ADMINISTRATION SPEAK

The Provost Search Committee will meet on Monday, April 26 to reduce to three the number of candidates it will recommend to the President. Shortly thereafter, President Collins will meet with the Committee to hear a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of each of the three candidates. The President will then offer the position of Provost of the Faculty to one of the three.

What follows are academic department change indicators at the College for the years 1977-1981.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department (1977-81)</th>
<th>% Change Expend.</th>
<th>% Change FTEs</th>
<th>% Change Faculty</th>
<th>% Change Courses (Fall)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Affairs</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy/Religious Studies</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Admin./Economics</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology/Anthropology</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education &amp; Health</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As previously noted, President Collins revised the Faculty and Administration Manual in August, 1981, by changing the normal length of service for department chairpersons from 5 years (renewable for one additional term) to an indefinite appointment with a major evaluation of the chairperson every five years. Next year, the manual will be re-revised to return to the fixed term of five years, but without placing a limit on the number of re-appointments. Prior to the completion of a chairperson’s term, the Provost will ask each of the returning departmental members for recommendations in writing. The President will give these recommendations, along with those of the Provost, careful consideration and will appoint the chairperson.

Faculty members will henceforth be evaluated early each spring on their accomplishments of the previous calendar (rather than academic) year. Departmental members will fill out evaluation forms on their chairpersons every other year during the fall semester.

The 1972 Higher Education Guidelines on affirmative action prepared by NEW and supported by the College state that "affirmative action requires the contractor to do more than ensure employment neutrality with regard to race, color, religion, sex and national origin. As the phrase implies, affirmative action requires the employer to make additional efforts to recruit, employ and promote qualified members of groups formerly excluded, even if that exclusion cannot be traced to particular actions on the part of the employer. The premise of the affirmative action concept of the Executive Order is that unless positive action is undertaken to overcome the effects of systematic institutional forms of exclusion and discrimination a benign neutrality in employment practices will tend to perpetuate the status quo ante indefinitely."

According to Roy Jones, Human Relations Director at the College, "As long as our qualifying criteria remain vague and rely heavily on subjective judgements, the condition exists for an individual to make biased decisions, within a wide range of variability, which seem on the surface reasonable. Affirmative action is necessary to the extent that it is possible to discriminate illegally either consciously or unconsciously, inadvertently or inadvertently. Our affirmative action obligation does not dictate who is hired to fill a position. Although, who is hired should take such factors as race and/or sex into consideration, when other job-related qualifications are constant, in view of institutional affirmative action goals."
The state Budget and Control Board approved an increase from 4% to 6% on interest for employee contributions in the State Retirement System, effective July 1. Retirement system Director Purvis C. Collins estimated the cost to the system to be $150,000 annually. Because of the financial health of the system, he felt that the fund could easily afford the 50% increase in interest payments on short-term contributions.

The U.S. Internal Revenue Service has approved an administrative order that will allow participants in the state's retirement system to defer federal income taxes on contributions. This would allow faculty to deduct from income their personal contributions to the retirement plan. Taxes would then be due when faculty start drawing retirement benefits or leave public employment and withdraw their retirement money. Before the deferrals can begin, the General Assembly must approve the change.

Because of an unexpected additional twenty million dollar shortfall of state revenue, the Budget and Control Board has placed an immediate freeze, except under extenuating circumstances that must carefully be justified, on all equipment purchases and hiring of personnel through June 30. This freeze does not affect hiring of faculty for the coming academic year.

COMMITTEESPEAK

The Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Assistance Spring 1982 Semester Report:

The Committee reviewed a petition requesting permission to take 9 of the final 30 hours at the University of South Carolina, 6 of which were major degree requirements, the petition was denied.

The Committee reviewed a petition requesting permission to take 10 of the final 30 hours at the University of Central Florida, all of which were electives, the petition was granted.

The Committee presented two motions to the faculty: one concerning the addition of a grade of audit; the other was to repeal the ruling that students can elect to have College of Charleston credits treated as transfer credits; both were remanded to the Committee. The Committee decided to present them to the faculty a second time, unchanged.

The Committee reviewed and denied a petition requesting the transfer of credits from Bucllege College.

The Committee reviewed the waivers which had been granted to graduating seniors and found them to be satisfactory.

END-OF-YEAR REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM AND ACADEMIC PLANNING

During the fall semester, the Committee on Curriculum and Academic planning concentrated on curriculum proposals from departments and programs. Because of the preparation of a new two-year Bulletin, there was an unusually large number of course proposals to review. Thirteen departments or programs submitted proposals, with the Curriculum Committee (and the Faculty) approving a total of 125 course additions, changes, and deletions. The number of deletions exceeded the number of additions, so this large number of course proposals does not represent an increase in the total number of courses. 99% of the submitted course proposals were approved, although many required further explanation and clarification before the Curriculum Committee presented them to the Faculty.

In the spring semester, the Curriculum Committee discussed over several meetings a proposal for Global Studies, it also studied the nature of Freshman Seminar on Orientation courses and their potential at the College of Charleston. Recent discussion has been directed to the establishing of a format for "concentrations of studies," which students can elect in addition to their majors.

Throughout the year we wrestled with the statement on "Major Requirements" (p. 83 in the Bulletin) without being able to revise that statement in a way that would remove all the specific problems. Since it was the consensus of the committee that no department or program was willfully not complying with the spirit of the statement, we decided that this issue, although important, did not require resolution this year.

Kenneth W. Severens, Chairman Committee on Curriculum and Academic Planning
The Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs was involved in the following activities during the Spring Semester:

1. The primary accomplishment of the Committee was the passage of a proposal which resulted in the merger of the Graduate Faculty Committee and the Committee on Continuing Education and Special Programs. It was our feeling that undergraduate faculty members need an established vehicle for recommendations they might have concerning the graduate program at the College (the Graduate Faculty Committee had the distinctive disadvantages of possessing neither written duties nor standing committee status). The new committee is called the "Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs." The only substantive changes in the old committee listed on pages 31-32 of The Faculty and Administration Manual (1981-1982) were in duties a and d. The new Committee, in addition to its previous duties, now receives or initiates recommendations and suggestions concerning graduate education, and serves as faculty liaison for graduate education planning of an academic nature.

2. The Committee petitioned, and was granted, representation on the Graduate Council (the administrative and policy-making agency of the graduate program). The purpose of this petition was to provide a formal vehicle by which the undergraduate faculty can present suggestions and remain informed about developments in the graduate program. One member of the Committee now sits as a non-voting member of the Council.

3. Concerns were raised about the advising system for continuing education students. The issue was discussed at length and the consensus was that the system works in a fashion comparable to that for regular day students. Suggestions for improvement included changes in the current Adult Student Handbook (e.g., emphasizing the importance of English placement tests for returning students, including lists of chairpersons and re-entry advisers for departments), sending a memo to evening adjunct professors, and so forth.

4. The recipients of the Continuing Education Incentive Grants were approved for the 1982 Spring Semester. Nine individuals received grants of $140 each. The Committee was pleased to hear from Sue Sommer that a grant of $10,000 was recently received from an anonymous donor for use in the Incentive Grant program.

5. The noncredit course offerings for the 1982 Summer Sessions were reviewed and approved.

6. The Committee discussed the 14-hour requirement for nomination to the semester-end "Faculty Honors List." A recent student complaint was that this requirement reflected unfairly upon students who take 9-12 hours and earn high GPAs. It was felt that the issue should be given careful consideration since such an honor is an extremely important academic motivator for some students, particularly older students. We also felt that it is proper to reconsider the rationale for bestowing academic honors during an era in which a) economic conditions make it necessary for more students to hold part-time jobs and extend their education beyond the traditional four years, and b) an increasingly larger proportion of our student body consists of adults returning to, or beginning, school. The issue was referred to the appropriate bodies.

Maggie Pennington

Dear Dr. Silverman:

The Faculty Grievance Committee had no business brought before it during the Academic Year 1981-82.

Respectfully submitted,

William Bischoff, Chairman

The emphasis of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President for the spring semester has been on the academic atmosphere of the College. Special concerns voiced related to declining motivation for learning, lack of preparedness in basic skills, and student-faculty rapport. Although it appears that these concerns are national in scope, The College should not be complacent, but rather should pursue avenues for fostering independent learners, scholarship and a more satisfying teaching atmosphere. It is hoped that the 1982-83 Committee will continue to pursue this topic.

Maggie Pennington

The Faculty Grievance Committee had no business brought before it during the Academic Year 1981-82.
The Library Committee met six times during Spring Semester 1982 and focused its attention on three main areas.

