Coordinator
Non-Credit Programs and Adult Advising

Writing for the World

A year ago this summer, questionnaires about writing were going into the mail to alumni and to employers in business, industry, and the professions in the Tri-County area. They sought answers to such comprehensive questions as these: How do our alumni feel that they have been served by their instruction in writing at the College of Charleston; and how does the business, industrial, and professional community rate the writing of employees? That is another way of asking whether the claims reported in the national media that college graduates cannot write as well as they need to apply to the Charleston area. In general, the employers who responded are less critical than some of the complainants we have read about, but only 41% of them rated the writing of their employees as "good"; 46% called it "satisfactory."

An unforeseen but reasonable response, considering that this is the age of sound, showed skill in oral communication to be more productive than skill in writing, although the ability to write business communications was rated by employers not far behind in importance. The Business, Industrial, and Professional Survey also gave a decisive answer to the question of what needs to be improved in the writing of employees: the presentation of complete and clearly-worded information. Some attention needs to be given also to grammar, vocabulary, and the conventions of writing (spelling and punctuation). Poor spelling, for instance, is an irritant to employers, but it does not interfere as significantly with communication as lack of clarity or of information.

Alumni, too, responded emphatically on the need for instruction in oral communication, asking for a requirement in it, and, second, for business writing. As several commented, "Everyone, no matter what field he goes into, has to write business letters." A number of comments strongly urged us to increase requirements in communication; English 101 and 102, a total of 6 credit hours, clearly do not meet the needs of our alumni in their careers. Although 70% reported English 101 to have been "helpful" and 51% endorsed the research paper, fewer endorsed the writing of themes about literature in English 102.
The Alumni Survey provides suggestions about how the College might offer what is needed. Some alumni recommend increasing the 6-hour requirement to 12 hours; that would let us add 3 hours in oral communication and 3 in writing in the student's major department. They agreed that students need instruction in writing in the junior or senior year to prepare them for jobs after graduation and that courses connected with their majors, such as business writing or scientific writing, would heighten their motivation.

Other alumni, however, recommend revision of the 6-hour requirement as an alternative to a 12-hour requirement or as a way of holding the total to 9 hours. This might entail transforming English 102 into an upper-level writing course closely connected with, or offered in and planned by the department of the student's major. In some departments, an existing course might be revised to include a research paper or some other kind of writing unit. Our alumni offer testimonials that the science departments have taught them scientific writing effectively—and probably they do it better than the English Department could. We can no more assume that literature specialists are prepared to teach other specialized kinds of writing than that scientists are prepared to teach the techniques and the vocabulary of writing about literature.

Actually, our students do not need to learn to write about literature unless they become English majors. At the same time, one would assume that every graduate of a liberal arts college would have had an introduction to literature in his or her native language. That could very well be required as an introductory course instead of the present English 102, which combines literature and composition with notable shortchanging of the attention that both subjects merit and with notably less enthusiasm from our alumni.

Other institutions of higher education are exploring or already have found ways to include in their curricula the kinds of writing that students of the 1980s need and expect to receive from their colleges. Therefore, based on the results of this survey of writing, I urge the appointment of a committee of members from every major department to work with the English Department to explore alternatives and discover feasible and acceptable ways to improve the preparation of our students for their lives ahead.

Sue Detherington

I Move, Therefore, I Am!

Allow me to introduce myself. I'm Jonathan Livingston Seagull and I'm a physical educator bird. I am writing this article because Big Bird asked for an explanation of my discipline. This presentation should be read recognizing that I am but one bird and my perceptions may not be shared by others in my discipline. Come with no. Fly a mile on my wings.

"Oh Father in Heaven, in Whom we live and move and have our being...", is the often used beginning offered by Dr. John Huss, your campus minister. I have overheard those words many times as I observed college functions and they seemed appropriate for opening remarks.

The art and science of bird movement is my focus. I am committed to Health and my primary educational tools are of a psychomotor nature. Calling me a physical educator indicates something about who I am and what I do, but is also a very confining term and stereotype. I usually teach, but not always in a school setting. I am both "of the physical" and "through the physical". A part of me yearns for all birds to value physical activity. While some of my bird colleagues work with high-performance birds, the strength of my field is a health-related physical education for all birds. We physical educator birds have an obligation to keep other birds from being "taken in" by health and exercise fraud, misconceptions, and bucksterism.
In my world, a gymnasium is known as a library and a library is known as a gymnasium. Many psychomotor experiences are available in our library. There is something for all ages and abilities. While "skill versus" frequently use the library, the library belongs to all birds. Though I am familiar with many of the Great Works in the library, I do not have command of all of them, although I would like to. Just as birds in the gymnasium do mental gymnastics in specialized areas such as English, Math, Languages, Sciences, etc., birds in the library find a need to emphasize and specialize in certain areas.

We physical educators go through educational programs in libraries and gymnasiums in order to earn the revered title of "Flock". Advanced degrees are available in Physical Education or sub-disciplinary areas such as Sports Medicine, Motor Learning, Biomechanics, Sport Sociology, and others. Birds who specialize in areas of the library sometimes have more in common with birds from the gymnasium than with birds from the library. Birds with advanced degrees command the respect of all birds and are known affectionately as "Super Flocks".

Another interesting feature of education in birdland is the Iib-gym. Birds have long recognized that "mental" involves the physical and that "physical" involves the mental. Although it is recorded that the Great Bird Plato taught in a gymnasium, it was probably a lib-gym. Most of my work is done in the lib-gym, which is the center and largest portion of our libraries and gymnasiums.

As I flew over the College the other day, I noticed a new lib-gym under construction. At least, that's what I thought it was. Judging from comments heard around campus, there seemed to be several opinions about the place. One said, "It's mostly for athletics and spectacles." Another was heard saying, "I think it's called the Physical Education Center." A regular student was heard to say, "At last there is a time and a place for me." And as I flew to the outer reaches of your campus, someone remarked, "This is a College, not a playground." Indeed, at the College there seems to be some confusion about the meaning and value of your new library. Birds used to fight those old battles in the Dark Ages. Although there are birds, such as myself, who see themselves as librarians, we birds recognize the interdependency of the mental and the physical. The library is an essential part of any education, including a "liberal education" for birds. Although all birds now value the library and the gymnasium in the education of all birds, it has not always been this way among birds.

The Dodo did not.

Roy Hills
Department of Physical Education and Health
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The deadline for submitting letters and pieces of information for Volume 2, Issue 1 of Newspeak is Thursday, September 24. May you all accomplish at least half of what you hope to this summer, and return refreshed and renewed.