The Provost Search Committee has recommended the five candidates to be invited for interviews. Each will have informal discussions with the faculty for at least four hours while on campus. The candidates, in alphabetical order, are:

Dr. David J. King, Dean, College of Liberal Arts, Oregon State University. Dr. King received his B.A. in Psychology from Boston University in 1951, his M.A. from the University of Maine in 1952, and his Ph.D. from the University of Maryland in 1958.

Dr. Jacqueline Mattfeld, Executive Director, The Governor's Blue Ribbon Commission on Higher Education and the Economy for the State of Connecticut. Dr. Mattfeld received her B.A. in Music from Goucher College in 1948 and her Ph.D. from Yale University in 1959.

Dr. Clifford Stewart, Dean of Academic Affairs and Chief Academic Officer, Adelphi University. Dr. Stewart received his B.S. in Psychology from Penn State in 1953, his M.S. from the University of Denver in 1957, and his Ph.D. in 1960.

Dr. James S. Vinson, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Hartford University. Dr. Vinson received his B.A. in Physics from Gettysburg College in 1963, his M.S. from University of Virginia in 1965, and his Ph.D. in 1967.

Dr. Charles O. Warren, Jr., Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Arts and Sciences, State University of New York at Plattsburg. Dr. Warren received his B.S. in Biology from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in 1961, his M.S. in 1964, and his Ph.D. from University of Florida in 1966.

The State College Board of Trustees did not approve the proposal recommended by the faculty that the Education Center be named in honor of Ms. Septima Clark. Instead, the Trustees voted unanimously to name the building in memory of Thaddeus Street, Jr. Mr. Street, a Charlestonian who served on the Board of Trustees from 1949-1968, the last two years as its President, was a business and civic leader in Charleston until his death in 1970. Street graduated in 1935 from the College, where he was captain of the golf team. He served as President of Carolina Stevedoring Company, Street Brokers, and the Carolina Stevedoring Company.

The Physical Education Building, named after former Chairman of the Board F. Mitchell Johnson, is 45 to 60 days behind schedule. Completion is expected by July 1, but no later than July 15.

The State Budget and Control Board is currently recommending a 5% average pay raise next year for all state employees. Faculty evaluation packets are to be submitted to letters to faculty members by April 15 in departments of ten or fewer and by April 22 in larger departments. Interviews are to be completed and the letters signed by the following week.

What follows are the approved nine-month faculty salary ranges for this year and next year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Level</th>
<th>1981-1982</th>
<th>1982-1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>$11,500-21,500</td>
<td>$12,500-23,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>14,500-28,200</td>
<td>15,500-31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>18,500-31,300</td>
<td>19,500-34,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>22,000-38,300</td>
<td>24,000-42,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student fees have been increased by $40 per semester and dormitory rates by $85 per semester, effective Fall, 1982.

Dr. Jeane Kirkpatrick, United States Ambassador to the United Nations, will be the commencement speaker at the College and will receive an honorary degree. Dr. Theodore Stern, Chairman of the Board for Spoleto and former President of the College, will also receive an honorary degree.
After a meeting to discuss campus security, the administration has added a guard in the Fine Arts Center. A suggestion was made to allow two dormitories to become co-educational this Fall in order to provide additional safety. This recommendation was rejected because it was felt that more time would be needed to bring a well-conceived plan to the Board of Trustees for approval.

State Senator Paul Cantrell introduced a bill requesting that the State College Board of Trustees -- which governs the College of Charleston, Lander, and Francis Marion -- be abolished, and that each institution have its own Board. Joe E. Berry, Jr., Chairman of the Board, asked its members to write letters in opposition.

Faculty may bank credits at the rate of one credit hour for every two independent study students taught. Credits can be used to obtain a reduced load in order to work on a project, subject to departmental needs.

The following sabbatical leaves have been approved.

**Fall Semester 1982**

Mary Boyd - Psychology - To do laboratory research at the Medical University of South Carolina related to psychophysiological measurement and clinical applications of biofeedback.

John Dempsey - Political Science - Visiting Research Fellow in the Faculty of Arts at the University of St. Andrews, Scotland. In addition, he will visit public administrators in several European cities to help prepare a course in comparative public education.

James Hagy - History Department - Research project on "The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World". Out of this study he plans to develop a new course of study "Early Civilizations of the Western Mediterranean." Also hopes to develop a book-length manuscript as a result of this further study.

Eugene Hunt - English - To do extensive study of the history of the Jenkins Orphanage with a view to writing a scholarly paper for presentation to historical societies, etc. Further to organize an exhibit of these materials which will require writing a proposal for funding.

David Hayes - Fine Arts - To devote full time to composing. Hopes to complete his CONCERTO FOR TWO PIANOS AND ORCHESTRA as well as other works.

**Spring Semester 1983**

Robert Cross - English - To supplement materials in the College Skills Lab and to develop a writing text for publication.


Jorge Marban - Spanish - To further explore the Hispanic presence in South Carolina during the early American period, as well as catching up in Spanish American literature. Publications will be forthcoming.

Richard Shainwald - Business Administration - To explore means of developing marketing programs to implement self-sufficient rural communities in Mexico.

James Smiley - Biology - To pursue studies of the reproductive biology of the fish, Himulus maormus. Will travel extensively in the Caribbean for collecting and will do laboratory studies at the Grice Marine Biological Laboratory or at one of several Caribbean marine biology laboratories.

**Full Academic Year 1982-83**

Rachel Doyle - Business Administration - To pursue a year of study at the Law and Economics Center at Emory University.