1. The committee engaged in a frank and detailed discussion with Mr. David Cohen, Director of Libraries, about the committee's role. This discussion concluded with the affirmation of the role of the committee as set forth in the Faculty Manual.

2. The committee endorsed a change in the timing of departmental allocations from the fall to the spring. Such a change would give both the Faculty and Library Staff more time to submit and process book orders. The committee then made departmental allocations for 1982-83.

3. The committee examined the Library Budget proposal for 1982-83 and sent the Administration a letter stating our support for the budget. We especially emphasized the need for the amount of money requested for books and periodicals and for increased Library security.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
John Newell
for the Committee

Robert Cross (secretary),
William Gudger, David Hall,
Jorge Marban, Frances Welch,
Reed Wiseman, and David Cohen
(Director of Libraries)

The Student Affairs and Athletic Committee met ten times during the 1981-82 year. As the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics was appointed to study the entire scope of the athletic program at the College, this committee focused its efforts largely upon student affairs. The accomplishments of the committee are as follows:

1. 1980-81 reports from all student affairs departments were distributed to committee members.

2. Discussion with John Burns, Director of Financial Aid, and Boyce Cox, Director of Career Development concerning problems created by federal financial cuts was the focus of one meeting.

3. Letters identifying committee concerns were sent to vice presidents in charge of:
   a. The Mail Room
   b. The Cafeteria
   c. Health Awareness Week

4. The committee recommended to the faculty that the College accept the invitation to participate in Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities. The committee is establishing criteria for selection of individuals from the College of Charleston to be named to this list.

5. Recommendations were made to the Vice President of Academic Affairs that
   a. the registrar's office use more computer programming in its process of making graduate checks, obtaining transcript copies, and distributing other pertinent information to faculty and students.
   b. the College newspaper be supported more strongly through improvements and changes listed in attached memo.
   c. freshmen seminars be set up where feasible.
   d. a questionnaire similar to the UCLA one be developed and given to seniors and recent graduates to elicit their evaluation of the College of Charleston.
The committee recommended to the Academic Standards Committee that waivers of any graduation requirements for any student be voted on either by that committee or by the entire faculty.

Marsha Haas read to the faculty at its April 12, 1982 meeting a resolution congratulating the athletic teams on their outstanding accomplishments this year.

The committee had its final meeting as a joint meeting with the 1982-83 committee on April 15. Frank Kinard was elected president and Julian Harrison, secretary.

Respectfully submitted

Kitty McIntosh, Secretary

THE FACULTY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE 1981-82 END OF YEAR REPORT

This year the Research and Development Committee assumed the duties of the Lilly Committee regarding faculty development.

Fall semester we recommended the awarding of four In-House Fellowships (for meritorious research/development projects), carrying funds for release time and/or project expenses for Spring Semester, 1982. These proposals were funded at a total cost of approximately $5500. In addition, we proposed a by-laws change, barring faculty members currently serving on the committee from submitting proposals to the committee. This change was adopted by the faculty in its November meeting.

Spring Semester, the committee reviewed proposals for summer research and development grants and recommended the awarding of 17 grants, totaling approximately $25,000. The recommendations were reviewed and approved by the President.

The committee is also presently planning a retreat May 6 to formulate its recommendations for next year. Members of both old and new committees are invited. The agenda will include a review of the effectiveness of faculty research and development programs over the past four years. A document on our findings and recommendations will be distributed to the faculty.

Kathy Alligood, Chairperson

Annual report of the welfare Committee

For the academic year 1981-82 the Welfare Committee concerned itself mainly with two items:

a) a survey of faculty salaries and fringe benefits at the six state supported colleges; and

b) a recommendation for uniformity in faculty evaluation procedures.

At the November faculty meeting, the Welfare Committee presented the results of the salary survey for the years 1979-80 and a resolution urging the administration to make strong efforts for reparation of past salary inequities at the college and for a fair share of future budget resources. The committee presented inflation adjusted salary data at the December Faculty meeting. The questionnaires regarding non-mandatory fringe benefits at the six schools have been returned and the committee is now in the process of summarizing these data.

At the April faculty meeting the committee presented a proposal for faculty valuation according to a quality point allocation system.

The committee endorsed a request by the Council of Chairmen that would reinstate earlier procedures for administration of student questionnaires. A motion in this effect was made at the March faculty meeting.

During the year the committee was approached by several private firms seeking endorsement for DHA and health care plans. The committee decided that such recommendation, if any, should come more properly from Personnel. President Collins requested that the committee look into possible college participation in a tuition exchange program. The committee is planning to meet with Carmelle Hardy to determine various legal aspects under our state supported system.

Several committee members provided hors d'oeuvres for the sherry hour following faculty meetings.

Susan Prasak, Chair
Report from The Honors Program Committee

The major items of business for the Honors Program Committee this semester have been:

I. Course Selection. The following courses have been approved for 1982-83:

Year Long Courses
Honors English Bishop Hunt
Honors Calculus Bob Mignone
Honors Western Civilization John Newell, David Koval & Jim Abbott

Fall Only
Honors Chemistry Frank Kinard & Betsy Martin
English and French Romanticism Andree Parrott & Bill Bradford
Senior Honors Seminar Skip Godow

Spring Only
Twentieth Century Existential Thought Marty Perlmuter & Beatrice Stiglitz
Political, Economic, and Bureaucratic Thought Fred Carter & David Mann

II. Selection of the Honors Program freshman class for next fall. A comparison of this year’s applications for the Honors Program with last year’s shows an increase in all of the following categories: (1) number of applications, (2) those with SAT scores above 1200, (3) valedictorians, (4) those in the top 2% of their high school classes, and (5) out of state applicants. The one discouraging note is that this year there were fewer students with very, very high SAT’s (i.e., 1350 and above).

Of the 75 applicants, 45 were accepted for admission with the hopes that approximately 35 would enroll in the fall. As of now, we expect 36 students whose average SAT verbal score is 600 (compared to 631 last year), whose average SAT math score is 618 (compared to 617 last year), and whose median range in class is the top 1.7% (compared to 2.1% last year). Although the average combined SAT score has decreased, perhaps the most significant fact of all is that some of the students who were not accepted this year would have been accepted in past years.

III. Evaluation Procedures. The Committee has written a detailed schedule for evaluating the Honors Program over the next few years. An evaluation team consisting of Bill Bischoff, Larry Carlson, John Dunkelberg (Chairman), Harry Freeman, Bill Lindstrom, and Susie Olsen (student) has been selected by the Academic Vice President to devise instruments for evaluating the program, to gather data, and to make a report to the faculty.

IV. Admission Procedures. A subcommittee consisting of David Koval and Jim Smiley has revised both the application form and the required student essay in order to provide the committee with better information when making its admissions decisions. Action on this will be taken at the Committee’s last meeting of this semester.

V. Student Review. Also to be done this semester is the annual review of all students in the Honors Program to determine which students will be dropped from the Honors Program for failing to meet the program's academic standards.

Rew A. Godow, Jr.

BUDGETSPEAK

REPORT FROM THE BUDGET REVIEW AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

In this, the final BRPC report of the academic year, I shall attempt to do three things: (1) to summarize briefly what we have done over this year; (2) to suggest some things that we might do next year; and (3) to share my reflections on how well the experiment seems to be working out.
(1) What we did this year was not as much as we should have done (see (3) below), but is not a total discouragement either as a beginning. First semester was taken up with preparing a working definition of the mission of the College, getting a clear picture of the desirable "areas of activity" and setting these activities into order priority, i.e., in order of relative importance or "centrality", as it is sometimes called in the literature, to the mission of the College. Each vice president supplied a list of activities which supervised and their costs—information which turned out to be surprisingly difficult to gather in some instances—and the committee discussed with each vice president these activities. When we all felt that we were reasonably able to do so, each BRPC member assigned a priority to each activity, ranging from "1" (absolutely essential to the mission) to "4" (not contributing to the mission). Averaging individual ratings and ranking-ordering the averages produced the "Master Priority List" for the College, which we had agreed would guide us in making budgetary recommendations to the President. By the Christmas holidays the committee had ready the list of 1981-82 objectives and suggestions for immediate action, which was published earlier, and all except one of which President Collins approved and issued written instructions to have implemented. The committee was then asked to make specific recommendations to achieve a $244,299 budget cut mandated by the State Budget and Control Board in midyear. As BRPC discovered just how hard selecting items for deletion can be, particularly when jobs real people are involved, but the assignment was carried out, using the Master Priority List as a guide. You will recall that the Council of Presidents was able to avoid making any cuts by assessing a tuition surcharge on students for second semester. First semester, then, an incredibly busy, and the members of the committee were left apparently too weary to dig with vigor when second semester began. Ten areas of College activity were selected for close study, but most of the subcommittees designated to undertake the studies missed their deadlines by a wide margin. To complicate things further, five members of the BRPC were also elected to serve on the Search Committee for the new position of Provost, and this led to various postponements of BRPC meetings. The upshot of this is that the committee accomplished slightly over half of its second semester goals. The most complicated of these was arriving at a budget for 1982-83, which we could agree to recommend to the President. That recommendation, numbered originally for mid-semester, should be handed to the President on the same day, as I turn in this report to you. As a part of it there will be a list of 53 items, which are inked-over for use by the President in making budget reductions as they are dictated. To sum up my reactions, then, first semester went well; second semester was seen as a lull across the mad flat.

