ADMINISTRATIONSPEAK

After reviewing 268 applications for the position of Provost-Dean of the Faculty, the Search Committee has reduced the field to 23. President Collins and Brian Wessellink are now travelling to Charlotte, Washington, and New York to interview eighteen of the candidates. Members of the Committee are phoning the remaining candidates. Hour-long tapes are being made of all the interviews to help the Committee narrow its choices to five. Each of the five finalists will be invited to campus to meet with faculty, students, and administrators, either in late March or early April, with a decision expected sometime in April.

Enrollment at the College is 4903, up 2.4% over last Spring. Undergraduate enrollment is 4684, up 4.9% over last Spring, while Graduate enrollment is 219, down 32%. The total FTE count is 3952, up 2.3% over last Spring.

For undergraduate degree candidates, the overall attrition rate at the College last year was 26%. Of those who were here in Fall, 1980, 30.7% of the freshmen, 27.2% of the sophomores, and 28.6% of the juniors did not return in Fall, 1981. Of those beginning their senior year, 12.2% neither graduated nor returned to the College to complete their education.

Currently, 14% of all courses taught at the College are being taught by temporary faculty.

Last Spring, each Department Chairperson was asked to rate departmental members on a scale of 1 to 9, with 9 the best, in the areas of teaching, professional development, and service, and then give an overall rating. The overall ratings at the College were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean departmental ratings in decreasing order were 8.5, 8.4, 8.1, 8.0, 7.2, 6.9, 6.7, 6.7, 6.7, 6.6, 6.6, 6.5, 6.2, 5.5, 5.4, and 5.3. These ratings reflect more on how Department Chairpersons choose to rate departmental members than on the quality of the individual departments.

The State Budget and Control Board has recommended a 6% across-the-board pay raise next year for all state personnel. The Council of Presidents has expressed its opposition to any procedure that does not allow for meritorious performances to be rewarded.

Of all the state colleges and universities in South Carolina, the College of Charleston ranks first in Room Usage. Between the hours of 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM, 62% of the rooms on campus are occupied. The Citadel, with 42%, ranks last.

The Commission on Higher Education has approved a Physical Education major at the College, effective Fall, 1982.

On February 26-27, there will be a retreat in Hobcaw to discuss the possibility of establishing a Ph.D. in Higher Education through the Consortium. Representing the College at the retreat will be Hugh Haynsworth, Ed Lawton, and Sue Sommer.

Based in part on faculty input, President Collins has given written evaluations to each of the Vice Presidents. He will be meeting individually with the Vice Presidents to discuss these evaluations.

Lindsey Hale, Director of Development, resigned from the College on January 31. Forrest Reaves, Manager of the Print Shop, will be leaving the College on March 31.

The College Mailroom has recently converted from part-time student help to full-time permanent help in an attempt to stabilize mailroom procedures and provide more efficient service.
Founder's Day this year will be without a speaker. Instead, there will be an Open House, with music and refreshments, in Alumni Memorial Hall on Tuesday, March 16 from 11:00 AM to 2:00 PM.

The senior class has voted once again to observe the traditional dress at graduation of women in long white dresses carrying one dozen roses and men in white dinner jackets and black pants.

COMMITTEE SPEAK

The Committee on Nominations has recently distributed forms asking faculty for committee preferences for next year. Faculty who have had requests denied in previous years should so indicate. The Committee will begin its deliberations shortly after the March 1 deadline for submitting requests.

The Committee on Curriculum and Academic Planning has had withdrawn from it the Global Issues Program, which may be considered at a later date. The Committee expects to be reviewing the curricula of Business Administration & Economics and Urban Studies, and plans to review all departments within the next three years. Minors or concentrations of study in addition to the normal major programs are also under consideration by the Committee.

The Faculty Welfare Committee met with two members of the American Family Life Assurance Company and listened to a presentation of a supplemental health care and life insurance program. The Committee has been approached by several companies offering additional health benefits or retirement plans, but will reserve judgment about pursuing them until after receiving data on fringe benefits at other state institutions. The Committee has begun gathering information to aid it in its deliberations on establishing specific criteria for promotion and tenure.

The Faculty Research and Development Committee has recommended the awarding of 17 grants for approximately $23,000. The recipients will be announced shortly after the President reviews the recommendations. Three additional projects were referred to, and will be funded by the Faculty Advisory Committee for Internationalizing the Curriculum.

The Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Assistance will make proposals concerning audits and transfer credits at the March 15 faculty meeting.

The Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics received the news that the College had been invited to participate in the organization of Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities. The Committee has recommended to the Vice President for Student Affairs that he be responsible for the management and setting of criteria. The possibility of designing an orientation course, University 101, is under consideration. Several members attended a workshop on this subject at the University of South Carolina. Finally, recommendations to the administration are being made that graduation checks be performed the semester before, instead of the semester of graduation, and that the length of time it takes for a student to secure a transcript be shortened.

The Faculty Library Committee met with David Cohen, new Director of the Library, who was asked about the current status of the Book Approval Plan. David noted that since such plans cannot serve all departments equally, mechanisms must be found for providing a more balanced allotment of library funds. The job of insuring such even-handed distribution is made more complex by the present difficulty in the College in making long-range budget plans. David gave an overview of the proposed library budget for next year. There is expected to be a slight increase in allocations for books. Also mentioned was a need to upgrade security in the library.

The Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs reviewed and awarded seven incentive scholarships for next year. The Committee discussed whether to continue offering courses at other sites and the advisability of the Consortium being responsible for all non-credit offerings. Suggestions were made to improve the advising system for continuing education students.

The Faculty Advisory Committee to the President has not yet met this semester.

An ad hoc committee consisting of two Professors, two Associate Professors, and one Assistant Professor will review the proposed by-laws change to make tenured Associate Professors eligible to serve as Speaker of the Faculty. The committee, consisting of Bill Bischoff, Malcolm Clark (Chair), Robert Dukas, Anna Katona, and Susan Schenck, will make its recommendations at the March 15 faculty meeting.
BUDGETSPEAK

REPORT FROM THE BUDGET REVIEW AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

On the forms sent out to applicants for faculty positions this year, the Chemistry Department has included a list of ten common faculty activities, asking the applicant to rank these in order of interest. Nearly all respondents placed teaching lectures first, teaching laboratories second, and research third or fourth. What do you suppose is generally of least interest to these prospective faculty members? Committee work, of course.

There is no mystery as to why committee work is so low in popularity. Any of us could give a dozen reasons in thirty seconds or less. I could claim that we on the BBPC are a group so wisely selected that we have risen above the frustration and exhaustion thresholds of ordinary people, pulled there, perhaps, by the high call of duty. You would know I was lying, so I won't make that claim; the fact is that, after a reasonably encouraging first semester, the BBPC is behind schedule for second semester. Subcommittees that were supposed to be at work weeks ago have, in a couple of cases, yet to meet at all. So we aren't batting a thousand. The team seems to be in a bit of a slump.