Herb Silverman - Mathematics - To pursue research in Complex Analysis at the University of Michigan.
COMMITTEESPEAK

The Committee on Nominations has received 123 replies regarding service on standing and ad hoc committees; of these, 20 faculty indicated they did not wish to serve and 14 gave no committee preference. The number of faculty who have indicated either a first, second, or third choice for the following committees are listed below, with the number to be elected listed in parentheses. Research and Development 23 (8); Advisory to the President 19 (9); Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Assistance 17 (7); Student Affairs and Athletics 15 (7); Library 15 (7); Student Affairs and Athletics 15 (7); Welfare 14 (8); Advisory on Tenure 10 (5); Grievance 10 (5); Hearing 8 (5); Honors Program 11 (5); Judicial Board 11 (6). The Committee will make its nominations at the April 12 faculty meeting.

The Committee on Curriculum and Academic Planning has been presented with a revised Global Studies Program and is discussing the proposal with regards to a future recommendation to the faculty.

The Faculty Welfare Committee has been gathering data about fringe benefits at state institutions within South Carolina and plans to make a presentation either at the April or May faculty meeting. The Committee is continuing its deliberations on establishing more specific criteria for promotion and tenure.

The Faculty Research and Development Committee is planning a retreat to evaluate the recent programs for faculty research and development and to formulate recommendations for next year's committee.

The Faculty Library Committee discussed the duties of its Committee and decided that no changes were necessary. The Committee received a detailed summary of the request for library contingency funds, which was being forwarded to the president.

The Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs felt that additions to the student handbook might be the easiest and least expensive way to improve the advising system for reentry students. Since English seemed to be the area that created the most problems, the Committee has suggested that the handbook make a strong statement emphasizing the necessity of English placement exams for reentry and returning students.

The Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Assistance will review the proposals concerning audits and transfer credits that had been remanded to committee at the March meeting.

BUDGETSPEAK

REPORT FROM THE BUDGET REVIEW AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

Since our February report to you, some of the people instructed earlier by President Collins to implement the objectives and suggestions for immediate action proposed at the end of the Fall '81 semester by the BRPC have submitted to the president progress reports. Progress is seldom as rapid as we--any of us--might wish for, but there is evidence that some is being made. Considering the mid-year administrative reorganization, I find it encouraging that by the end of this academic year there promises to be a number of concrete improvements at the College, some of them the correction of specific problems, others improvements in general procedures.

A recent recommendation to the president is that the fees for dormitory use be changed in a stepwise fashion over the next three years, so that at the end of the 1984-85 year, the dormitory operation will be fully self-supporting, including the cost of security, residence life counselors, and utilities. This recommendation, if accepted, would free funds now used in subsidizing dormitory operation for use in meeting the primary, support, and outreach missions of the College.

All academic departments, as most of you are well aware, have been hard at work preparing reports to the BRPC that the committee will use in studying the areas of the College where the primary mission of the college is largely accomplished—or not, depending on the success we enjoy as teacher/scholars. It has been a bit discouraging to learn that something less than enthusiasm. To quote a speaker at a recent A.C.E. leadership seminar, "We have a choice. We may plan, we may drift, or we may react to emergencies." The academic departments in an institution to which most of us faculty members take as central the effectiveness of these departments. I deserve planning. I believe. To avoid planning that includes these "front line units" would be folly indeed. So, my thanks for the cooperation we have received in our earnest attempt to get sound academic resource planning underway in these critical times, with particular thanks to those who participated even though their hearts were not in the effort!
Finally, we are currently in the throes of trying to arrive at a final proposed College budget recommendation for 1982-83. The mechanism for doing this is proving to be difficult and complicated this first time around, but I have confidence that next year this, like many other activities which we have undertaken this year, will be much easier. The blustering of a trial, we think, is sometimes frustrating and back-breaking, but for those who follow it, the going is easier. It is my hope that at the end of this semester, the consensus of the College community will be that we have blazed a good trail.

Gerald Gibson
Chairman, BPC

SPEAKEASY

I heard of a meeting of the Faculty Senate at the University of South Carolina in which two faculty members engaged in a fist fight. But I have never actually seen or experienced frustration, divisive, hostile, and childish faculty meeting than the one we have just completed. I can understand why my objectivity questioned on a controversial issue, which it had been by each side; under such circumstances, I felt it entirely appropriate that someone else preside while the deliberations on the election of a new Speaker continued. I should certainly be held responsible for anything I say at a faculty meeting or at any other public forum. What I can neither understand nor accept is an attack on my integrity from the floor of the faculty with regards to a private conversation, especially when—in my view—both the facts and purpose of the conversation were misrepresented and distorted.

It hurts me to see faculty members I have respected attempt to subvert the democratic process of faculty governance by walking out of a meeting for the express purpose of destroying a quorum and thus preventing a vote from being taken. We should be collectively ashamed that a substantial number of faculty on both sides of the issue have tried to achieve their ends by whatever means possible. Unfortunately, the minority of faculty members on both sides who had tried to be fair and objective throughout the proceedings were too few in number to have made a difference.

I attempt to find some positives in all negatives. The positive I see is an open, involved, energetic faculty willing to speak its mind on significant issues without fear of reprisals. Perhaps the divisive issue that has just been resolved will enable us to channel this energy and drive more constructively. I congratulate Speaker-Elect Malcolm Clark and offer him my support. I wish him success in bringing a divided faculty together so that we may work effectively on our many important mutual concerns.

I think the proposal by Senator Cantrell, that the College have its own Board, is an excellent one. I feel the current role of the State College Board of Trustees, which encompasses the governance of three institutions, prevents it from focusing on the academic, administrative, financial, and political needs of the College. A separate Board might have both the time and resources to address such problems competently. I would urge faculty members to make their feelings known by writing to Harry A. Chapman, Jr., Senate Education Committee, The Senate of South Carolina, Senate Office Building, P.O. Box 142, Columbia, S.C. 29202. For the more ambitious, please see me for a list of all seventeen members on the Senate Education Committee.

I asked for, and received, a final report of the Charleston Higher Education Study Task Force that investigated the possibility of a merger between the College of Charleston and M.I.T. The course finally adopted by the Task Force was to recommend the strengthening of the Charleston Higher Education Consortium. I have donated to the College Archives my copy of the complete report for those who would like to peruse it.