(2) The committee has yet to decide precisely what its goals for 1982-83 will be. They insist, include those adopted but not accomplished this semester: development of a plan for determining proposed budgets by January 30th each year, development of a plan for implementing faculty objectives, and the drafting of a reorganization/reallocation continuity plan. In addition, I am asking each vice president, as we are organized now, to redefine his or her activities falling under his or her purview, arriving as we do this for more consistency and complementarity. The BRPC can construct a new and better Master Priority List at early in the fall. We shall then be able to get a much earlier start on setting yearly objectives and planning recommendations for the 1983-84 year. The topic of reorganization is in preparation to continue, but there is no doubt that by next year, given the fiscal climate and legislative mood in South Carolina, it will demand serious consideration.

(3) In some ways the experiment with a "consensual College community" committee has worked better than I expected, in some ways it has worked less well than I hope it eventually will. On the positive side, we have had thorough cooperation from President Collins, our Business Office, and the Institutional Research Office in obtaining all the information the committee has wanted; indeed, we have a good bushel of data, perhaps more than some of us expected. There has also been generally an air of collegiality in our meetings, despite the obvious potential for conflict when faculty, vice presidents, and the SCA President are dealing with such volatile issues as were our lot to address. There was only one shouting match at I can recall! Recommendations have, except for the one about midyear graduation and another about generating the college end-year funds for budget overages, been accepted by the President. On the negative side, there has been too much planning and too little action to determine by some committee members, occasionally too much relegating of mission and priorities to turf, and too little between-committee homework done by some of us. Of greatest concern to me is that in preparing our fiscal 1982-83 budget recommendations, the pie charts for 1982-83 will not look greatly different from those of 1981-82. Pleas for restorations frowned the priority list in the home stretch, and subcommittees tended to avoid hard recommendations affecting those whom they had learned as people in doing their studies. This was not mean that the BRPC might just as well have not been involved, for within the budget we did influence how College resources are to be used. It does mean that we have yet to face up to the imperative of reallocating resources in a way more consistent with our stated mission and priorities. Some of the BRPC members, like many faculty members, appear still to be in the "denial stage" where academic fiscal matters are concerned. We have postponed thereby some hard decisions that should have been made this year, decisions that could have made a real difference in our ability to provide an excellent instructional program. Finally, not with regret the behind-the-scenes sniping by some faculty members as a part of this work. That is to be expected, no doubt, but it did not boost our spirits as we attempted to serve the College community diligently and faithfully. While we learned to live with the sniping and cynicism, it did not help in our work, and it is my sincere hope that those colleagues whose real concerns will come to mind rather than settling for catharsis of criticism and gossip.
Presidential Decisions are about to make the most important decision so far in his tenure at the College. Who he chooses for Provost-Dean of the Faculty will very well determine our course for the next ten or twenty years.

At the beginning of the fall semester, additional pages of the Faculty and Administration Manual will be distributed to reflect all by-laws changes passed by the faculty this year and any administrative changes. I would think that one of the first orders of faculty business next semester would be to form an ad hoc committee to clear up some of the ambiguities in the wording of our current voting procedures.

The following faculty members have been nominated for the Distinguished Research Award: William Anderson, Michael Finefrock, William Gudger, Julian Harrison, Sam Hines, and Wayne Jordan.

The following faculty members have been nominated for the Distinguished Teaching Award: Virginia Benham, Robert Cross, John Newell, and Thomas Palmer.

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

The previous recipients of the awards are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Distinguished Research</th>
<th>Distinguished Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Glen Merrill</td>
<td>Andree Parrott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Herb Silverman</td>
<td>Carl Likes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Anna Katona</td>
<td>Susan Prazak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Diane Johnson</td>
<td>Sister Anne Francis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Ralph Melnick</td>
<td>William Moore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editor.

Professor Gibson
Chairman, Budget Review and Planning Committee

SPEAKEASY

My profound thanks go to those colleagues who have offered encouragement and advice as we on the BRPC worked at the tasks of the year, and especially to the members of the committee for putting up with my nagging, and for giving hour upon hour of their time to committee and subcommittee work. Let us not forget either that few faculties have been given the opportunity to participate so thoroughly in the budgeting and planning process, for which President Collins is due a particular expression of appreciation.

In conclusion, I would urge again that all of us, committee members, administrators, faculty, staff, and students look for the shared vision of a college that has clear definite laudable goals, and intense aspirations to recognize its full potential. If we are to enjoy significant success in the trying years ahead, that has to be the key to it.
I have additional copies of all back issues of Newspeak for any faculty or staff who would be interested in them. The complete two-volume set is now in the Special Collections section of our library.

Gennie Mann sent me a paper by Bruce D. Price entitled "Noun Overuse Phenomenon". The article appeared in Verbatim, the Language Quarterly, Vol. 11, No. 4 (February, 1976). She underlined the sentence "Newspeak was designated not to extend but to diminish the range of thought." The quote is from George Orwell, who was not referring to the faculty newsletter. The article by Price introduces the phrase Newspeak, the modern jargon, a blend of overspoken nouns by people who either have little to say and wish to add something or have something unsavory to say and wish to obfuscate through friendly camouflage.

Irony of the Month: If the percentage present of the entire faculty at the last faculty meeting had been no greater than the percentage present of those who were to receive pins and certificates for loyal and faithful service to the College, then we could have been unable to conduct business for lack of a quorum.

Prior to the election of new chairpersons for faculty committees, I heard a discussion minimizing the importance of the office because chairpersons have but one vote. A faculty member commented that "The chairman of my committee last year had a lot of power because she did most of the work." That is the best definition of "power" I have ever heard.

The following committees have met and elected officers for the coming academic year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Chairperson</th>
<th>Secretary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standards, Admissions &amp; Financial Assistance</td>
<td>Frank Morris</td>
<td>Jeffrey Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Academic Planning</td>
<td>George Pothering</td>
<td>Rosanne Wray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate &amp; Continuing Education</td>
<td>Susan Morrison</td>
<td>Libba Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance</td>
<td>Fred Ettline</td>
<td>Rose Hamm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Fred Carter</td>
<td>Mac Tennyson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>Susan Schenck</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs &amp; Athletics</td>
<td>Frank Knard</td>
<td>Julian Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>Elaine Simons</td>
<td>Marilyn Lewis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A meet the author autograph party for the budding local novelist Karina Alexis, author of Young Blood, will be held at the Book Bag on King Street sometime during the summer. Many of the sites and scenes of this Charleston-based allegedly fictional work may seem familiar in this novel of horror published by Tom Doherty Associates and distributed by Pinnacle Books. Karina Alexis is the thinly disguised pseudonym for our own Karina Strach.