On the other hand, I am able to remind you of the list of objectives and suggestions for immediate action reported as endorsed by President Collins in the last issue of Newspeak, and to report further that now the next step has been taken: The President has gone down the list, and has given written instructions to those who are to implement each action to get started. In a number of cases, things are already being done. You should soon, then, begin to see more than words.

The Subcommittee on Academic Departments has met once with department chairmen to discuss with them details of the studies that must be done of the areas where the primary mission of the College is carried out. We have solicited ideas and suggestions from the chairmen, and have done a first draft of a worksheet that we hope will facilitate the preparation of brief departmental reports. Chairmen are being asked to review these worksheets with departmental faculty and return to the subcommittee in writing suggestions for improvements in the worksheet. Reports will, as suggested by the literature on such studies, address three principal questions: (1) How does the department contribute to the College mission? (2) What is the quality of the department’s program? (3) How costly is the department’s program? A fourth question asks about the impact that would be produced by a 10% budget reduction for the department. This study will be going on for most of the semester.

Meanwhile, the full committee is working on the 1982-83 budget for the College. We have begun looking at revenue projections and non-academic budget proposals, and will, by the time this is published, have begun an examination of budget proposals from academic departments. Although the committee is behind schedule in this process, we should have a final recommendation to the President in time for a much earlier decision on the 1982-83 departmental budgets than has been possible in the past. Next year our plan is to develop a timetable that will lead to budget decisions by January 20th, subject, of course, to action by the state legislature.

The American Council Education Literature encourages budget management as opposed to administration, something that takes place almost nowhere in academe, they say. If the BBPC can keep its collective energy, determination, and creativity trained steadily on that goal, by 1982-83 we should have at the College of Charleston an integrated system of management, one guided by a consensus on mission, and facilitated by clearly set priorities, that will set the College apart from most institutions of higher learning. More importantly, it will assure that whatever resources are available to us are used to the best advantage.

Gerald Gibson
Chairman, BBPC

SPEAKEASY

In Fall, 1980, the College-wide mean on the key question on the Student Opinion Questionnaire, about overall quality of instruction, was 4.02 on a scale of 1 to 5. In Fall, 1981, the College-wide mean on the new questionnaire dropped to 3.72. This significant decrease probably reflects more a change in the categories of response than the quality of teaching. Last year the categories were excellent (5), above average (4), average (3), below average (2), and poor (1); this year they are outstanding (5), well above average (4), competent (3), only fair (2), and ranks below (1). It certainly sounds better to be well above average than to be merely above average and to be competent rather than average.
The period for faculty to distribute student opinion questionnaires to their classes this semester will be from March 29 to April 16.

At 1:00 PM on Tuesday, January 19 I made the decision to be born again. In a talk sponsored by Alpha Phi Omega, Joyce Cook, program coordinator for the Living Bank, explained how people can donate any part of their bodies for transplantation or medical study after their deaths. For further information, please contact a member of Alpha Phi Omega or me.

After quoting a passage from I Corinthians in the previous issue, with "time" substituted for "charity", I was told by a faculty member that "love", not "charity", was the original word. The King James version uses "charity", while the New American Standard Bible believes in "love".

At the February faculty meeting a question was asked about a change in the Faculty and Administrative Manual on the normal length of service of Department Chairman. The old version stated that a Chairman was appointed for a maximum term of five years and was normally eligible for re-appointment to one further term. The new version states that a Chairman, though evaluated every five years, is appointed for an indefinite period of time. In August, 1981, President Collins approved this change, which was one of the recommendations made by an Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation. The members of the Committee, which submitted the report in May, 1980, were Paul Allen, Jim Anderson, Jack Bevan, Gerald Gibson (Chair), George Hopkins, and Jill McGovern.

A majority of members in any department may submit, at any time, a petition to the Vice President for Academic Affairs requesting a performance review of its Chairman and stating why such a review is warranted. The Vice President for Academic Affairs would then forward the opinion, along with his comments, to the President for his consideration and decision.

An ad hoc committee has been formed by Hugh Haysworth to recommend eligibility criteria for and benefits of Distinguished Professorships at the College. Its members are Paul Hamill, Anna Katona, Carl Likes, and Sue Przak.

At a luncheon meeting on January 26, Paul Hamill and Hugh Haysworth met with about fifteen junior and senior faculty. The purpose was to propose starting, on a pilot basis, a pairing of new faculty with tenured faculty for information, orientation, discussion, non-threatening mutual evaluations of teaching, and similar sharing of experiences. The partnerships might be casual or fairly structured projects, depending on what the individuals have decided. Up to $50 per pair of partners is available for projects or readings they may choose together. The goals are to improve the "welcome" to full participation and give senior faculty the benefit of newcomers' perspectives. Five pairs that have started are: Linda Greene & Fred Etetline, John Kavanaugh & Brian Wessellink, Bob Mignone & Nick Horton, Nancy Shell & Sandy Powers, and Jan Tomlinson & Andree Parrott.

Others who may be interested should contact Paul Hamill. The arrangements are informal and may be ended by the persons involved at any time. If the partnerships seem to fill a need at the College, this program will be encouraged more generally in the following academic year.

Casino Night has been changed from March 17 to April 14. Faculty are needed to work at the gaming tables. Please contact me if you are willing to help. All proceeds will be used for student scholarships.

A College of Charleston Financial Aid Newsletter was recently distributed to High School Guidance Counselors in the area, publicizing Financial Aid Awareness Week. It contains information for students who wish to apply for scholarships, loans, work-study programs, and other grants at the College.

For those who have been uncertain about writing a letter to Newspeak for the past two years and haven't yet gotten around to it, there are only two more issues left.

Just prior to the big game, Ted Welant's response to the question "Who do you want to win the Super Bowl?" was printed in the ON THE SPOT feature of the News and Courier. Ted said: "I never watch football anyway. In fact, I thought the football season was over at Thanksgiving. I just hope the best team wins!"

The Frank van Aalst award was given this month to Sue Sommer, who was to speak on "Women, Money, and Work" to the Brown Bag Luncheon Series. When Sue was unable to show up for her scheduled talk because of a previous engagement, the address was delivered by Donna Richter, a woman who must work for her money.
EDITORIALS

Ignorance is not Bliss

If ignorance were bliss, there would certainly be more happiness in the world. Those of us who have chosen teaching as a career must combat ignorance daily. Even the pacifists among us relish the opportunity to declare war on ignorance. The pacificist paradox of this war is that destruction creates. The only way to destroy ignorance is to impart knowledge. We can keep people ignorant but we cannot make people ignorant. We try not only to teach, but to teach the importance of what we teach. Should our students find useless what we disseminate, it is still better that they learn useless things than that they learn nothing. What we dread most are students who take pride in their ignorance. Such instances of gross ignorance, 144 times worse than ordinary ignorance, are usually reserved for students who do not belong in an academic institution and who soon will not be.