In an article on February 21 by Darlene Hrobak, Post-Courier Reporter, entitled "Premed Philosophy: The Best Man Wins", the president of the College of Charleston premedical honor society is quoted as saying that he probably studies twice the amount of time he's in class. What bothers me, aside from the sexist title of the piece, is that what used to be considered an average amount of studying is now so unusual as to warrant special attention in our local newspaper.

I wanted to publish mean ratings about overall quality of instruction last semester for each department, but the interim Academic Vice President would not make the information public because of objections by some Departmental Chairpersons. Faculty members who would like to know the means for their departments should ask their Chairpersons. The range last semester was from 3.00 to 4.16, with an overall College mean of 3.72.

The Scholastic Aptitude Test scores of students who have applied for Fall admission to the College are considerably higher than those who had applied by this time last year. The three most popular major preferences indicated by the applicants are Business Administration, Biology, and Computer Science.
The College of Charleston was one of the 265 institutions mentioned in the New York Times Selective Guide to Colleges. On a scale from one to five, the College received two and one-half stars for Academics, three for Social Life, and four for Quality of Life. On a scale from one to ten, the College was given one dollar sign—indicating it to be among the least expensive institutions. For those who do not mind stretching statistics to prove a point, it may be observed that the College has a higher ratio of stars to dollar signs than any other institution—thus signifying that an education at the College of Charleston is a better value than almost any other college or university in the country. Several comments, though, were far from complimentary. The concluding paragraph about the College was:

The College of Charleston is not the place for a "progressive thinker", and those seriously interested in academic work would probably be better off elsewhere. But students enjoy their school's tranquil atmosphere and value its sense of Southern elegance. As one woman student says, it's a school ideally suited to the type who is "unsure of exactly what he wants to do".

EDITORS

What does the College of Charleston faculty have in common with the faculty at every other college and university in the country? It believes it has too many administrators. The primary mission at most institutions is to provide a quality education for its students. A faculty that is well-educated, productive, sensitive to student needs, and enthusiastic about fulfilling the primary mission is effective in securing and properly managing funds necessary to maintain a strong program of instruction is also essential to fulfilling the primary mission. Both faculty and administration profess not to want the "He-They" relationship. Yet both groups recognize that decisions have to be made on how best to divide a shrinking retrenchment pie. The pure "We-They" model is hardly ever attained because neither group is, or should be, monolithic. To facilitate communication, some members of the academic community should be part of both the faculty and administration, though—if they do their job properly—they will probably be viewed with suspicion by each group.

There are essentially two paths to college or university administration: through the professional faculty ranks up (or down, depending on your point of view) to academic administration, or from a managerial position in either government or business into one in education. The former group is more likely to focus on long-range academic planning and exerting a leadership role in setting academic policy. The latter group, though it may still be committed to the primary mission of the institution, is more likely to focus on the financial health, the physical environment, and the day-to-day operations that are noticed only when they fail to work properly. While an administrator who has once been a member of the faculty is more likely to be respected by the faculty than one who has not, there is still a tendency to mistrust or at least be wary of anyone who would voluntarily choose to leave the faculty for an administrative position.

A few of the reasons a faculty member might flirt with the possibility of trying to defy the Peter Principle (assuming we are talking about competent faculty members) are money, prestige, different challenges, and boredom. I expect that many teachers become administrators for some of the same reasons they become teachers in the first place. As students, they feel they can explain the subject matter to their peers better than can their teachers, and eventually decide to enter the profession of those whose daily failings they have scrutinized. Some, of course, become teachers, and perhaps even administrators, because of a positive role model. Most faculty have always been goal-oriented: B.A., M.A., Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor. Though the advantages to being a Dean rather than a Professor are not as obvious or widely accepted as the advantages to having three degrees instead of two, a goal is still a goal.

A faculty title may change to an administrative title abruptly, but in practice the transition from faculty member to administrator is usually gradual. Most of us would like the faculty both to maximize its control over the institution and to minimize its bureaucratic involvement. It is not possible for an individual faculty member to achieve uninvolved control. Those who opt more for control are those who do in part what administrators do. Our faculty committees deal with academic standards and admissions, curriculum and academic planning, graduate and continuing education, research and development, promotion and tenure, grievances and hearings, student affairs, library, nominations, and advising the president. Each is designed to assist, take responsibilities from, and advise the president. Yet all the administrators who are members of the College suddenly disappear, leaving the faculty to run the institution, a small group would assume most of the administrative duties and obligations until they, too, would be viewed as administrators. Even then I don’t think we would have a satisfactory answer to the question of how many administrators are too many.
It is difficult for administrators to evaluate faculty members, it is even more difficult for faculty members to evaluate administrators. Those administrators largely responsible for evaluating faculty have usually once been members of a faculty and should have some appreciation for what faculty members are doing and how well they do it. They also are afforded the opportunity to examine colleague evaluations prior to making decisions. Rarely, if ever, do upper level administrators ever return to the faculty.

Those who are found wanting in one administrative post are frequently given another at the same institution if they are well liked or at a different institution if they are not. Thus, faculty are not likely to have much of an understanding of what administrators do or are supposed to do. Nor is it as well defined how an administrator is supposed to fulfill his or her responsibilities. It is not always easy to determine which administrator is responsible for which problem, whether the fault lies with the nature of the person or the position, or if the difficulty is really caused by external forces or demons over which we have no control.