EDITORIALS

Remembrances of Things Past

George Orwell began his essay Shooting an Elephant with "In Moulmein, in Lower Burma, I was hated by large numbers of people — the only time in my life that I have been important enough for this to happen to me." After serving as Speaker of the Faculty, I think I have a better idea of how George Orwell must have felt. I had originally planned to write of memorable events in the past two years for the College and for me as its speaker, but any such attempt would probably look more like my compendium on the best of Newspeak or, even worse, like a pre-summer rerun. Suffice it to say that many satisfactions and frustrations have provided me with the best of times and the worst of times, and certainly some of the most memorable times of my life. My current philosophical and reflective mood has inspired me to think and write about other experiences that have helped shape me. I am avoiding the standard culmination or fulfillment events — awards, degrees, etc. — that are supposed to be memorable. I prefer sharing with you some of the more spontaneous episodes that appeared insignificant at the time, and what I have learned from them. If this seems self-indulgent, which it is, it is because I would rather write a nostalgic than a controversial editorial in this final issue of Newspeak when there is no opportunity for rebuttal. I would also like to reveal my emotional side to colleagues in a profession that generally takes pride in its ability to maintain emotional detachment, especially doing so as a member of a discipline in which cool, dispassionate, critical, logical analysis is essential. So with some self-consciousness, I begin.
One of my earliest memories is of people known as "displaced persons" who moved into my 1947 neighborhood. Like many other five-year-olds, I enjoyed shooting a cap gun at friend and stranger alike — for the slightest, or even absence of, provocation. To the glee of my companions and me, the boys in this new family ran away crying whenever we shot. Overall, it was a nice place at the time. Nothing seemed as satisfying to a five-year-old as an ever-present ability to intimidate a pair of grown-up boys of seven and nine. The family moved shortly thereafter, but it wasn’t until several years later — upon being told of displaced relatives who had perished in a concentration camp — that I learned that these two, skinny boys who had been dragged themselves to one of the dreadful camps. The world and I were both much younger then. I had thought, as five-year-olds today do not, that only bad boys got hurt by guns. Still I knew even then that I was doing something wrong, though I was unaware of its magnitude or severity. Of the many metaphorical feet I have put in my mouth, this is the one I would most want to take back. I can only hope that these two boys, who I believe contributed significantly to my later pacifism, have suffered less from our exchange than I have. My thoughts were on them during a brief incarceration for protesting the Vietnam War.

When I was nine, my elementary school class took a trip to Fels Planetarium in Philadelphia to hear a lecture by someone we were told was a very famous scientist. When he finished his presentation and asked for questions, somnolence temporarily overcame my shyness. I wanted some perspective on this mysterious room that seemed to contain countless optical illusions. Wondering how many feet above the ground the planetarium ceiling was, I took a deep breath, cleared my throat, and said: "How high is the sky?" The famous scientist responded with laughter, which encouraged my classmates to join until the planetarium walls seemed to reverberate. When the ridicule had died down enough for all to hear his answer, he replied condescendingly that the sky was all around us — and quickly moved on to a question leaving my humiliation behind. It was at least a year before I made another inquiry in a group larger than five. I sometimes tell this story to individual students or to an entire class in order to show that I can empathize with their difficulties in asking questions and to encourage them to do so.

When I was ten, I dropped a quarter outside of Gene’s Candy Store. I was not about to give this precious gem up for lost, not even after twenty minutes of searching in the rain. I explained my story to kindly old Gene when he came out to inquire, whereupon he reentered the store and emerged to help me look. After about thirty seconds, he pointed to a quarter lying on the ground. My joy at this discovery forestalled my embarrassment about not having previously seen the quarter during my many searches of that area. It wasn’t until after that I realized what Gene had done and why he had done it the way he did. Had he merely handed me a quarter, either I would not have taken it, or would have felt guilty and indebted. Gene was charitable both in what he gave and how he gave it. Since then, some of my warmest and most fulfilling feelings were on those few occasions in which I have done a "Gene" for someone.

I learned a valuable lesson in a playground as an emotionally insecure pre-teen arriving to make a transition into what I perceived to be the mature, self-confident, popular world of teens. I was invited to buddy up with a girl I had met during a trip to a local carnival. One joke was about two climbers who reached the top of a mountain and decided to take a simultaneous picture. The first shouted to the second "Bare!", to which the second replied "No, television!" After the raucous laughter, accompanied by my chuckle, subsided, I gave a half-nod when asked if I got the joke. Another was about a girl who tripped and was asked by her boy friend the meaningful question "Pee?", to which she replied "No, well..." To camouflage my embarrassment about not having understood what I assumed to be obvious sexual innuendo that someone my age should have been able to appreciate, I laughed more enthusiastically at this joke. After several more, I began recognizing cues that signified when the jokes had ended and how heartily it was appropriate to laugh. Finally, they all looked at me, asked me to explain the jokes, and began to laugh. This time I got the joke, and realized it was me. From this experience I learned that hypocrisy is more shameful than ignorance, that the truth can set you free, and that I should never laugh at jokes I don’t understand.

There is a time to speak and a time to remain silent. About a dozen years ago, I spoke when I should not have and said nothing when I felt an apology to be inadequate. I was invited by friends to meet a couple of their friends, who I liked because they seemed to share with me a perverted sense of humor. When I was told that their baby was sleeping in the next room, I made the obligatory trip to take a look. He appeared ugly, but to me — an only child who had had little contact with infants — most looked ugly. So I purposely made the most trite remark I could think of: "He looks like a chip off the old block!" My father thought the baby was a Mongoloid, now called a Down’s baby, I laughed at what I believed to have been the type of humor I had heard from him. Earlier I noticed no one else was laughing as my friend was informing me that what was was clearly true. An embarrassed and strained silence was all I could muster. What I learned from this experience is that apparently not very many years ago, a colleague asked if I would teach one of his classes. I know he took his obligations too seriously to make this request lightly, but I nevertheless responded jokingly "Sure! I’ll take the day off to play golf, it’s all right with me." The following day I found out that his father had died. I hope subsequently to be more sensitive to sensitive situations.
Athletics has always been an integral part of my life. I stopped believing in a God who rewarded good and punished bad deeds when I recognized the impossibility of being a virtuous that He would provide me with a major league baseball career or so evil that He would deny me my only ambition. I realized in college that I did not have the ability to make professional baseball a career, but that life could still be worth living. That summer I became a counselor and coached the camp softball team. We spent several weeks trying to play a nearby "jock" camp that had beaten our camp 23 consecutive years. To everyone's surprise, we players played better than they had ever played before, and won a one-run. Excited, I telephoned the news of our victory prior to boarding the camp bus. We were greeted on our return by the entire camp, singing the camp song, which brought tears to almost all eyes on the bus. Looking back, I think the satisfaction I felt that by having worked hard to help others achieve their potential played a significant role in spurring me toward the teaching profession.

The final incident I wish to relate is the 1978 San Francisco Marathon. I was doing more research and casual jogging at the University of California that summer, when I decided to commit myself to run my first 26.2 mile marathon in a hilly region 3000 miles from home all alone. To complete the marathon, I had to spend myself physically, emotionally, and mentally. What distinguished this accomplishment from most of my others was the required self-reliance and independence. Degrees, publications, awards, even the no-hitter I pitched in high school, were comparative or required approval of others or relied on the weaknesses of others. I ran the marathon for and by myself. What made me feel even better was that I felt good about finishing in 1628th place out of about 2900 runners. Too frequently I have confused doing what I did well with doing what I enjoyed doing. It was nice to not mind being in the bottom half and to not feel the necessity to compete with others in the midst of a competition.

Writing and thinking about and exposing some of my highlights (and lowlights) has provided me with an emotional catharsis and insights into myself—a satisfying, inexpensive form of self-therapy. Its appearance here is partly to show my peers a different side of me, partly out of sheer egoism, and partly to furnish a sentimental finale to my weekly blendings of the personal and professional—as I have to some extent been doing through Newspeak these past two years. I would urge my colleagues to take the time to perform, though not necessarily publish, their own catharsis through reflections on important life experiences. As educators of ourselves and others, we must continually take the advice of the philosopher Plotarch to "Know Thyself!"
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Why, one may ask, should acknowledgments be in an editorial? Because I would like to only to mention a few of the many people who deserve mention, but to discuss the process of acknowledging. I feel somewhat uneasy, though not as much as I used to, when either to give or accept praise. I tend to focus more on what must be done than on what has been done, on what has been done poorly than on what has been done well, and on motivating group criticisms than through compliments.

I don't think I am alone in my penchant for encouraging, praising, and thanking the past those whom I like and respect the most. I am more comfortable and feel I am performing a more worthwhile service when I am analyzing, dissecting, and judging than when I am merely complimenting. A component of lavish praise is the surprise factor—that the praised was able to do what the praiser did not think or expect the praised capable of doing. I received more compliments for my first issue of Newspeak than for any other free combined. After 16 issues of almost 250 pages containing 33 editorials and about 20 letters, the first and shortest issue of 11 pages was, I believe, the worst. I display no appreciation for a A student who earns a B than for an A student who attains a A. Whether we admit it or not, the sounds of silent respect are not as satisfying as spoken regard. I cannot possibly mention all who helped me in my two years as Speaker, for all the times I have been helped by the people I do mention. To those who undeservedly feel left out, please accept my apologies and assume it to be my way of showing respect for you.