While we in academe are normally the staunchest defenders of the faith, we too occasionally are guilty of the sin of gross ignorance. At the December faculty meeting, Bill Golightly proposed a change in our voting procedure that was intended to reduce the number of ballots normally required, but was quantitatively more difficult to compute -- though not beyond the scope of the average Math 101 student. A significant number of faculty, perhaps even a majority, did not understand the proposal. More appalling was that many faculty members thought the proposal to be an attempt at humor rather than something to be considered, discussed, and voted upon. When we joke about such a proposal being too intricate to comprehend, what kind of statement are we making to our students about the value of a liberal arts education? Fortunately, we would fail to see any humor in a faculty member who boasted about lacking the reading skills of the average English 101 student or lacking the ability to write a complete sentence. We are a society that lives in awe of and defers to those with quantitative skills more than it should, perhaps so that it may also more easily condone the total absence of such skills.

The Golightly proposal has just achieved academic immortality. Pamela Tisdale, of the Education Department, submitted it and had it accepted by the Journal of Irreproducible Results as an example of academic humor. So at least the collective sense of humor of the College of Charleston faculty on this matter is somewhat of a national phenomenon. The proposal, rewritten by an ad hoc committee to make it more palatable, was adopted without discussion at the January faculty meeting. There are still faculty members who do not understand the worded proposal, but they at least had the decency to be too embarrassed by their ignorance to joke about it on the floor of the faculty.

Many people make light of their deficiencies because it is easier to laugh about them than to correct them. I think I have the mechanical ability of an average ten-year-old. Instead of striving to reach my mechanical potential, which is probably that of an average twelve-year-old, I act as if I am below average eight-year-old. I know that the joke is really on me when I deposit my automobile with a mechanic and say that my car is sick and I would like it to be made well. We tend to know more and learn more about what we like than what we dislike, which usually means that ideological opponents of an issue are not as well informed as ideological supporters. Those who are philosophically opposed to huge expenditures for military weapons rarely know as much about the weapons as those who use them; those who would like to prevent free circulation of books are not likely to be as well read as those who circulate them. To surround ourselves with people, information, and objects we like can be enjoyable but can also give a narrow, one-sided perspective.

Some faculty expressed surprise in the last issue that a self-proclaimed agnostic would quote from the Bible in an editorial. I don’t understand why many intellectuals who would think it inexcusable not to be familiar with the writings of Homer, Milton, Plato, or Shakespeare nevertheless think nothing of displaying their ignorance of the Bible, perhaps the most important and influential literary work ever composed. One need not believe in God to appreciate the Bible any more than one need be a Communist to admire the writings of Marx or a Nazi to be aware of the impact of Mein Kampf on civilization.

I am not, as Dick Crosby intimated in his letter last month, afraid of Christians. I used to be, though, not because my life was “filled with various kinds of evil” but because my childhood was filled with stories of the many atrocities perpetrated by Christians against Jews and other Christians. I must confess that on my initial reading I misinterpreted the first phrase in Dick’s last sentence: “Christianity seems to thrive on persecution”. What Dick meant was that Christianity thrived when it was persecuted rather than when it was the persecutor, as it had been all too often. In any case, after dealing with Christians of all sorts throughout my adult life, I now have a more balanced view. Some of my best friends, as well as my worst enemies, are Christians. I do fear superstition, prejudice, and fear itself — all companions to ignorance and suppression.
There are numerous biblical myths that seem to perpetuate the notion that ignorance is bliss. The first, and most famous, is the story of the Fall. Eve and Adam, living in Paradise, are forbidden to eat the fruit of the Garden of Eden. As heretical as it may sound, I would rather live with sin and knowledge than with the blissful ignorance that was Eden. Eden was Paradise because it contained the tree of knowledge. When Adam and Eve left the Garden, they took with them the tree for all to taste. Some of its fruits may be difficult to reach and some may be bitter, but we must continue to sample food for the mind as well as food for the body or we shall surely die an intellectual as well as a physiological death.

The Tower of Babel story is another biblical myth that purports to show the bliss of ignorance. Inhabitants of Babel attempt to build a tower high enough so that they may see God and partake of his knowledge. An angry and jealous God interrupts the construction of this heaven-reaching tower by the confusion of tongues, and then scatters the insouciant people of Babel throughout the world. Though momentary pleasure may have been lost, we have ultimately been enriched through a concomitant heterogeneous society with a diversity of cultures, customs, and languages.

I could go on, but enough sermonising. I think I would have enjoyed becoming a preacher if only I could have found a God to believe in or a religion to follow. I recognize that we are not gods and we can never overcome ignorance. We should not be proud of our ignorance, but should treat it with respect and humility. Ignorance is the absence of knowledge. With knowledge comes wisdom and wisdom comes the awareness of ignorance. Care must be taken to replace ignorance only with truth. For it is better not to know than to know what is not so.

**Publishing: Two Kinds**

A publication is a publication is a publication. Though all publications may be equal, some are more equal than others. The dichotomy that first comes to mind when distinguishing between two types of publications is good vs. bad. While I certainly have produced the latter, and hope I have achieved a few of the former, my purpose here is to share with you some thoughts on the similarities and differences I have found from publishing research and publishing a newsletter.

Motivated in part by a love of mathematics, a desire for respect from professionals in my field and colleagues at my institution, and a wish to do my job well and advance professionally, I have made publishable research a high priority in my academic career. Since assuming the Speakership, communication on campus has become a high priority for me than research because of a change in my role and responsibilities at the College. In the sequel, I speak of research I will mean research in mathematics, not because it is the highest form but because it is the kind with which I am most familiar. Of course, what I say about mathematical research will usually apply to research in most of the other academic disciplines.

One of the rewards of publishing Newspeak is the almost immediate feedback I receive from colleagues. I enjoy hearing from and discussing with other faculty some of the issues that were raised. After a research article is written, it generally takes almost two years to pass through the stages of being submitted to a journal, refereed, accepted, and finally published. By that time, none of the results are frequently outdated and the initial excitement of discovery and achievement has subsided. There is still a sense of accomplishment that other professionals deemed it worthy of publication. While the short-term effect of Newspeak may be greater, there are usually more long-term consequences from a research publication. I feel proud when someone asks me for a reprint or cites one of my theorems in a paper that I had published several years prior. I expect that people will not long remember what I have written for Newspeak, yet I like to at least fantasize that what I write I write for posterity.

I know there are approximately 350 Newspeak readers which, unfortunately, is probably more than have read many of my research articles. After writing numerous esoteric papers that only specialists in a narrow area can comprehend, it is a relief to publish regularly something that can be understood by everyone. Academic disciplines cover a wide spectrum, from those in which conclusions can be demonstrably verified to those in which conclusions are not even required. Mathematical publications satisfy my objective side and Newspeak my argumentative side. While the quality of a mathematical paper is subject to opinion, there is essentially no disagreement about the correctness of its conclusions. Newspeak, on the other hand, is essentially all about range of opinions, founded or unfounded, on a variety of topics.