Recently, the Academic Vice President asked Department Chairpersons if the department would assume future responsibility for certifying that their majors had met all requirements for graduation. It was explained that an understaffed registrar's office is not sufficiently able to handle this task. Faced with the unpleasant choice of either spending funds on an additional person in the registrar's office or burdening further an already overburdened faculty, the Chairpersons recommended the former. No useful purpose is served by merely decrying the proliferation of administrators. If we feel there are too many, we must learn how better to articulate those administrative responsibilities that can be done more efficiently, those that we as faculty should assume, and those that need not be done at all. The Chairpersons had to make their recommendation without having access to the operations within the registrar's office. In contrast, for the first time in the history of the College, the faculty—through its representatives on the Budget Review and Planning Committee—have free access to the budget of the entire College and the charge both to investigate and to recompose changes in any area that will better serve the primary mission of the institution. Let us hope that the hard work and countless hours spent by the Committee will ultimately be viewed by all as time well spent.

I would like to make one final comment about institutional governance. We wrestle constantly with whether we want to arrive at decisions through a democratic or an oligarchic process. We say we want both strong leadership and democratic decisions, though the two are usually contraries. The best I think we can hope for in an institution the size of the College is an administration that is sensitive to faculty needs, seeks faculty input whenever possible, believes in shared governance, and acts forcefully, decisively, and fairly. In my two years as Speaker of the Faculty, I have found more well-intentioned administrators that I had expected who communicated with each other more poorly and less frequently than I had expected. Most of the correctable problems, and I'm not sure if this is good or bad, have been the result of general administrative bungling rather than a consequence of clever planning by ill-intended, malevolent administrators.

A TALE OF TWO PRESIDENTS

The two presidents under whom I have served at the College provide an interesting contrast. Ted Stern came to the College in 1968 when it was a small private institution in danger of closing its doors because of a lack of funds and he was instrumental in transforming it into a financially solvent state institution. In ten years the College grew from a student body of 500 and a faculty of 27, with 12 Ph.D's, to a student body of 5000 and a faculty of 200. Ted Stern was a dynamic, energetic, politically powerful and decisive leader who wanted to be involved in every facet of every decision made at the College. He probably felt more at home in the military, where he served as a captain in the navy, than at an academic institution, where a baccalaureate was his highest earned degree. Yet even in an academic setting he expected, and usually received, the unquestioning loyalty and support of his staff, some of whom were former naval associates.

Ted Stern thought of the College as his extended family, with himself as the paternalistic and patriarchal father. He wanted his children, the faculty, to trust him and did not seem to understand why they might have requested that his books be opened or his government shared. He sought the respect of the faculty and thought he could obtain and retain it through the trappings of royalty. When he received an honorary degree from Presbyterian College in 1971, Mr. Stern became forever Dr. Stern. He gave lavish parties and enjoyed lavish attention. He took pride in his ability to judge character and sometimes appeared to base rewards and punishments more on personality traits than on academic successes. He presided over a faculty that lived in awe of his management and political skills and in fear of his autocratic and unpredictable behavior.
If I am being too harsh on Ted Stern, it is perhaps because I was only at the College for the final two years of his presidency. His supporters and detractors alike have themselves been led into assuming that the credit for saving the Institution from bankruptcy in the early years. He knew how well to work with key legislators and was largely responsible for developing the beautiful campus we now have. However, his failure to place more emphasis on books than bricks led to collegiality at the College being defined by an aesthetic rather than an intellectual environment. He began as a benevolent dictator and, through the years, became more dictatorial and less benevolent. He started by using power and ended by abusing it. In his terminal year at the College, I served on a Faculty Research Committee that spent many hours deciding how best to recommend the awarding of $20,000 in funds set aside for research and development. To our dismay, President Stern doled out only about half the funds recommended without giving either to the Committee a rationale for how he chose to allocate the funds or to the faculty an explanation for cutting the research budget in half during less than austere times. One of his last, and most vindictive, acts was to deny tenure to Frank Kinard for reasons that would have been laughed out of court had it gone that far.

Ted Stern was proud to advertise that whatever was good for Charleston was good for the College. His philosophy earned him some friends in the local community and some foes in an academic community that envisioned an institution striving for national recognition. Ted Stern, through his position at the College, gained respect and influence in the Charleston community. He was instrumental in seeing that the Spoleto festival came to and stayed in Charleston. In addition to his time and efforts, he contributed $10,000 from the College's vending machine accounts for the festival that has produced so many benefits to the city. I think Ted Stern's present position as head of Spoleto is more suitable than his former position as head of an academic institution.

If Ted Stern left behind a closed administration that fostered fear and paranoia, as did Richard Nixon, then Ed Collins entered as a Gerald Ford, whose humility and self-deprecating humor created an atmosphere for an open administration and as much of an end to paranoia as was possible at an academic institution. He began by forming one Faculty committee to communicate regularly with him about faculty concerns and another to advise him on tenure decisions. He said the right things about shared governance and collegiality. He had an appropriate academic and administrative background and seemed like a pleasant, friendly person with neither delusions of nor desires for grandeur. Had a popularity poll been taken those first few months, President Collins would probably have received more than 90% faculty approval. Like all honeymooners, however, this one had to end. Some of Ed Collins' good points were also his bad points. His willingness to delegate authority meant that he was not as aware of his predecessor's institutional problems. Though he was well liked, the trains no longer ran on time. His aversion to making decisions that were not pleasing to everyone made him appear indecisive. His integrity and trust in dealing with the legislature did not bring the anticipated returns. Expectations for and recognition of faculty were growing under an able academic vice president who was providing the leadership that many felt should have been supplied by the president. In an inherited administration that was molded in someone else's image, President Collins lacked the inclination either to shape up or ship out those administrators he may have found wanting. He is not a rocker of boats.

Ed Collins looks for cooperation rather than confrontation. His consensus style of shared governance has been enthusiastically welcomed by most faculty. Its inherent fairness, though, loses some luster when the institution no longer receives its fair share from the state. Some faculty members had the impression that a president with Ed's intentions and Ted's abilities would be close to ideal. Such statements are too simplistic. True, President Stern seemed as remarkably successful in getting what he wanted as President Collins seemed unsuccessful. Yet when something goes right or wrong, the credit or blame is not always ascribed to those at whom the buck stops. A legislature is more willing to pour money into a newly formed state institution in a thriving economy when higher education is respected than in a crisis into an older institution in a depressed economy when higher education is slighted. A president is more likely to be autocratic with a small, young, inexperienced, homogeneous faculty than with a faculty that is large, mature, diverse, and opinionated.