I must begin with Gerald Gibson, not only because he is the ace reporter for Newspeak but because I feel no one has worked harder at or for the College this past year. In addition to continuing with his departmental duties, he assumed the chairmanship of the Budget Committee, educated himself and others on the budgetary process, tried to be creative when called for, did the drudgery when necessary, and was always fair. In addition to his numerous institutional duties, Brian W Jesselink assumed the chairmanship of the other important committee—the Provost Search Committee—and worked hard and far above. Our players were also working hard, and the 268 applicants and helping to reduce the field to the few fine ones who have visited the campus. The work of these two committees, led by Gerald and Brian, will have an impact on the institution for many years to come.
Thanks to Hugh Haysworth, who assumed the difficult position of interim Academic Vice President for one semester and is doing the best job he knows how to do. Thanks to Ed Collins for his patience with my nagging and tactlessness. Thanks to Jack Revan for the direction he has provided for the College. Thanks to all vice presidents and other administrators who have become accustomed to hearing my complaints when something goes wrong and my silence when something goes right. Thanks to Betty Craig and Mildred Donaldson, who know more about the College and how to keep it from disarray than most in more glamorous administrative posts. Thanks to Jim Abbott and Frank Petrusak, who have spent hours with me and my problems. And, thank you, to those who have helped maintain the College and to those who have helped maintain the College and to those who have helped maintain the College and to those who have helped maintain the College.

I would like to express my appreciation to all who contributed letters and pieces of information to Newsspeak and those who suggested items to write about or investigate. I am grateful to Anne Harris, Susan Jones, Emmy Mack, and Cindy Stanko for typing various issues of Newsspeak. I would like to thank Marilyn Lewis for her help in editing and proofreading most of the issues and for her friendship, support, and encouragement during some of the darkest moments of my speakership. Credit must also be given to David Hunter, Caroline Meyer, Kenny Nichols, and Forrest Reeves — the often beleaguered members of the Print Shop. When I have given enough advance notice as to when Newsspeak would be delivered and worked with them on a reasonable completion time, they have honored their commitments and met the deadlines. Finally, I would like to thank all who are reading this for affording me the opportunity to serve you these past two years.

One of the reasons these acknowledgments are not at the end is that I hate to end and am uncomfortable with goodbyes. Yet there is a time to write and a time to stop writing. That time for me has come. Letters to the Editor, the final and most essential section, has always provided a forum for faculty to rise and discuss issues, disseminate information, express concerns, and exchange ideas. It also furnishes us with a fitting finale.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Herb,

Thank you for urging me to make my first contribution to Newsspeak. Since my duties as Speaker of the Faculty for next year have descended rather unexpectedly, I have not been fashioning a platform so that upon election it might be proclaimed. All have certainly lamented the impasse into which the faculty had slid during the March meeting. That deadlock had to end—and quickly. Furthermore, it seemed my duty to try to become the agent for compromise and reconciliation.

What should be the Speaker's role? He has, in my conception, at least four important responsibilities:

1. He is the representative and spokesman of the faculty with administrators and trustees. While he must present to these authorities the faculty case on certain issues, he should be sensitive to the needs of the entire institution. In a time of shrinking budgets, it is clear that the faculty will not receive all that it requests. To gratify the faculty in this regard would probably mean the abandonment of the remedial and supportive services which are necessary to assist the marginal student and to soften the more impersonal aspects of campus life that have come with our physical growth.

2. The Speaker is a mediator among the various constituents of the College. This function is most essential within the faculty in order that the tendency toward factionalism may be abated. If not entirely arrested. Since professors, by definition, are those who think otherwise, it is utopian to suppose that a faculty will conduct its affairs in perfect harmony. If we have too much of that, one of our fears, college will be on its feet to castigate us for being inert, spineless, and feckless. That we really seek, I believe, is debate that is reasoned and civil, with the ultimate end being the good of the College and the students we serve. As a mediator, the Speaker performs a role analogous to that of the diplomat: he tries to keep everything he can to prevent "minor differences" from swelling into "irreconcilable conflicts over principle."
(3) He is a moderator for faculty meetings, one who may facilitate the dispense of our academic business. During my sixteen years at the college, I have emerged from some faculty convocations feeling as though I had just come from the circus. Indeed, if we could charge the animals to watch us, we might tap a lucrative source for the scholarship fund. Yet our theater of the absurd is one of the risks of the general faculty meeting. Not many of us really care to abandon our version of Athenian Democracy. What usually ties us into knots is our proclivity to write legislation on the floor of the faculty when someone disapproves of the intent or the wording of a proposed measure. Perhaps we need to ask those who desire alterations to commit the Speaker so that we can reduce the number of amendments to amendments that tend to enunciate proposals.

(4) The Speaker is a compiler and disseminator of information useful or essential for faculty planning and decision. Newspeak has been a valuable instrument for this purpose, providing a forum for issues or questions of common concern. It is also the ideal place for the various reports that our officers and committees are required to submit at the close of semesters. I have been uncomfortable, however, with the allusion to Orwell's 1984 and should prefer a title more descriptive and less ironic. Nevertheless, by whatever name it may be given, this paper deserves to be continued. It has acquired the same familiar place in our box as the great metropolitan daily that thunders upon our front porch.

What is my conception of the faculty's task? I assume that most of our colleagues, in following the life of teaching and scholarship, acted upon two essential premises: devotion to a chosen discipline and pleasure in explaining its fundamental elements. Beyond this, we must be men and women who will encourage our students to cultivate a permanent relationship to learning. Here we see the purpose of faculty scholarship in its broadest sense: to keep the instructor's mind alive and his teaching stimulating. Moreover, we should be exemplars of the humanistic values, reminding our students through our teaching and our conduct that man does not live by bread alone. We must be quiet but firm defenders of high academic standards, inculcating thereby a sense of good craftsmanship which is indispensable to self-esteem. Finally, we need to deepen our appreciation of one another as colleagues in a common venture. This would merely foster our sense of community and encourage what Mary Ellen Chase aptly called "a goodly fellowship." Best these observations be dismissed as irrelevant. I should add that worthy ideals are not merely for the young; they also help to protect the mature from cynicism, that most corrosive human disease.

When our private vocations shall end, as eventually they must, may each be able to say that his work was nobly conceived and faithfully done.

Sincerely,

Malcolm Clark

Dear Herb,

You have asked for a letter to serve as an exit interview of sorts as the semester draws to a close. I should observe that when you first requested the letter three weeks ago, I had served less than three months in the position of academic vice president so a recap of my accomplishments in this office would be presumptuous. Instead, I would like to share a few thoughts on our future.

We find ourselves facing a time of dwindling financial resources as well as a declining student population. The primary financial support for the institution has come from the state and from federal grants. The state is facing a sixty million dollar deficit and is rated as one of the twelve worst states in which to find a job and the federal government has eliminated or severely cut many programs which once provided support to the faculty and students alike. At the same time we face a declining number of eighteen to twenty-two year olds which implies a decline in the size of our student body. Clearly we must plan for our future in order to maintain our budget and our student body. The economy, while providing a poor financial position for the College, does provide the mixed blessing of more students, as young adults who are unable to work will attend college. Since funds are tight, the college selected is likely to be a public institution. While this may not fully explain the increase, it is the case that we are ahead of last year's pace in terms of accepting new students.

For the future we will need to broaden our student base, develop new sources of financial support and better utilize the financial support we have. Toward these ends the upcoming self-study should help us in the planning process, which must include individual, departmental, and institutional directions. The following is a shopping list of topics which relate to the three needs mentioned above. No significance is implied by the order.
1) Develop contacts with business and industry. These contacts can lead to financial support, positions for our graduates, a large pool of students for our continuing education program and opportunities for faculty development such as summer internships.

2) Continue to develop interdisciplinary programs such as the Honors Program and courses taught in Mayester and the International program. The exchange and integration of ideas across departmental lines serves to counteract the ivory tower image and provides an uncommon opportunity for learning.

3) Restrict the number of majors in some departments as well as the enrollment in the College. Both ideas have been tried elsewhere with good results. Without some restrictions, over-subscribed departments such as business administration find it increasingly difficult to serve the needs of their majors.

4) Develop strong technologically or scientifically oriented programs such as computer science and geology to attract technologically oriented students. We lose a large segment of bright students to engineering schools. By offering a three-two engineering program and some technologically oriented majors, we attract a number of those students to the College.

5) Develop a network of ties between the liberal arts departments and the community. Majors should tie their college experience to the real world through a "capstone" course or an internship in the senior year.