Mathematics is probably the field in which one is most likely to spend months working hard on a document with absolutely nothing to show for it. No matter how many years, no matter how much energy or ingenuity is devoted to something that is in fact false, one must come up empty. Experiments in the objective sciences produce data that always bear witness to the fruits, however sour they may be, of the labor invested. In the humanities, one may always interpret documents to formulate opinions on which to base some thesis. It is both comforting and disquieting to know that each month I will produce an issue of Newspeak. I don't have to decide when I have enough to publish; I publish when the deadline arrives. I don't have to decide if it is good enough to publish; I am committed to publishing monthly.
I am not surprised that my research productivity has sharply declined since assuming the Speakership. I am surprised that I haven’t missed research as much as I thought I would. It seems that Newspeak has been a reasonable substitute for me. Perhaps I seek merely to channel my energies into any worthwhile project that eventually leads to seeing my name in print. Were it not for egoists, there would be precious little to read. Still, the rewards in the real world of academe are far greater for externally produced research than for an internally produced newsletter. When I have told colleagues at other institutions about my role in publishing the faculty newsletter, the usual response was an offer of condolences because of its negative effect on my research career. I am looking forward to devoting more time to research upon completion of my term as Speaker.

Often when I’m in a library, even the small Small Library, I think of all that is there that I am ignorant of. I recognize further that I am too ignorant to even realize all that I am ignorant of. Sometimes I feel as if I could be satisfied spending most of my time just reading, reading for pleasure and for knowledge. I know, however, that I would become restless, would want to add to the body of knowledge in existence. If I could live forever, I would certainly spend many thousands of centuries reading. I hope I would also continue to write even if nobody were around to read what I wrote, even if there were neither pressures nor rewards for publishing.

For many adults, lacking in ambition and smothered by drudgery, material and physical comforts are all that is desired. They seem content to live through their diversions as spectators, gravitating only toward soap operas, cinemas, sporting events, and the like. It is up to the small percentage of creative people in the world, which includes those of us in academe, who want to contribute to as well as consume that which is fresh, innovative, unusual, original, or eternal. It is our responsibility and our duty to work toward fulfilling our creative potential, whether it be through the bright burning fires of a major research undertaking or through a tiny spark like Newspeak.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Harb:

As you suggested, let me respond to certain of your colleagues’ concerns.

My invitation to all South Carolina college faculties for a Sea Pines "get-away weekend" apparently troubled some, and I apologize to any who were offended.

In retrospect, I can understand (1) how indication of my State College Board membership could be construed other than, as I meant it, to note my awareness that resort vacations are beyond the financial means of many educators, and (2) how the $100 package may have seemed steep. However regrettable, the invitation was to enjoy a premier resort with other educators for a 50% discount. Our Company cannot "break even" on this rate; mailing costs alone would not have merited the program.

But aware of college instructors’ finances (having myself spent six years in graduate school and having been an instructor at three colleges), I wanted to make a resort weekend somewhat more affordable to educators. I had no intent of showing any favoritism, in my Board role, to those who attended.

I would be pleased to speak with any of your colleagues on this matter so that my trusteeship might be exercised with additional insight into faculty perspectives.

Sincerely,

Editor’s Note: Philip Lader, President of Sea Pines Company at Hilton Head Island, became a member of the State College Board of Trustees on July 1.
Dear Herb,

Last November, I was flattered that you took the time to write an editorial whose subject was yours truly. While the "facts" you gave regarding my research credentials were not entirely accurate, they were representative and as such served their purpose. Several weeks later you indicated that in discussing reactions to the editorial with our colleagues, some member(s) of the faculty had expressed a concern that I might be "soft on research." Consequently, I thought I would share some thoughts with you on this subject. While my comments may neither alleviate nor substantiate the concern which was expressed, I hope they will stimulate more open discussion both within departments and on a campus-wide basis.

The development of an academician is a highly personalized phenomena, but one which may be creatively influenced by the direction provided by the individual's department and academic institution. In academia, there is a traditional standing of respect for the individual's teaching and research productivity. On the other hand, many four-year colleges recognize teaching effectiveness as the primary criterion for advancement, with virtually no attention given to the research produced by the faculty member. While these are extreme cases, unfortunately they are also common. The College falls somewhere in between.

Since faculty respond to the environment they work in, the development of the faculty at the two types of institutions is quite different. Because of the limited size of most undergraduate institutions, faculty members at these institutions typically have no colleagues with the same specialty and research facilities are limited. The College of Charleston is certainly not an exception. Both the immediate reward and the long-term effect of research efforts should be clear and substantial. At the same time we should note that while the most easily recognized form of development is the publication of research, it may not be the most effective for all individuals. Since the environment for carrying out traditional research is less than ideal, many faculty are either unable or unwilling to publish. It is important that our faculty continue to develop both in their discipline and pedagogically in order to be the most effective teachers and representatives of the institution possible. Those who do not will eventually stagnate, becoming a liability to our institution and to the academic community. This will be particularly true in the 1980's. The curriculum continues to change, the size of the student age population will drop, the economy is weakening, and the support of higher education at both the national and state level is deteriorating. The result will be less faculty mobility.
In order to encourage professional development, the purpose of professional development should be established by the department or institution. Once this is done, a broader definition than simply doing and publishing original research may be established. I suggest the following primary objectives for professional development:

I. To increase the instructor's teaching effectiveness.

II. To increase the stature of the individual and the institution in the academic community.

III. To increase the instructor's ability serve the institution and academic community outside the classroom.

Publication of original research addresses each of these objectives, but obviously is not the only way to accomplish any one of the objectives. Faculty development may reasonably be described as any activity which contributes to one or more of the above objectives.

Two years ago, the mathematics faculty developed a list of types of activities which contribute to faculty development. Listed below are those items the department felt contributed to professional development.

1) Original research in pure and applied areas.
2) Original research in mathematics pedagogy.
3) Papers given at professional meetings.
4) Refereeing and reviewing papers.
5) Publications (texts and papers) that directly or indirectly affect teaching.
6) Learning areas of mathematics outside of one's specialty.
7) Learning areas related to mathematics.
8) Giving departmental seminars.
9) Holding office in a professional society.

Recognizing and rewarding growth in each of these areas is a more positive approach than simply setting publication guidelines. Our faculty is made up of individuals with different strengths and it is inappropriate that they all be molded in the same image. At the same time, distinguished recognition of the individual and of the institution by the academic community cannot occur without publications and presentations.