Beneath the nice guy image that Ed Collins projects is, upon closer examination, a nice guy. I don't think it any more possible to be too qualified, but "too nice" may be a pejorative depiction of someone who avoids or delays making a correct decision for fear that someone else might find it unpleasant. President Collins seems to enjoy the company of his colleagues, but often prefers surrounding himself with bland food that need not be

Professor of History and Government

This is a faculty member's perspective on the presidency of Ted Stern and Ed Collins at the College of Charleston, highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of each administration. The writing is a combination of personal reflections and objective analysis, providing insights into the college's evolution during these years. The text discusses the impact of the presidents on the institution's governance, faculty morale, and community relationships, offering a nuanced view of their legacies.
That said, I think President Collins is having his finest semester at the College. Communication between the faculty and administration has never been better. Faculty feel free to speak their individual or collective minds without fear of retribution in an atmosphere of openness and trust. If President Collins has not stamped his personal philosophy on the doors of the College, he has also not stampeded us away from something that the faculty have wanted to pursue. He has responded to criticism by reorganizing his administration. He has allowed the Budget Review and Planning Committee to move in directions it felt necessary to move in, and provided guidance when either he or the Committee felt it called for. He worked with the Provost Search Committee in setting criteria for the position, charged the Committee with reducing the field to a manageable number, and then furnished assistance in narrowing the choices to the five that are being invited to campus. If he has not thus far been a particularly creative and innovative president, he has been a president who has tried to be fair and is learning better what to manage himself and what management responsibilities are best delegated to others. Considering the long and often inglorious administrative history of the College, we could certainly do much worse than President Collins. When his administration eventually comes to an end, I hope some future Speaker of the Faculty will be able to look back and say that we could hardly have done better.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

THE GRICE YEARS

When Herb asked me to write something for Newspeak about changes I have seen at the College, I thought it might be of passing interest to recall something of my salad days on the faculty during the time Dr. George D. Grice was President. What follows are "recollections," not matters which have been "researched." Bear in mind also that when I make favorable references to the faculty of the College, I am, in all modesty, excluding myself.

If you want to know what the College was like in 1955, go to "Alumni Memorial Hall" and look around. In those days, that was the Chapel. It accommodated half of the student body. Chapel was required--Tuesdays: freshmen and juniors; Thursdays: sophomores and seniors--men on the one side, women on the other. The prayer used most frequently concluded with the memorable words,

And raise up, we beseech Thee, a never-failing succession of benefactors whose names may be perpetuated through all generations as of blessed memory, and their good deeds be rewarded...

And, of course, as is proper, the students faced the South when they prayed.

At opening convocation, squeezed onto the Chapel platform were the entire faculty, the President, the Chairman of the Board, the Mayor of Charleston, and one man of the cloth commandeered for invocational purposes. Most of the students were from Charleston. Of course, there was a goodies representation from "up-state," and even a handful of students from the North, the vanguard of the second Yankee invasion.

George Daniel Grice became President of the College on May 29, 1945, by coincidence, the day of my admission to the College. When he left in 1966, he had served for 21 years, an unusually long tenure for a college president. Mr. Grice was a remarkable man. A native Charlestonian, he had great respect for the College and, I believe, he hoped to hand the College on to his successor in the same condition as he found it. He had two outstanding abilities. He was able to attract a first-rate faculty to the College, and he was able to operate the College on an astonishingly small budget. Few people were neutral about Mr. Grice--one either admired him, or exploded at the mention of his name. To say that he was a conservative is an understatement. His lifelong foes were liberals and the enemies of "decency." He delighted in blasting away at what he considered the most "indecent" folks of all, those who controlled public education ("a bunch of jackasses and old boodaddies").

The College prided itself on being a liberal arts institution, dedicated to teaching. Its tradition emphasized the importance of the humanities and of the sciences. What existed in the academic world outside of these was considered, more or less, a wasteland. This view of the curriculum stemmed in part from conviction and in part from economic necessity. With funds severely limited, the College tried to do a few things and to do them well. The term used was, "a quality, no-frills education."
Faculty life was considered very "civilized." The normal teaching load was fifteen hours. This usually amounted to four "preparations" and one duplicate section. Each member of the faculty turned in his roll book to the Dean so that a check could be made on attendance. Classes ended at 2:00 p.m., and afternoons were reserved for laboratories. For most of the faculty, afternoons were spent attending students, grading papers, preparing lectures and working in the library. As at present, some of the faculty gathered in the lounge to engage in edifying discourse (i.e., caussing administrators and bad-mouthing students). Most of the faculty preferred to work at home and few stayed around after 2:00 p.m. every day.

There was a Spartan quality to faculty life. Each faculty office was provided with a desk, wood chairs, perhaps an old filing cabinet, lights and some sort only, heat - no telephone and no air conditioning. There were no faculty secretaries, duplicating services were minimal, and there was no budget for "supplies." Although there was no travel budget, if you were to present a paper at a meeting, Mr. Grice would get you the necessary money.

There were magnificent compensations! The faculty salary scale was about the best in South Carolina, faculty members could borrow money from the College and purchase a home at very low interest rates, and assigned parcels of land for home ownership.

With the President presiding, meetings were conducted in a most decorous manner. A record of those present and those absent was kept in the permanent minutes and was read at the following meeting by the secretary. Anyone presenting untimely, unseemly, or unwanted business was promptly declared "out of order" by the President. And that was the end of it.