6) Recognize the education and business administration departments as important links with the community. Their students are recruited on campus, whereas most other majors must search for a job. Our students recognize the utility of majoring in these areas as evidenced by the majors of the graduating seniors. We can develop community links with other departments, through these departments as well as the Center for Metropolitan Affairs and the fine arts department.

7) Build or our strengths as students look for quality programs. If we have a plethora of poorly defined programs with a junkyard curriculum, students will go elsewhere. Each department must decide what they can do well, using the faculty they have. We should streamline the curriculum to allow better planning and to emphasize identified strengths.

8) Work with the high schools to streamline their college preparatory curriculum. Whenever appropriate, replace advanced placement courses taught on the high school campus with college work taught at the College.

9) Strengthen the Charleston Higher Education Consortium and our relationship with the other institutions in the area as a way to better use resources. This includes ideas such as cross-listing departmental offerings; planning and advertising summer session offerings jointly; using a common motor pool, security force, or computer facility; and joint appointments for faculty.

10) Continue to provide opportunities for faculty development. Some ideas are the joint appointments which cut across disciplines, external activities which lead to faculty development such as consulting or summer internships, with business faculty partnerships formed between mature faculty and first-year faculty, and College internships which allow faculty to pursue some administrative or service interest.

11) Implement minors or areas of concentration which may be either departmental or topical in nature.

12) Aggressively pursue external funding for academic programs, academic equipment, faculty development funds, and faculty salaries. With the elimination of various government programs and lean budgets from the state, it is imperative that we apply for grants through private foundations, the remaining federal programs and business and industry.

Over the next several years we will put considerable effort into committee work as part of the self-study. As part of the self-study we will need to clarify our mission, to decide what we are about. The future for the College promises to be challenging and the next few years will be crucial. I have no doubt in our ability to successfully meet the challenge.

W. Hugh Haynsworth
Academic Vice President
Dear Herb:

The recent decision not to name the Education Building for Septima Clark, a leading Charleston educator, as recommended unanimously by the Faculty has distressed a significant number of our colleagues. While upsetting, it was not unpredictable, given the history of naming at the College. Not to beat the subject to death, I thought it might be somewhat enlightening to discuss a few other cases.

Maybank Hall is named for the late U.S. Senator Burnet Rhett Maybank. A staunch believer in state's rights and the racial status quo of mid-twentieth century America, he held an equally negative view on the question of immigration. Representing a most abhorrent brand of nativism in responding to several attempts to allow some of World War II's Displaced Persons into the United States (mostly the victims of the Holocaust), he wrote to a constituent in 1957, "We have too many foreigners here already and I think we should get rid of them rather than bring in additional ones."

George Grice, the recently lauded President of the College from 1945-1966, and the namesake of the Grice Marine Biological Laboratory, was instrumental in maintaining the color barrier policies of this institution. In July of 1956, the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare sent a letter to the College's students because of the school's refusal to comply with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Responding to this development, Grice sent the following memo to the Board of Trustees as his response regarding what the college can do to enhance its financial position with donors:

"by this I mean that it would be "bad" public relations to proclaim the College of Charleston as an 'all-white' school and, yet, it could work to our financial advantage to let our anti-integration friends know where we stand. This must be done subtly and we should not take a stand publicly which would adversely affect our appeals to foundations and large endowment sources... There probably will come a day when such a stand must be made. Until that time, we should continue our present course without fanfare... I feel that the College of Charleston should take advantage of this opportunity to attract financial support."

The College's attorney had advised that admissions materials be sent to blacks making inquiries before refusing to admit them, rather than handle their requests as Grice had planned. Grice advised against the sending of application blanks to those persons whom we know to be Negroes, because we know that hundreds of such persons will refuse such persons admission even though they academically qualified. I agreed that a catalogue should be sent to any inquirer. The applicant for the 1965 Summer Session from State College at Orangeburg is probably qualified for admission. Our Summer Session admissions policies are much more liberal and elastic than our regular session policy. This is true because the Summer Session is a service semester and does not necessarily involve candidates for degree. In general, an applicant need only be a student in good standing at his parent institution. Accordingly, I am recommending a direct confrontation with this applicant, on the grounds of his application for the Summer Session of 1965. If this refusal is challenged in the courts - so be it. I assume we will pursue the matter until the courts "hold for the defendant" and affirm our status as a private institution. In the event of a plaintiff's decision, I assume that we will keep up the legal battle until "we run out of courts." Then we will be "between the rock and the hard place"... An integrated College of Charleston (no matter how token) will experience a not-too-slow death... While a segregated College of Charleston will live and grow and continue into the future serving the Low Country as we have done for almost 200 years.

A year later, on July 11, 1966, following continued economic hardship and the real threat of losing a significant number of students due to a lack of financial assistance, the board voted to sign the compliance documents.

WHEREAS the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston after long and careful deliberation is now convinced in the light of recent events that the best interest of the institution can only be served by complying with the requirements of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; NOW, THEREFORE, The Board of Trustees adopts as a matter of policy the position that it will comply effectively immediately with the requirements of Title IV...

Last Grice be seen as a victim of his times, rather than one of the moving forces behind them, it should be noted that in 1955, he was a founding member of the South Carolina Committee of 52, the umbrella organization of the state's Citizens Councils; in 1960, he was a founding member and first president of Charleston Alert, a politically right-wing group; and in 1966, he became the District Leader or Committeeman for H.L. Hunt's Youth Speaks organization.
Regarding the name of Thaddeus Street as a poor choice for the Education Building, it should be pointed out that Mr. Street joined the Board of Trustees at the point when the City of Charleston found it too hot politically to retain ownership of the segregated College and returned it to private ownership. Thaddeus Street served on the board all through this hold-fast period, eventually becoming its president and the one empowered by the Board to sign the compliance document. In refusing to sign a year earlier, the board released the following statement, an official acknowledgment of the agreement with the segregationists stand taken by Dr. Rice with their approval:

The College of Charleston is a private institution. Its Board of Trustees, upon whom rests the responsibility of determining the policies of the institution, has decided that at this time to sign the compliance statement would not be in the best interest of the College. The proposed statement purports to bind not only the present Board, but also its successors, transferees and assignees. The members of the present Board sit the policy of the College according to their best judgment. They will not surrender that right and duty to any other agency, nor will they presume to bind their successors in such matters.

A year later, they changed their minds and committed the future to an idea new to the nearly 200 year old institution.

Not to undercut Clarence Davis's excellent suggestion of a Denmark Vesey Hall, I would like to present a different choice to our Board, particularly since they seem desirous of choosing names from among those individuals having long-term associations with the College. These names are, in fact, out of the period that ended with the 1980s signing. They are Old Tom (late 19th century) and Venerable Robert (early 20th century), custodians of the College's facilities, the truly unsung helpers of our students of the past, individuals who made the lives of others more pleasant than they might otherwise have been. At least one of the two deserves immortalization -- either as Old Tom Hall or Venerable Robert Hall. I realize that I have not supplied their last names, but then, in keeping with the spirit of this earlier period, they were not recorded in the brief mention made of them in the College's records.

Of Robert, the 1930 College Yearbook noted, in passing, that he enjoyed the private confidence of the students and the faculty alike. Robert, by his peculiar position, knows more intimate details about the College than any other living person. A large part of his knowledge is, as Robert says, unprintable, for "the gentlemen wouldn't like it now."

Those familiar with regional history should make special note of a particular usage of the word peculiar at this institution as late as 1930.

What I have written above might be considered by some as knowledge that was "unprintable" and best left unsaid, things of which "gentlemen" do not speak. But in the same article that referred to Robert as the "venerable college janitor," the following passage is found:

A student's life at the College is but a brief period during which he pauses, imbues the heritage of knowledge, of culture, and of tradition, built up by previous generations, and then departs. I hope that our students do not depart with the apparent lesson taught by the names placed upon many of our buildings.

Sincerely,

Ralph Melnick

Dear Herb,

Having recently attended a faculty meeting where the issue of the length of the term of service for department chairman was brought up, and having just a few minutes ago read George Hopkins' comments on this subject, I want to offer some comments of my own. Because I have been a department chairman for most of my professional life, I am open to charges of bias in this matter, but I would also claim that I am as much in a position to assert what connection there is between the term of service of a chairman and how well that chairman's job can be done as anyone around.