This week I will ask the departmental chairpersons to begin working with their colleagues on guidelines for applying the criteria for tenure and promotion as stated in the Faculty and Administration Manual (p. 46). These departmental deliberations will need to be frank, open and honest discussions in which each member's views are heard and respected. The resulting guidelines will help shape the future of each department and ultimately of the College. Becoming an excellent four-year institution in which scholarship, service, and effective teaching are all viewed as vital and respected components of the life of our faculty requires delicate handling by both the faculty and administration. We have come a long way from our image in the early seventies of a parochial school in which scholarship was actually discouraged. As unappealing as that image is, I find the image of a predominately four-year institution with a faculty rewards system modeled after a "publish-or-perish" university equally distressing. Hopefully, we will be wise enough to avoid both of these positions in sharing our future.

Before I close I must comment on your suggestion in the last paragraph of your January editorial on evaluation of faculty. You recommended that departments hire faculty to shore up specific weaknesses, as opposed to building on their strengths and termed this your most radical suggestion. I don't find the suggestion radical and I suspect you don't either. Six years ago the mathematics department recruited a bearded Philadelphian who preferred sandals to shoes and T-shirts to ties. While each of these characteristics was under represented in the department, the candidate's real attraction was his strong research record and sufficient maturity to work in relative isolation. As such he could serve as a role model and spokesman for research, giving needed balance to a department strong in teaching and service. You haven't disappointed us.

Sincerely,

W. Hugh Hayworth
Dear Herb,

Several members of the Faculty have asked me why I accepted the nomination as Speaker of the Faculty, and I am grateful to you for this opportunity to respond publicly to them and, at the same time, to express my gratitude to the Committee on Nominations and to the Faculty for nominating me.

I accepted the nomination because I think it is the duty of a teacher at the College of Charleston to serve the institution in any way he or she can. In particular, I think that individuals who have been promoted to the highest academic rank should not retreat from positions of responsibility. To thrive, the College needs fresh, new teachers with new ideas and older, experienced teachers with new and old ideas. I would like for the generation gap at the College to be bridged. It has been divisive, demoralizing, and delusive.

I was created by an administrator who cleverly hid poverty by drawing to his side those who viewed themselves as powerless. I hope that in the future new faculty members will see that they have more security as members of a community of teachers and scholars than they have as personal favorites of an administrator.

And that brings me to the second reason I accepted the nomination: to try to bring about a Faculty Renaissance on campus. It is time for us to remember that we ARE The College of Charleston. Deans, directors, vice presidents of all sorts and conditions come and go, but the Faculty, the only stable element in any college, remains. The responsibility for deciding where the College goes lies with the Faculty. We have forfeited our sovereignty for too long. The Womble, Stern, Bevan eras are behind us. For the next fifty years, at least, let’s have the Faculty era.

The third reason I would like to be Speaker is to try, with your help, to put an end to the Reign of the Tacky and the Gimmicky. When I came to the College in 1967 it was a tasteful, academically sound, though poor, institution. Fortunately our poverty ended when we began to receive state funds, but, unfortunately, state funds brought not just security but work-shops and counseling centers, mini-grants and skills clusters. Support services are valuable only so long as they support the academic program. When they begin to use funds that should go into classroom instruction or when they practice something that is antithetical to what the College stands for, they should be abolished.

The fourth reason I want to be Speaker is that I want the members of the Faculty, beleaguered by financial and political troubles, to pull together to protect those who are competent and to protect the integrity of our profession. Let us not shake in our boots every time a politician or administrator says the next years will be austere. I have heard that song ever since I started teaching. As long as we do what we are supposed to, there is no reason for any of us to be paranoid. We should all fight to the finish to help any competent member of the Faculty of any rank and to make sure that we do not sacrifice our standards and ideals because we are afraid.

I am aware that the Speaker of the Faculty has no power, but I am also aware that the Faculty as a corporate body has tremendous power. Since the only calls I have received about my candidacy have been addressed to the future of Newspeak or to the colorlessness of my wardrobe, I realize that the polemical quality of this letter is not necessary and the presumptuousness of my addressing the Faculty about these matters may not be appreciated. But truth to tell, I haven’t decided yet whether I’ll stock up or green T-Shirts or continue Newspeak. I do appreciate the many kind offers of support. I will need the help of everyone on the Faculty.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ian Morrison

Editor’s Note: Ian will be available to answer any questions of the faculty on Tuesday, March 2 from 12:05 PM to 1:00 PM in Maybank Hall, Room 100.
Dear Herb,

I recently received the following letter and hope you will print it in Newsteam along with my response:

Dear Dr. Dempsey:

Last year you denied one of our students permission to take a course at Trident Tech for credit at the College of Charleston. He did not protest your action because he did not know you had no right to take it. But having heard his case, I am sure your denial of his request was indefensible - that in turning it down, you were dishonoring President Collins' signature which is on the Consortium agreement entered into by him and the heads of other Charleston area institutions of higher education.

Your major function should be to assist students in their efforts at attainment of legitimate educational goals, not to find ways of imposing your personal prejudices and preferences on them. You, evidently, have taken the attitude that your role is somehow adversarial to students (and also, apparently, to Board policy). Your obstructionist relationship to students and your unauthorized negation of the Consortium agreement signed by Dr. Collins in accord with Board direction appear to me and to some of our colleagues to go beyond abuse of discretion and authority to outright insubordination.

I hope that you will rethink your relationship to students and that from now on, when asked, you will help them in their achievement of respectable goals of their choice and forego all belittling or frustration thereof.

In the maintenance of peace on the campus, I choose to be, simply,

A Faculty Member

The first point I wish to make in response is that I am delighted to receive a letter which accuses me of an "adversarial" relationship to students in which I am an "obstructionist" to their educational aims. After hearing so many complaints about my pandering to students, my advocacy of students' causes, and my penchant for putting students' needs above academic standards, it is nice to see some balance in the picture.

My second point is perhaps more substantive. I do not recall the incident in question, but it is the policy of the College to approve course work at other institutions (including consortium institutions) only when that course work parallels our own and is offered at a level of quality similar to our own. For all I know, this student may have wanted a course in typing or business machines maintenance. In cases where the course does parallel our offerings, I normally require the permission of the department chairperson before I approve the course. To the best of my knowledge, most departments have established policies regarding which Trident Tech courses they will or will not accept, and I almost inevitably defer to their judgments in these matters.

My third point is that I am ashamed of myself. I am ashamed of myself because I have wasted almost ten minutes of my time replying to a letter from a person who lacks either the courtesy or the courage to sign his or her correspondence. I shouldn't be bothered by such trivia.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John B. Dempsey
Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Dear Herb:

As a non-Christian and a member of an often beleaguered religious minority, I hesitate to encroach myself in a matter of such delicacy, but as an historian of religion and a member of an academic community, I feel compelled to respond to a series of ideas recently tossed into the academic arena by Mr. Crosby. Thus, while I am wearing two hats in making this response, I hope that my scholar's cap will be seen resting above my yarmulke. I hope, also, that the response will be taken in the spirit in which it is intended, that of a colleague seeking to continue a discourse on an important matter.