There was one faculty committee, the "All Purpose Committee." It was appointed by the President and met at the will of the President. It functioned as an advisory, planning, admissions, discipline and grievance committee. And it met infrequently. There was no need for faculty evaluation, committees were given to the faculty at no cost, Mr. Grice felt that most meetings were unprofitable, therefore meetings were kept to a minimum. The faculty met at the beginning of the year to welcome new members, at the end of the first semester to discuss student demands in academic difficulty, and near the end of the year to approve candidates for graduation. Other meetings may or may not occur. Except for the first meeting, which might be followed by a reception (e.g., mint-juleps, crab-claws, shrimp, etc.), all meetings were held in the President's Office. To ensure brevity, meetings were usually held at 2:00 p.m. when everyone was hungry and wanted to go home.

Spared from frequent meetings, endless evaluations and constant paper work, the faculty member was to devote himself to teaching, to assisting students, and to such "scholarly pursuits" as he could manage. Research was not encouraged because it would divert the professor from his primary responsibility, teaching. Inefficiency, of course, with 15 hours of teaching, no available laboratory space, the most meager of library facilities, and no possibility of matching funds, it was futile to talk of research.

Students who came to the College in those days suffered little from the confusion occasioned by choice. The freshman was required to take English 101-102 and to select four courses from Biology, Chemistry, History, Languages, Mathematics and Public Speaking. For those who survived the first year, the second year usually involved Sophomore Literature, a second year of science, a second year of language, a second course in the major, and one course of the student's own selection. Rising in class rank involved passing required courses as well as accumulating hours. If a required course were failed, the student could reate it until it was passed. But, if it failed it three times, he was unceremoniously dropped from the College.

The fundamental choice the student had to make was whether to attempt the B.S. or the B.A. degree. To receive the B.A. degree, the student had to present four years of high school Latin upon admission to the College, and to complete 20 semester hours of college Latin or Greek. (At graduation, the Chairman of the Board recited the citation for this degree in Latin.) As you can imagine, few graduated with the B.A. and the typical graduate was awarded a B.S. in History or English (to the eternal justification of deans of graduate schools).

It may sound as if the life of the student were regimented unduly. To the contrary, the student was treated as a mature adult. He was given full responsibility for his academic and personal life. If he needed advice, he sought an advisor. Student organisations operated without faculty interference. The students took special pride in the Honor Code. The Code was explained to all freshmen and all formalized the signatures to the Code. Violation of the Honor Code resulted in expulsion. One of the traditional duties of the President was to write the pledge on the blackboard in every room in which an examination was to be held.)
Several faculty traditions may be of interest. After the first meeting of the Trustees each year, the faculty joined the Board in the basement of the Library for coffee and Lady Baltimore cake. This was an opportunity to get to know the members of the Board, and, after five or six years, some of the Board members might actually remember your name... On the Saturday before graduation, every member of the faculty signed diplomas. The diplomas were laid out on the tables in the Biology Laboratory and they were signed according to seniority and using staff pens and indelible ink... Mr. Grice conducted a very "civilized" graduation, designed to last no more than one hour. The faculty wore business suits. The faculty, city aldermen, and heads of distinguished civic groups mingled in the procession and sat together on the west side of the cistern. This was symbolic of our historic roots as "America's Oldest Municipal College." (Occasionally an insensitive member of the faculty would grumble about sitting with a bunch of hyners and lousy politicians.) Music, such as it was, was provided by an independent-minded collection of string and woodwind players seated on the balcony, trying desperately to be heard!

These were the "Grice Years." By the early 60's the College was falling on hard times. Charleston grew, but the College did not. Social change was in the wind, but the College tried to ignore it. Stabbing attempts were made to change with the times—a dormitory was built, a student recruiter was employed, and an ill-fated development plan for the decade was begun. But it was old wine in new bottles. Time and money were running out. With the retirement of Mr. Grice, an era ended. The next President, Walter Copplege, (a perfectly delightful gentleman with many sterling qualities) was equipped by neither nature nor inclination to deal with the basic problem of survival. What Mr. Grice had held together, through ingenuity and force of character, started to fall apart at the seams. At the end of Academic Year 1967-68, the College was without a President. The redoubtable Dean Edward Towell agreed to function as acting president, but he and the rest of us wondered how long the College could survive. (Little did we know that, like Stonewall Jackson at First Bull Run, Capt. Stern and the South Carolina Volunteers were about to appear and turn the tide!)

...And that's the way it was.

William Bischoff

Herb,

The activities of the last two meetings of the faculty (particularly the meeting of 3-17-82) have prompted me to write my first letter to Newspeak.

Before Wednesday's meeting, I was relatively neutral about the election of Speaker of the faculty. It is my understanding that the Speaker is to represent the faculty, and I believe that should mean a majority (not minority) of the faculty. As I see it, three different written ballots have been taken on essentially the same issue—whether the majority of the faculty wishes Nan Morrison to represent them. In all three cases, the answer was clear: Nan Morrison represents a minority, not a majority. Several parliamentary maneuvers have been used to try to allow the minority to rule on this issue. Who knows? They may be successful; Nan may yet end up as Speaker of the faculty. But what a disgraceful way to win! (What was that about El Salvador and Nicaragua?)

I am embarrassed by (and ashamed of) the actions of my colleagues in walking out of Wednesday's meeting. This incident has an athletic analogy. A basketball team found it had lost the first half of the game. And it appeared to be losing in the second half as well. So, the losing team decided to walk off the court rather than display enough sportsmanship to lose gracefully. As one faculty member remarked, they appeared to say, "If you won't let me win, I'll take my ball and go home." In athletics the rules would require that this team forfeit the game. Unfortunately, the rules of parliamentary procedure are no so clear-cut and allow such childish action to go unpunished.