The ad hoc committee to which George referred, I chaired, and I had much to do with the inclusion of the change that people have chosen to get exercised about (some people, anyway) in the recommendation list approved by President Collins, although that recommendation, like all the others, represented the majority opinion of the committee, not just my own views. It is too bad that our full report to the President never was circulated to all of the faculty, for the intention of the committee was to address all of the problems that we had become aware of through experience having to do with evaluation, tenure, and promotion, and the list of recommendations was intended to comprise a comprehensive "program," if you will, that would remedy these perceived problems.
A very fundamental problem that we saw was that in many instances chairmen were not being candid at evaluation time. Certainly we were not assuming any kind of "mentor" role with regard to faculty development, even though chairmen were charged under the law with serving in this role. We felt that any sensible, effective system that would lead to a strong, productive college would have to involve faculty evaluation in the future. Frank evaluations of faculty by chairmen. The chairman is, after all, whether we or anyone else might think that would work in a traditional setting, can't think of a better one at the moment) capacity where his position at the college and making salary recommendations. To ask someone to do this kind of administrative work, which is no longer plain and making unpleasant decisions which must be communicated unambiguously, with the knowledge of a temporary position—no only temporary, but more to the point, rigidly defined—is silly from the committee report. Critical to the efficacy of the chairmen as counselors to develop or college as the perception of the chairmanship position on the part of faculty and, indeed, of the chairmen themselves. Those appointed chairmen will, ideally, be people who have the confidence of both the departmental faculty and the college administration. It is, however, probably overly idealistic to expect in all departments majorities such as charisma and craft would be needed to shape effectively the professional growth of entire departments by personal persuasion alone. A balance needs to be struck between establishing in the departments the academic equivalent of formal baronies and defining the chairmanship position so weakly as to guarantee a perpetual lame duck status to the chairman. (The change to an unified term for chairman, along with periodic evaluations of them) should protect against the danger of departmental dominance in perpetuity by insensitive or incompetent chairmen, while granting those accepting the chairmanship position the authority to meet what have become substantial responsibilities. I would in-vote a cogent rebukal of that argument.

It is peculiar to me that in an institution where the chairmanship calls for the making of administrative and educational decisions that affect people's pocketbooks, anyone would imagine that a rotational chairmanship is the best kind of a system to invite all sorts of abuses and intrigue. Further, if the chairmanship calls for someone to serve as something more than a secretary, it seems peculiar to want the position to be one in which someone who need only be tolerated or manipulated for a fixed period, rather than someone who will learn the job thoroughly, do it enthusiastically, and be viewed as responsible for seeing that what needs doing gets done. I cite different example, in my naive youth I thought that every able-bodied man had to serve in the military service, and so took R.O.T.C. in college. One of the worst experiences of my life was attending R.O.T.C. camp at Fort Benning, and the worst sub-experience while there was being Company-Commander-for-a-Day. In contrast to a real Company Commander, one who might win a battle with a company of loyal and competent soldiers, a Company-Commander-for-a-Day simply took on the nominal chores, the less important responsibilities of the tactical officer. He never had to plan. He never had to fight or win a battle. He just had to get through the day. That's how I see the chairmanship in an institution where the tour is fixed.

Historically there have been two views of the position of chairman, either as the head of the department or as a glorified secretary. In the former case, terms of duty are not fixed; in the latter they are. In the latter case, they are usually in institutions some form of "power" or office on campus. This is how we originally began the policy of rotating chairmen on this campus during the Nested-Wobble regime, when the first order of business was to allow them to dislodge or to get them to stay, perhaps in that order. In fact, if was a guise for assuring tyranny, as it was demonstrated when one of the department head who would not be a chairman unacceptable to the president. My experience tells me that the best protection a department can have from administrative tyranny is a chairman whose term is not fixed, provided that call is independent of others, aggressive in protecting the rights of his department members, and brave enough to risk being removed when there is a lack of horns with the administration. The latter course is only necessary when a matter of principle is at stake and reasoned debate with the administration fails, a situation which I have faced only a few times in the years I have chaired the Chemistry Department. In institutions with which I was associated or familiar before coming to the College of Charleston, the chairmen was always seen as the department head. I was considerably surprised to discover that some- one to me that (a) when transferred to the administration authority that properly belongs with the faculty—and I believe that chairmen always identify with the faculty and repre- sent them rather faithfully to the administration; and (b) it weakens the strong principle of the "front line units" of the college, which I consider to be more crucial in determining the quality of college we shall have than anything that those paid administrative salaries—those usually referred to as "the administration." The sole advantage that I see anyone ever gains in adopting the fixed-term policy is to make it easy to rid of a chairman without confrontation, something that admin- istrators who lack the stomach for decision making find attractive, but one which those who are willing to staff positions when they are applied for are not willing to swap for the certain loss of good and effective chairmen along with the not-so-good.
All of us are influenced in what we would advocate as standard policy by our personal experiences and, often, current situations. That is, if we are unhappy with the current chairman or have had some unpleasant experience with a past one, we may be tempted to opt for a change in the chairmanship role, one with a fixed term, for this will (we think)

assure us that we need abide a given chairman for no more than a known constant. In fact, my experience has been that when the administration wants to keep a given chairman badly enough, no amount of "voting" in the department prevents his retention. And when the administration wants not to have a given individual serve as chairman, democracy also is set aside for the moment. (I am speaking here in general terms, not about any particular administrator.) So let us not imagine that former administrations which advertised "democracy" in the selection of the chairman of a department were practicing truth in advertising. Let us not imagine either that surgery is ever best done with a hatchet when poor chairmen are being excised any more than it is when pruning off inadequate faculty at tenure-decision time. The best interests of the faculty, the departments, and the College are best served, I would submit, by a policy that restricts for the wielding of a scalpel by a competent pathologist. Surgeon, one who has consulted with other "experts" (department members, the Academic Vice President), but who recognizes that good administration at the departmental level is ultimately his, the surgeon's, responsibility, and that the best way to assure this is to assure that the chairmen are the best that he can find, regardless of race, color, religion, or creed. What I am advocating here, then, is simply that our guiding principle, whether deciding on tenure, promotion, budget allocations, or terms for chairmen (plus any number of other decisions that must be made on that list), be that of rational discrimination: judgments based on facts. It strikes me as strange indeed, a profound puzzle, that a faculty member would support and practice the use of this principle in nearly every area except that of the departmental chairmanship. Why is it any more logical to appoint chairmen for fixed terms than, say, academic vice presidents, presidents—or faculty members? New blood? That's the same cliché as is used by administrators who would do away with tenure for faculty, and clearly applies just as aptly (which I would claim is not very) to any other position on campus. There certainly should be no stigma attached to a chairman's stepping down from the position (if "down" is where he is stepping), but neither should there be an automatic removal of a chairman who likes his work and is doing it well. This latter point is one that the current policy guarantees will be examined at regular intervals; if the work is not being done well, a hard decision is called for, to be sure. But hard decisions are part of our business, whether we are grading student papers, writing evaluations of our colleagues, helping select a Provost, or any number of other things. The important duty we have is to assure that they are made as objectively and rationally as possible.

To those who will dismiss what is said above as a defense constructed by a long-time chairman to protect his position, I say simply this: I think you are mistaken, although I am not optimistic about convincing you of the error of your ways in light of the depth of my feeling on this subject is affected by the obvious injustice I could see being done if asked to give up the chairmanship for no reason better than years of service, but I sincerely believe not only that my reason for my feeling and for my being a long-time chairman is valid, but also one with which a majority of that ad hoc committee agreed on the grounds that it was central to purposes served by having a sound system of faculty evaluation.

Sincerely,

Gerald Gibson

Dear Herb,

We didn't walk out of the faculty meeting in an attempt to subvert the democratic process, nor in a childish refusal to lose gracefully a term in protest of an undemocratic attempt to push through an illegal procedure, and to indicate that we did not wish to take part in an improper election.

Before the vote on the amendment, the question was asked, "If this amendment passes, will it affect this year's election of the Speaker?" Your answer was clear and unambiguous, "No, the amendment will go into effect next year." It was on the understanding that this was a ruling from the Chair and, and others that have questioned, voted for the amendment. Had you ruled otherwise, our vote would have been against the amendment.

After the amendment had passed, the question was again raised about its application to the on-going election. At that time you responded, "No, it does not apply to the current election!" It is unfortunate that your first answer was not recorded in the minutes. That it was not, coupled with the lack of standard procedure in initiating the election, coupled with the attitude of the Speaker when reading the results of the first ballot (you asked him to read the names of the candidates, but, surely, there was no requirement to immortalize nonsense), coupled with the refusal to consider the question raised about the legality of the first ballot, coupled with various attempts from the floor to circumvent the rules of proper procedure, led to an inescapable impression that this election was not being taken seriously, and that a clique would take advantage of this to push through their own views, regardless of propriety.
Who the Speaker of the Faculty is, is of relatively little importance. How that Speaker is elected is of the utmost importance to our future integrity. While it is regrettable that we were presented with only one nominee, once that was an accomplished fact, the faculty had only two alternatives: to vote for the nominee, or to write in the name of a person with the qualifications listed in the by-laws. To vote for a faculty member without these qualifications indicates an ignorance that should have been enlightened by the Parliamentarian; to vote for Mickey Mouse indicates a levity and disrespect that should have been curbed by the Speaker.