Admittedly, none of us are Constitutional lawyers, and so I'd like to offer my own, differing interpretation of the recent Supreme Court decision requiring state supported schools to make their facilities available for "purely religious services." The case with which the Court was concerned involved the question of use of institutional facilities by a religious group, and not by an office of the school for one of its state funded activities. Permitting the use of space by an independent, though campus-based, group is in no way an endorsement of the group's views; using space, staff, and other funds for an officially sanctioned promotion of religious beliefs, -- requiring a sacrifice of one's personal faith in the passing power structure that has forcibly gained dominance. If we are concerned with the spiritual growth of our youth, then we have a responsibility to expose them to the full range of human thought and experience, including all that is good and bad. I'm reminded of the critique given to the Great Books Program -- that it didn't include the great bad books as well. Not to expose our students to all that humanity is capable of devising is to do them a grave disservice and to stunt the very spirits they have entrusted to our care.

I am very concerned about what I hope I am not detecting in Dick's letter. There seems to be a rather purposeful use of the word "radical." Do I smell a red herring when the term "radical" is used to characterize the idea that religious activity "be restricted to a debate format where all viewpoints have to be represented," or when he disagrees with the idea that future Spiritual Enrichment Days be precluded because of what is to him an innocent oversight (but to me a serious breach of the established notion of truth formulated to prevail in a passing power structure that had forcibly gained dominance). If we are concerned with the spiritual growth of our youth, then we have a responsibility to expose them to the full range of human thought and experience, including all that is good and bad. I'm reminded of the critique given to the Great Books Program -- that it didn't include the great bad books as well. Not to expose our students to all that humanity is capable of devising is to do them a grave disservice and to stunt the very spirits they have entrusted to our care.

Further, is the United States, in fact, a Christian country (not that an affirmative answer should change the above?). This notion is one of those apple-pie phrases that gets tossed around when the mood suits, and all too often when it is decided that internal dissent or alien forces are at play, seeking to destroy the social contract and political order -- forces that in other eras could easily have been called Satanic. I often wonder if humanity is going backwards. If we consider this question for a moment, on what basis can we legitimately call the United States a Christian country? Constitutionally, it's not a theocracy, but a democracy -- of sorts. The designers of the Declaration and the Constitution, while coming out of the Western tradition (itself too narrowly defined as Christian, or equally as misleading, and far more insidious, Judeo-Christian), were neither Deists or Atheists, and certainly not Theists. But if some would make the case for Christian authorship of these documents, then it must be asked if slavery is a Christian teaching. I would think not, at least not according to my reading of the life and teachings of Jesus.

Nor can we call the United States Christian if we define a nation by its primary inhabitants. There is little dispute as to who these various peoples were. Certainly, they were not Christians, so that if we want to say that the United States is Christian based upon this criteria, then primary must be redefined or something attributable to those who flex and successfully attend such activities as the greatest amount of muscle. This would make of the United States a conquering nation rather than a Christian one, unless conquest is also a true Christian teaching, which I again do not believe to be the case.
There is one final point I would like to raise regarding this question of the United States as a Christian country. Which Christianity are we talking about? There are dozens of varieties, if not hundreds, and in a sense, each has his or her own notion of the religious life -- or should, religion being both a public and a private matter. (The theologian who said that religion was "what one does with his solemnities" was largely, though not totally, correct.) Given this wide variety of Christianities, it would be necessary to select one variation as an established church so that the statement, "the United States is a Christian country," would have some definite meaning. Would other variations then be assigned roles as lesser truths? If this route is not taken, then I think the statement, watered down and diffuse, loses all significant meaning. But if it is taken, would the majority of Christians in the United States accept this move?

Dick is concerned with the ill-will Christians seem to receive at the hands of those who look upon them as "invading legions of marauders." He admits that "abuses perpetrated in the name of Christ" by many who have called themselves Christians have occurred throughout history. We cannot lay extraordinary guilt at the feet of Christendom, for all peoples and religious groups have been responsible for some outrage or another. George Bernard Shaw's thought that Christianity was a good idea, too bad no one had ever tried it, can be made about most good ideas. But if there is a fear of "modern day Christians," as Dick proposes, it is not a fear of Christianity but of some of its practitioners, a fear of many of they might become the victims of the self-appointed and self-righteous, of those who often follow their own reasoning to the point of book-banning and book-burning (yes, it happened in the United States in 1981), of political smearing, of using racial and ethnic slurs to condemn and disenfranchise, and on and on. It has happened before. Not that it necessarily follows, but history has demonstrated how this kind of thinking (all too often characterized by innocent enough motives that look like Dick's "Christians in the truest sense of the word") can lead to Inquisitions. The group that believes it holds the keys to the kingdom usually opens the doors of Hell.

Is this what I read when before me sits the following: "Why so many are so afraid of modern day Christians used to puzzle me. But now I believe it is because those whose lives are filled with various kinds of evil are very uncomfortable when there are Christians about." Since there are so many who call themselves Christians but are not, and since Dick has a notion of what a true Christian is, and since there are many who call themselves Christians but are uncomfortable with what I think he means by "modern day Christians," are they filled with evil? While some would seek to judge the hearts of others, such omniscience is too godlike for most of us mortals to handle.

Yet, beyond all of these points, there is what I believe to be a more important, because more dangerous, thought expressed in Dick's letter. Historically, and contrary to Dick's belief, Christianity has not thrived on persecution -- little does, aside from abjection, anxiety, and paranoia. While easy times make for laxity, hard times destroy body and soul. Numbers dwindle, bonds break, communities collapse, hearts harden, ideas die or change for the worse, faith dissolves or becomes inscrutable. Christendom, the physical expression of the body of believers, thrived best in an era of political, military, and social strength. Its best times contained some of its worst excesses, as it fed upon exploited subject peoples -- as all groups end up doing when they attempt to extend their ideas and influence, whether religious or secular, beyond the boundary of their own community of believers. Separated now from the temptations of state, we may see a new flowering of Christianity. Weighed down, forced to wage war nor subjected to massive persecution, a more experienced and mature theology has begun to appear in the last few decades, what is most frightening to these thinkers and to others outside the kingdom of "true believers" is the sense of martyrdom felt by this latter group. May all that is sacred save us from the zealots, whoever they may be.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ralph Helmick

To my fellow colleagues:

On 19 January, 1982 the President of the United States held a news conference that was carried live by the major TV networks. As an educator and an educated individual, I like to keep up with current information and to make the opportunity to observe elected officials (particularly the President) as they respond to questioning.