I deeply resent the fact that a minority of faculty members have wasted my time as well as the time of my colleagues. I had better things to do than wait until 5:00 p.m. to attend a faculty meeting. I had hoped the matter of election of the Speaker would have been settled at Wednesday's meeting. As a citizen of the academic community, I felt it was my duty to attend the meeting to help resolve the problem. Yet the actions of a minority kept the faculty from accomplishing the objective of that meeting. I believe a Speaker should expedite faculty business—not disrupt it.

By the time this letter is printed I hope the issue of the election of the Speaker is resolved. I really don't care who wins that election—so long as it is a person who represents the majority of the faculty. I felt compelled to write this letter to express my contempt for the childish actions of a supposedly adult group of people who did not have the class to lose gracefully.
Dear Herb,

In the last issue of Newspeak, a report in the "Speakeasy" section on page four noted that in August, 1981, President Collins instituted a change in the term of chairpersons from a fixed term of five years (renewable for one further term) to an indefinite appointment with a major evaluation of the chairperson every five years. At any time, a majority of members of the department petition the Vice President for Academic Affairs for a performance review of the chairperson. The "Speakeasy" item also noted that President Collins made this change based on a 1980 recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation, whose members were listed.

Consciously or not, the report in Newspeak implied to a number of faculty that the Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation - and perhaps the Faculty Committee chairperson at the time who was a member of that committee (me) - had "sold out" the faculty on this matter, that a "back door" play had been made without faculty knowledge or consent. Several faculty members have made such comments to me.

I would like to respond to this interpretation. I was not asked about this matter before it appeared in Newspeak and the incomplete report has caused some confusion. This recommendation was vigorously discussed within the committee and support for this recommendation was not unanimous. I, for one, opposed changing the fixed term for chairpersons and argued against the recommendation.

Moreover, the Newspeak report omitted the rationale for the recommendation. The majority was persuaded that fixed terms increased political and factional tensions within a department as maneuvering and jockeying for position occurred near the end of a fixed term and an "election" of sorts neared; that the last year of a fixed term made the chairperson a "lame duck" with reduced authority to discharge duties; and that the possibility of "deals" regarding salary recommendations between outgoing and incoming chairpersons was increased. The majority believed that an unfixed term with a fifth-year major evaluation would decrease factionalism and increase the chairperson's effectiveness.

President Collins attended this meeting of the committee, made it clear that he found these arguments persuasive, and that he considered this an administrative decision not subject to faculty approval. At a later meeting, President Collins agreed that those recommendations relevant to the Faculty Welfare Committee (tenure and promotion procedures) would be forwarded to that committee and then to the full faculty. This was done. It was also agreed that any administrative changes would be publicized. Evidently this was not effectively done, leading to suspicions of "back door" power plays when the change was implemented. However, when a recommendation made in May, 1980, is instituted in August, 1981, for anyone to imply that the faculty members on the Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation had sold out his/her colleagues is erroneous and unfair.

I hope this letter has clarified the matter.

Sincerely,

George V. Hopkins

Editor's Note: No such implication was intended.
Dear Herb:

At your request, I have summarized the final report submitted by my office to the Lilly Endowment on the three-year Lilly Grant. A pamphlet on that grant and the whole faculty development effort is being prepared, in hopes that it will be useful for publicizing the College to other foundations.

The Lilly Grant ran from September, 1978 through August 1981; it provided $91,000 for which the College pledged match in a total of $132,000. In addition to this support, there were a number of additional grants for which we received correspondence: $10,000 for student internships, $10,000 to purchase a new computer, and $10,000 for student research. The College also funded some of these efforts directly, and these grants were included in the final report.

Category I included individual small grants ("mini-grants") for new course preparation, new materials (for example, audio-visual), short courses (for example, training to use new scientific equipment), and teaching or evaluation consultants. The College "Match" included small grants for research, grants to develop Honors courses, funds for NEH Chautauquas, and travel funds required by NEH Summer Seminars.

Category II funded interdisciplinary activities, including match for the NEH grant on Low Country Studies, and funds for workshops and Chautauquas. It also funded faculty internships (for example, at MESC) and work with local businesses to set up student internships. By the terms of the grant, Category II grew to about 250,000 in the third year.

Category III, for administrative training of faculty and "other" costs, covered xerography, various retreats, workshops, and supplies. Much of this was for chairpersons' training.

Results? The Lilly Committee, particularly Diane Johnson and Jay Parker, were asked to review the results in preparation for an external evaluation by Mike Johnson and the College. The committee concluded that a significant number of the projects funded by the Lilly Grant were successful, and that there was evidence of long-term impact. Since most recipients of grants rated their own projects highly, we traced impacts over one, two, and three years. Was this advice adopted? Was that trust in micro-computers used? Did that mini-grant for research lead to the promised article? Did that "Lilly award" write the grant or set up the program projected? In general, results were excellent. The Academic Affairs Office had record of twenty papers delivered or published in 1975; in 1980, the number was over 300, including volumes edited, major performances, and so on. Grants and fellowships received grew, roughly threefold in amount and about tenfold in number. Cross-disciplinary and other innovative teaching formats were widespread, while content was presumed to be strengthened by about three dozen NEH Seminars, Chautauquas, and similar high-level courses. Lilly and College funds did not cause all the good things that faculty accomplished, but they helped a constructive faculty to shape its own strengths. Dr. William O'Connell of A&I, evaluating the program, noted several unusual features. First, research and other kinds of development were combined: most institutions separate the two and experience damaging territorial and ideological conflicts over standard vs. experimental teaching and teaching vs. research. Second, funds were blended: that is, any specific project might be supported by a combination of external and internal special funds, department or community funds. The result was that faculty development funds often stretched a long way, as chairmen and faculty recipients and administrators combined to find "match."

My report suggests other factors of success: 1) The Vice President was the main thrust, with tremendous force and vision. 2) The faculty recruited strong candidates to its ranks, so that there was a basis for development. 3) The faculty who supported Lilly were strong academicians, including leaders in both research and service. 4) The College possessed accidental strengths—heritage, location, and a wonderful campus.