Finally, to decide the essential point of whether or not there had been a ruling from the Chair that the amendment did not go into effect this year by a casual declaration that the unresolved election was over and that we would now have a new election under new rules, was entirely improper. It was at this point, you may recall, that Dr. Heltni rose and left the room, followed by half of the faculty that also found themselves offended.

To say that we left because we could not have our choice is to ascribe to us a childishness that would be better placed on those unwilling to accept the standing laws of the faculty. Even though a majority objects to the results of a law, the law may not be broken in protest. To do so is not democratic rule, but sub-rule.

In point of fact, Nam Morrison was not my choice. I disagree with her on many of the points she raised in her letter. None the less, I voted for her because I had no proper and effective alternative, and because I think the process more important than the person. I shall support Malcolm Clark, but for the first time, as student, alumna, and faculty member, I am ashamed of the College.

I do agree that a good tape recorder should be obtained to assist the Secretary in recording minutes. I also suggest that in any controversial balloting in the future, elections or bylaw changes, a roll call vote or some other method of identifying qualified voters be employed.

Dear Herb,

I am sorry this information arrived too late for the SPEAKEASY section, but appreciate the opportunity to submit it in letter to the editor form. The Education Department wanted to share information with your readers on two important, recent events.

First, Memminger Elementary School has won a "Palmetto's Finest" award from the S.C. Association of Elementary and Middle School Principals. Three awards were given this year, one each to an elementary and middle school in Greenville, and the one to Memminger School. This is the first time a Charleston County school has received the award. For the past several years the Education Department has been extensively involved at Memminger. Education majors work in practicum and student teaching assignments, and since last year have been active in the SEEK program. That program, under the direction of Ken Bower is regarded as a significant addition to the Memminger curriculum and as a valuable experience for participating college students.

Also, Education majors did exceptionally well this past year on the National Teachers' Examination. For example, five graduating seniors scored in the 99th percentile on the test. Again, this is the first time anyone can recall such an achievement. We are extremely pleased that these accomplishments reflect favorably on the Education Department and the College.

Sincerely,

Ed Lawton
The objective of this letter is to inform the faculty on matters regarding waiving academic requirements for students suffering from handicaps, disabilities or learning impairments. In 1973, the U.S. Congress passed legislation called the Rehabilitation Act. It mandates to institutions of higher learning certain standards governing the accommodation of programs to students with physical or learning disabilities.

Known as "Section 504," this legislation requires that colleges and universities which receive federal government assistance not discriminate against students with handicaps, disabilities or learning impairments. Specifically, programs which are available to the general student population must be made available to those students with special needs. Access to buildings, campus activities and campus facilities are included. These mandates specify further that no student may be discriminated against on the basis of handicap in admission to any academic program of instruction.

In other words, THE LEGISLATION SPECIFIES THAT ACADEMIC STANDARDS NOT BE LOWERED OR REQUIREMENTS WAIVED. Disabled students are required to take all courses to complete the general college degree. If the student's disability prevents him or her from, for example, taking exams in the conventional fashion, it is the mutual responsibility of the student and faculty member at the beginning of the semester to agree upon a comparable standard on which the student will be evaluated. Situations may arise where an adjustment seems to be the most viable option; e.g., physical therapy replacing tennis. "504" urges most strongly that the handicapped, disabled or learning impaired student must have the same opportunity to obtain an undiluted college degree as any other student. It is incumbent upon all concerned that the student's work be assessed according to his or her true ability rather than the disability.

Last fall, the Human Relations Officer, Dr. Roy Jones, and I conducted an evening workshop on this subject. Approximately twenty faculty and staff attended. We are the "contact persons" at the College in this area. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to notify us and we will be of assistance.

David S. Mann
Political Science

I wanted to write this article for three reasons:

1. To call attention to the beleaguered department chairman on this campus, in this, their busiest year.
2. To thank Herb Silverman for his example and service to us as Speaker.
3. To urge the faculty to continue to utilize this forum which Herb instituted, Newspeak.

Thanks, Herb, and I wish I had time to elaborate.

Dear Herb,

It was most thoughtful of you to extend to me the opportunity of expressing through Newspeak some parting thoughts relative to my approaching retirement.

Needless to say, that both as an alumnus and as a member of the faculty, my years at the College have been most rewarding and filled with pleasant memories. I will miss it all very much, particularly the teaching and the association with colleagues and students. I do regret that with the rapid growth in the size of the College, coupled with other factors, it was not my privilege to become better acquainted with so many members of the staff and faculty. However, my devotion to the College will continue, and I will retire, not only with a deep sense of gratitude for all that it has meant to me, but also with very best wishes for its continued growth and for the welfare of all associated with it.

Most sincerely,

Carl J. Liles
Dear Herb,

When I first sat down to write this letter, I thought of it as a 'thanks and good wishes' letter to you on the occasion of your leaving the Speakership. Those thanks and good wishes still hold (you've done a great job, and we'll all miss you next year), but I'd like this letter to be something more - and I hope you won't mind my using Newspeak to say a few personal words to some very special people.

As lots of people probably know, I will most likely be leaving the College in July to work at Belmont Abbey College in North Carolina. Belmont Abbey is a Catholic school, and I've wanted for some time to be involved in Catholic higher education, so I'm very excited about the opportunity. On the other hand, moving to Belmont Abbey means leaving the College, and leaving many of the best friends I've ever had - I've got very mixed feelings about the whole thing.

I don't want to use your space to get sentimental about the past seven years, but I simply can't leave without saying thank you to all the people who have made those years so memorable and fulfilling. Apart from the joys of one's family, life's greatest blessing is to be given the chance to do meaningful work in the company of dedicated colleagues. I can never forget that the College of Charleston community (and it is a community, despite its occasional fissures) gave me the chance to experience that blessing.

Being one of your number has been a pleasure and an honor. I thank you for both.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Editor's Note: Under the capable leadership and direction of John Dempsey as its President, Belmont Abbey College is about to become the 'Notre Dame of the South'.

Dear Herb:

Everyone seeks to discover immortality. I am no exception. Thus this letter for the final issue of Newspeak. Of course, the constant persistence and annoyance of the editor in soliciting material provided some impetus for this decision.

When I asked the Editor for appropriate topics he suggested I write on racism at the College or on the leadership and effectiveness of the Board of Trustees or the President. The Editor is faithful to his commitment not to seek out or to create controversy. Dr. Silverman is a most subtle person.

However, I resisted the temptation to approach those topics. I am not qualified to make judgements on racism for if it is present on the campus, as I suspect, I am a part of it. Even as every attempt is made not to be. The Black experience, in my opinion, is difficult if not impossible for whites to understand or to appreciate fully. Perhaps all we can hope for is to be honest in our feelings about and consistent in our expectations of people. Not Black people or white people, but people.

Similarly, I am not qualified to judge the Board or the President, and to make comparisons on the quality or efficacy of their leadership. There are no doubt better boards and presidents and worse. The same can be said of vice presidents, faculty and even speakers. Perhaps with more certainty.

Having discussed the topics the editor has suggested, what remains? Only some brief observations.

We shall miss John Dempsey as a member of our College community. He has provided a sense of concern and compassion that united faculty, students and administration. A role he did not, I guess, create but one that was set around him. Colleges like ours need Dempseys.
We shall miss, I think, NEWSPEAK. I am somewhat more certain of my position on the former than on the latter. Nonetheless, the tour de force of Dr. Silverman's sheet was appreciated by many. Each issue has given us material for provocative discussion. Some hope that the editor will use his sabbatical for work in journalism, creative writing and communications. At least one Provost candidate has suggested the need for a communications department at the College.

Finally, this letter is not worth a damn for anything. I had promised the editor a letter two to three months ago. I had wanted to get involved in the tremendous non-theological debate that took place over a couple of issues but time and interest dissipated.

The inclusion of this letter in NEWSPEAK may diminish its depth and character. It probably does not help mine either. However, Herb Silverman is a friend and a colleague whom I admire and respect and he has been on my case for some time.

Cermette J. Clardy, Jr.