Finding that the only television set available (at least the only one I was able to learn about) was the one in the Stern Center, I arrived a bit before two o'clock for fear that I might find the room crowded with students anxious to watch the press conference. There were a reasonable number of students there, but it certainly was not crowded. I was able to find a seat, once I entered the dimly lit room. As two o'clock neared, the room did not become more crowded, rather than the ABC soap opera ended many of those students there left.
I regret to say I observed that only one student actually watched the press conference. Several watched for a few minutes than commenced to chat with neighbors, some came and went, and most carried on as if they were oblivious to what was on the television. The noise level in the room increased so much during the thirty-five or so minutes that Mr. Reagan spoke that I (seated only two tables from the TV) could not hear much of what was said during the last twenty minutes.

Somehow and here. Perhaps there were no other faculty there because they were well aware of what to expect at the Stern Center, but it was not easy to suspect that they exhibited a great deal of interest in the political science department not require or at least officially encourage its students to monitor such events?

The most distressing aspect to this whole scenario is that the soap operas beforehand the press conference elicited more attention and quieter conditions than did the President’s remarks. It is not that I’m distressed that students watch soap operas, as I confess that I have been known to watch from time to time myself, but that they exhibit so little interest in what their President has to say, how he says it, and how he handles himself.

I have two recommendations. (1) A television set should be made available in the faculty lounge or at some other suitable location for the use of those faculty that would like to observe such things as press conferences, news events, NASA launches, etc. (2) The faculty at the college should encourage their students to take an interest in such events. Certainly if some students are required to attend Spiritual Enrichment Day, many more should have been required to monitor the President’s press conference.

Sincerely,

James L. Carew

LET’S SELL THE COLLEGE!

Fortunately we are not yet in a Department of Energy situation. Few have proposed closing the College and selling the property. We still have a program that is supported and we are still supposed to be operating; doing whatever it is we are supposed to do in a college. Our problem is that we do not feel supported well enough to do whatever it is we do. Perhaps with the new mission statement we will have greater unanimity of purpose. Certainly, with a new mission statement we will be able to discern those functions which are ancillary to the central mission of the College and rid the College of, at least those unwarranted expenses. It just occurs to me (and I have heard this sentiment expressed often) that we are spending an awesome amount of time and energy talking retention without an equal amount of zeal for selling. I am in favor of selling the College.

One of the strange paradoxes in advertising is that those things which are of the least benefit to humans are often advertised the most. A norm that is that professionals who benefit humans the most are often viewed askance by the public because others take the time and trouble to project a helpful and concerned image and they do not. Does this College and faculty seem to fit these paradoxes somehow? I happen to believe that we have a lot to offer, but precious little of our concern and effort has been devoted to “selling” our case. I also believe that because of the search of “selling,” we have a long way to go before we sell our souls for selling. It is time for us all to be concerned with our image and it is time for us to do a little advertising.

We have to be a little careful how we go about it. The idealists and purists among us will argue that there is no need. “Why, any fool can see that a college education from a liberal arts school is a good thing! Why, it makes students aware. Just look in their faces! It just happens.” The liberals in our midst will get some heat when they propose the issuance of Green Stamps with letter grades or advocate naming the new wing of the Science Center for the legislator most responsible for its fruition. Most assuredly, there would be differences of opinion about what should be “sold” or advertised and about the techniques employed in that task. Should the selling of the College be left up to the appointed person or arm of the College? The scholarship auction was a success and another like it is being proposed. Maybe we should have bake sales for the operating fund? Perhaps departments should have to justify budget shares based upon measurable efforts in PR, image, advertising, etc. (that great unknown category known as community service). When one of our athletic teams is a national champ, that will be worth some advertising! Surely, hundreds of real and hypothetical examples of opportunities for selling, advertising, and protecting the College must come into mind. Of course, the clincher again is that we want the College and ourselves sold in a certain way.
We want to accentuate the positive and deemphasize the negative in a way consistent with our "academic," "liberal arts," "collegiate," or "educational" views. That's the trick in the kind of selling that I am talking about. I think it can be done a lot better than it has been done. And, I think that this faculty ought to get busy doing it.

Probably the first thing we should do is find out if we have a good product to sell. The product doesn't have to be good to sell; I would just feel better about the College, my career and myself if it were. Is a degree from this College worth anything? Do our students learn anything while they are here? How does our product compare with State College #107? Hopefully, we would find out something good about our product. A good salesman also knows his process. What's particularly good about our process? Really? Can you substantiate or document that? Do students come out of here with more compassion and love for their fellow man than when they entered? Are they healthier because of their experiences at this College? Is it true that our graduates are being snapped up by the professional schools because of some uniqueness in our programs? An as a good salesman would want to show that his product is a "good buy." What evidence do we have that what we offer is a good deal? Maybe a South Carolina resident can't get a better educational return for his dollar than at the College of Charleston. Assuming a college professor has a good product and process at a competitive price, can he sell it? I think we have a very poor track record. It is time for us to accumulate information on the above and to think about becoming salespersons. Why do we persist in thinking that legislatures will continue to support us because we are "a good thing." Why will students continue to enter our doors to face requirements and subject matter offered by unenthusiastic professors at a high price with little assurance of future benefit?

Everyone connected with this college can contribute to the selling of the College. Certainly, the administration and specific arms of the College are charged with that responsibility. I just want us to remember that offensive and defensive maneuvers can be employed in times of strife. Couldn't the faculty be of any help in identifying aspects of the College which ought to be highlighted? Wouldn't some faculty be willing to help in developing brochures, pamphlets, and other written materials? Maybe someone in BA/Econ is interested in marketing, advertising, selling, or promotions. What about A-V productions? Is there no data to suggest that there are some things for which our constituency gets a real value?

I want to sell the College! Perhaps other faculty share my sentiments. I propose the establishment of a faculty committee to investigate ways of doing that. And, with loc or non loc group could be called as the Committee for Public Relations, Image, and Advertising. The goal would be to formulate data and information, cooperate with existing structures, and make suggestions for doing a better selling job. Anyone interested? If not, we can always retrain. Old bricks bring a better price every day!

NOTE: The above article was prepared for the January issue of Newskze, but was submitted too late to meet the deadline. There were several letters and points included in that issue which seem to lend support to my letter. First of all, Gerald Gibson wrote about "a shared vision so powerful that each of us would work unthinkingly to see that it becomes reality," and about problems and grievances which might be alleviated by "creative ideas for dealing with them, ideas which should not be in short supply in an academic institution." Several of the objectives of the BERC seemed related to promoting PR. "SPEAKASY" made reference to an aggressive offensive by the University of Minnesota faculty. Dean Bevan's letter directly addressed "image building" and went on to say that "we should not be surprised to discover that the most important keys to surviving change are energy, imagination and perspective." Frank van Aalst outlined several proposals worthy of discussion. The little pamphlet recently produced "Is there life after graduation?" seems a start in the right direction.