I suggest that from my own vantage point, the first reason—Dr. Sevan's vital spirit—was the sine qua non. The massive accomplishment, however, is the faculty's.

By way of conclusion, the 1981-82 budgets contained 40,000 in state funds and 15,000 in Foundation funds for faculty development, plus most of the "Internationalizing the Curriculum" grant (35,000).

Paul J. Hamill
Dear Faculty,

It may be, as Herb says in his October 21 editorial on "Academic Freedom," that we are not entitled to... introduce controversial material that has no relation to the subject," in our classrooms. However, in keeping with my anarchistic nature, I am making a plea to all of you to talk to all of your classes about something which, though I hope no one will consider it controversial, is not related to the subject matter of most of the classes taught here.

It's Spring at the College of Charleston again. It's beautiful isn't it? When you stroll around campus the temperature is pleasant, the flowers are beautiful, people seem to be smiling and laughing more and feeling better. But, unfortunately, along with the blooming of the flowers, comes an increase in the litter that's left about.

Do you know how depressing it is to see four or five soft drink cans and empty Milk Duds boxes left on the steps of Maybank whenever I am able to escape from the Library? And Folly Beach, that mini-heaven where I live---people come out, play on the beach for a few hours, and leave all their trash behind!

As you are well aware, the College of Charleston and Folly Beach are not the only places victimized by this ignorance and laziness. So please, all of you, talk to your students about not littering. It will only take a few minutes of your class time, and it's an extremely important issue. I'm hoping an educational campaign will help. While you are educating your students, be sure to mention that cigarette butts are trash too.

The Physical Plant could also help Reid Wiseman in his honorable recycling endeavor by placing receptacles marked for the disposal of aluminum cans only at convenient places inside all the buildings and around campus. This would help immensely.

Thank you, and if this doesn't work, I do have more drastic measures in mind which would also help the population problem.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Ann Linton

P.S.

In case you don't agree that this is a serious matter, just think about the image the College is presenting to all the visitors to our campus in the Spring and Summer months.

Dear Herb,

May I take a little of your space here to get the announcement regarding Casino Night before the faculty once again--this time in writing.

Casino Night is part of The College's G'telops Week spring festival. It will be from 6:00 to 10:00 p.m. on April 16 in the Etern Student Center Ballroom. Sponsorship for the event is shared by the College Union Board and the Office of Special Events. Proceeds from the evening will go to The College of Charleston Foundation's scholarship fund.

Admission at Casino Night will be $3.00 for students and $4.00 for all others. This fee will also purchase your packet of play money for the game tables. Since, in order for a profit to be realized it will be necessary for at least 300 people to be there and playing at the tables, invitations have been sent to the Alumni to come to the event and join the student body, staff and faculty at play.

We have already demonstrated our enthusiasm and generosity as a group during the Foundation Auction in the Fall of the year, and I believe we can be as supportive of this worthwhile activity as we were of that one.

Michael Tyszack and the "Early Days Jazz Band" have already donated their services to make it a musically pleasant Casino Night. We now need volunteers to run the tables (the legality of this aspect of the evening has been cleared with the college lawyers) and to contribute prizes of a nature similar to last Fall's auction item, with the proviso that we may not go outside The College community for contributions. Naturally, we also need as many members of the College community to come and play.
If you are interested in running a table or contributing an item to be used as a prize, please contact: Susan Sanders, 2-5525; Herb Silverman, 2-5720 or me, 2-5713 at your early convenience.

Remember, this is all for the scholarship fund which in the long run will help us achieve what we all want—better qualified Foundation scholars who will in turn improve the standard of the entire student body.

Sincerely,

Lara Pierce

Dear Herb,

I understand from a recent issue of Newspeak that an alternative proposal by one of the Trustees has been made for naming the Education Center, rather than to name it, as the Faculty suggested, after Septima Clark. This came initially as a surprise to me, but I have given the matter some thought, and I would like to make a compromise suggestion. I do not know what the disposition of the question will be, and I understand that it may be resolved before my letter is printed. Perhaps the building will be named for Mrs. Clark. If no decision is reached, the Faculty may wish to consider my recommendation.

While I cannot read a Trustee's mind, it came to me that there may be two difficulties with naming the building Septima Clark Hall. First, she is a woman. South Carolina has yet to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment, and the Trustees may fear that to place the school too far in advance of public sentiment might reflect poorly upon the institution. If this is their thinking, we must respect them for it, and it may be necessary to wait until our legislators bring themselves to accept the equality of all before the law. In any event, we have plenty of unnamed buildings, and I am sure there will still be some around the campus when the time arrives to honor Mrs. Clark.

So we may have to accept the idea of a building named for a male.

But I may be mistaken on the Trustee's reasoning. The objections may stem, instead, from the fact that Mrs. Clark is still active in public life. If such is the case, I must also concur that it is a matter of some moment to name a building for someone still holding office. And it can be well argued that such honors ought rightly to come only after retirement. I understand that this has not been the policy of the Board of Trustees in the past, but perhaps their thinking has changed.

So we may have to accept the idea of a building named after someone no longer active in public life.

Should we leave the Education Center unnamed for a further time? This is neither necessary nor desirable. An obvious alternative choice is available to us. If a female is unacceptable, and it is impolitic to name the building for someone still active, then I propose that the College honor someone who played an important role in the city's past, someone who illustrated through his life that it is possible to improve one's economic and social standing in the community through one's own efforts, someone who was active in educating his peers during the ante-bellum period so dear to many of our fellow citizens, someone who lived almost in the shadow of the present campus. I recommend that we name the Education Center Denmark Vesey Hall.

Cordially,

Clarence B. Davis

Thanks to those who contributed to this issue of Newspeak. I would like all standing committees to send me their end of semester reports for publication in the next issue. The deadline for submitting letters and pieces of information for this final issue of Newspeak is Monday, April 19.