Finally, though pangs of conscience and idealism gnaw at my soul when "Casino Night" is mentioned, even that idea may have some merit in promoting the mission of the College. And if you attend, unlike poor old Richard in "A Man For All Season," perhaps you will at least have sold your soul for a worthwhile cause, the College of Charleston.
Dear Herb,

We wanted to take this opportunity to make a final report to the faculty on the 1981 Faculty-Staff Fund Drive. As Carmentte Clardy reported in the February faculty meeting, the Fund Drive exceeded its goal of $35,000, with the total contributions of $54,498.94. Although we did not reach the goal of 60% of the eligible faculty and staff contributors, we are pleased that almost 50% did contribute. This represents a significant increase over last year's number of contributors.

We would also like to thank once more those faculty and staff whose generosity and commitment to the College have made additional scholarship funding available to deserving students. We truly appreciate your cooperation in a highly successful Fund Drive.

Sincerely,

Paul Hamill
Suzanne Moore

Dear Herb:

Issues and court cases regarding age discrimination have caused some nationwide alarm.

I share with you a portion of the memorandum from Mr. James Clyburn, Human Affairs Commissioner: "The unique nature of age discrimination results in the enactment of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA). The state of South Carolina, by enactment of the South Carolina Human Affairs Law in 1972, made age a protected class along with race, religion, color, sex, and national origin. In 1979 the Human Affairs Law was amended to parallel the ADEA as it related to individuals protected from age discrimination. Like the ADEA, the Human Affairs Law protects individuals between the ages of 40 and 70 from employment discrimination with respect to hiring, discharge, classification, benefits, employment status as well as their terms, conditions and privileges of employment."

The Human Affairs Commission processed six age complaints in 1979, and forty-three such complaints in 1980. During the current fiscal year, they estimate processing 100 age discrimination complaints.

In view of reorganizational changes in departments due to fiscal restraint, we should be careful of the adverse impact employment decisions may have on persons between the ages of 40 and 70.

Thank you.

Roy E. Jones
Human Relations

Dear Herb:

I am writing to share information with the faculty concerning the current activities of the College’s Task Force on Desegregation and Affirmative Action Faculty Recruitment Committee.

The Implementation Committee of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education has approved the funding for project SPECTRA. The 1982-83 pilot project is primarily a retention model designed to provide a summer program experience for a target population of twenty incoming black freshmen. The students will take summer school courses, participate in study skills and career workshops, receive tutorial assistance, and counseling. The academic status of project students will be monitored throughout the academic year along with appropriate supportive services as needed. The success of the one-year pilot could mean expanding the concept to the entire black freshman class the following year. The project will be funded for approximately $20,000.
A proposed Faculty Exchange Program between The College of Charleston and South Carolina State College has been discussed by the institutions' vice presidents for academic affairs. The general purpose of the exchange is to foster mutual cooperation and communication among students and faculty from the two colleges. The program will allow participating faculty members an opportunity for professional as well as personal recognition and growth. The Faculty Exchange Program is voluntary and will be offered to the entire faculty in each institution. We will attempt to make the faculty exchange possible as early as this summer. Both college presidents endorse the faculty exchange idea.

Approximately 90 to 100 minority students attended a meeting on January 26, to discuss the statewide desegregation plan. A survey was conducted eliciting perception and opinions of students regarding campus services. Their thought-provoking feedback has been extremely valuable to the Task Force. A summary of the survey responses can be made available to interested persons upon request to me.

A campus visitation program is scheduled to accommodate approximately 50 black high school students who have been accepted to the college. Hopefully, the campus visitation will enhance their interest enough to matriculate in the fall.

There are several vacant faculty positions available beginning the next academic year. The departments include: Geology, Education, Fine Arts, Languages, Physical Education and Health, Computer Science, and Mathematics. Referrals or resumes from minority group persons is encouraged. Your assistance in our recruitment of minorities will be appreciated. For a more detailed position description please contact me.

The Task Force is actively engaged in a number of other activities. As plans become confirmed we will inform the campus community.

Sincerely,

Roy J. Jones
Human Relations

TO: Herb Silverman
FROM: Mack Tennyson, Business Ad./Economics Department

I would like to inform the faculty of three research tools at their disposal:

1. County/City Databook Computer Tapes.
   This contains, in computer readable form, the 58 demographic data items reported every five years by the Census Bureau. This data set, which is available for every city in the U.S., includes form of government and commercial data, as well as the more traditional census data.

   The 97 municipal finance data items reported annually by the Census Bureau. This includes details of revenue and expenditures for every city in the U.S.

3. Iker's WORDS program.
   This powerful computer program uses factor analysis to perform content analysis on narratives. This program would provide an innovative approach to anyone interested in doing content analysis of any written communication.

If anyone needs additional details, please call me (ext. 4066)
Dear Herb,

I enjoyed Newspeak's last issue. In fact, it was one of your better efforts. I must take exception, however, to the implications of that section of your Newspeak column which describes the article written about the Florida Tech—College of Charleston basketball game. You and Mr. Waters, of course, are entitled to your respective opinions. Nonetheless, I suspect that the coach of a team which played as poorly as Florida Tech would be foolish not to look for some excuse to rationalize his team's poor performance. He chose academic excellence. (Poor coaching would have been an equally plausible explanation).

In point of fact, the College of Charleston's basketball team has earned its successful record "inspite" (to follow the Florida Tech coach's logic) of the dedication to academics on the part of Coach Rassie and the players. That dedication to academics manifests itself in various ways: supervised study halls; intensive academic advising and counseling; the scheduling of regular season games in such a way as to minimize or eliminate the possibility of missed classes; meetings with the academic advisor, prospective Department Chairpersons, the Dean, and the faculty advisor with recruits before they enroll, etc. The most telling manifestation, however, is in the academic records of the athletes themselves. As you know, I send nearly five hundred "probation" letters to College of Charleston students each semester. While I am sorry about that large number, I am happy to say that none of those letters I sent in December went to members of Coach Rassie's team. Indeed, all players but one have averages above 2.0 (including the freshmen), several have averages over 3.0, and at least one is a member of a College Honor Society.

With reference to the business of games and examinations, it is true that the game in question was played on the last day of our examination period. There were no players, however, who had exams scheduled on that day.

As you can tell, I am a strong supporter of the College's basketball program - and I would like to see more faculty members come to the games and support the team. But I agree with you that academics must come first and that athletics must be integrated into the academic program - not the other way around. We must keep our priorities in order, and keep athletics in its proper place. After all, I'd hate to see the College of Charleston turn into another Notre Dame.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Editor's Note: John is still somewhat bitter about being bypassed in favor of Gerry Faust for the Head Coaching job at his alma mater.

I would like to thank all contributors to this issue of Newspeak. The deadline for submitting letters and pieces of information in the next issue is Monday, March 22.

COMING NEXT MONTH

Bill Bischoff, a native of Charleston and faculty member at the College since 1955, discusses and reminisces about changes he has seen in both the city and the College.