The Speaker's Report

According to the Faculty Manual, the Speaker of the Faculty is to make a report to the Faculty twice a year. I have decided that the Faculty Newsletter is a better device for reporting to the Faculty than the meetings inasmuch as the Newsletter has a wider distribution and it frees up time that might be better utilized at such meetings.

Fall Semester has been a learning experience for me. I have learned that the Speaker, while given recognition, has limited power. The Speaker does, however, have greater access to decision-makers and their information than many Faculty. Thus my focus has been on improving communication between the Faculty and Administration. In this respect I have undertaken the following this semester.

A. The publication of Newspeak in order to facilitate the flow of communications at the College.
B. Regular meetings with the President, the Provost and other administrators to discuss issues as they arise.
C. Regular attendance at the following: Advisory Committee to the President, Budget Review and Planning, Department Chairmen-Provost-Dean meetings, President's Staff meetings.
D. Meetings with individual Faculty members and groups on a variety of issues.

One issue which has concerned the Faculty has been the appointment of various task forces and ad hoc committees which have bypassed the regular Faculty committees. I have talked to both the Provost and the President concerning this. While such committees may still be appointed in special cases both the President and Provost have agreed to seek input from the nominating committee of the Faculty concerning appointments to such groups in the future when possible. The President has also agreed to prepare a column for Newspeak on a regular basis. In it he will discuss various activities he has undertaken as well as topics which are of interest to the Faculty. The suggestion for this column came from the Advisory Committee to the President.

While I cannot do all things to all people, I encourage Faculty members to contact me with their concerns. I would also like additional input from Faculty members concerning Newspeak and what you would like to be included in it. Both the Newsletter and the Speaker's position belong to the Faculty. Use them as you see fit.

William D. Moore
TO: William V. Moore, Speaker of the Faculty
FR: David S. Mann, Student Affairs and Athletics Committee
RE: Fall Semester Committee Report

The Committee met approximately every two weeks. On its agenda were three items. First, there was a concern that student health forms needed to be revised. A subcommittee was formed and the task was completed with the help of Dr. Habrask, Dr. Post, and the Student Health staff. Second, the Committee investigated in great detail the apparent need for standard academic and non-academic grievance procedures. Several hearings were held which included reports from such distinguished guests as Mr. Bischoff, Dean Taylor, and Mr. Gedney Howe. A subcommittee was formed to search for existing grievance procedures at other campuses. Having received same, the Committee has requested of Dr. Martfield permission to inspect grievance procedure language which may exist in the Faculty Manual (currently under revision) so that the Committee can offer suggestions for improvement as necessary. The Committee also working with Dr. Habrask to pursue similar objectives (or are they is also working with Dr. Martfield to pursue similar objectives) with the Student Handbook document. Third, the Committee screened 108 student applications for Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities. The Committee recommended that 23 applicants' names be forwarded to that organization for further action so that those students may be invited to join.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bill Moore, Newspeak
FROM: Lee Drago, Chairperson
SUBJECT: Library Committee
DATE: December 7, 1983

We have met twice. On September 22, 1983 and December 6, 1983. In the first meeting we discussed the budget for fiscal year 1984. Two members of the committee were appointed to the Library Search Committee for the positions under the new reorganization plans. In the second meeting, we began reviewing the Library's Three Year Plan, the Self-Study, and modifications to the Library building. In addition we will discuss some suggestions raised by Faculty members: 1) A $5 per student per semester Library fee to be spent on new books, 2) the possibility of using discarded Library periodicals in some of our department reading rooms. Finally, Mr. Ted Pappas was appointed student member of our committee.

LD:dw

To: William Moore,
   Speaker of the Faculty
From: Frank Petrusak, Chairman
   Faculty Hearing Committee
Subject: Report of Semester Activities

The Committee has met several times this semester. We recently concluded a hearing regarding a charge that the College had violated the academic freedom of a member of the faculty. We are deliberating and expect to render a judgment in this matter in January. The Committee is in the preliminary stages of considering a second case, in which a group of faculty allege that the College has violated their academic freedom.
To: All Faculty

From: Hugh Wilder, Chair, Faculty Research and Development Committee

Re: Faculty Research & Development Committee Activities, Fall 1983-84

The main work of the Faculty Research and Development Committee this Fall was the evaluation of applications for Second Semester College Grants. We are pleased to announce the following Awards:

1. Robert L. Anderson, "A Comparison of Women Working in Large and Small Organizations" (Faculty Research). $165.00 plus one course release time.

2. Charles F. Beam, Jr., "Novel Syntheses with Strong Bases or Isotopic Anhydrides and Acetylene Esters" (Faculty Research). $1500.00

3. Klaus de Albuquerque, "Final Preparation and Typing of a 392 page Manuscript to be Published by Carolina Academic Press" (Faculty Professional Advancement). $800.00.

4. James F. Deavor, "The Determination of Metals in Natural Waters by In-Situ Precipitation in a Graphite Furnace Atomizer" (Faculty Research). $1474.00.

5. Edmund L. Drago, "Preparing for Publication the Minutes of the Friendly Moralist Society, 1841-1856" (Faculty Professional Advancement). $1140.00.

6. Michael M. Pinafrock, "3 Semester Hours Course Load Reduction Request to Facilitate Presentation and Publication of Research" (Faculty Research). One Course release time.

7. Jeffrey A. Foster, "French Drama and Opera (Late 17th and 18th Centuries)" (Faculty Research). $400.00.

8. Rose C. Ham, "An Investigation of Embeddings" (Faculty Research). $600.00 plus one course release time.

9. Marsha E. Bass and B. Mack Tennyson, "Sexual Discrimination in the Workplace" (Faculty Research and Curriculum Development) $1300.00.

10. Rick Heldrich, "Preliminary Investigations for Biogenetic Synthesis" (Faculty Research). $1500.00.

11. Mark Jenkins, "Representations of Co-compact Fuchsian Groups" (Faculty Research). $1312.00 plus two courses release time.

12. Diane Chalmers Johnson, "American Art in the Symbolist Mode" (Faculty Research). $1439.00.

13. David M. Koval, "The Controversy Over Francisco Ribalta's True Patria" (Faculty Professional Advancement). $240.00.

14. Herb Silverman, "An Investigation of Subclasses of Univalent Functions" (Faculty Research). Two courses release time.


Applications for Second Semester Faculty Professional Support, Summer College Grants (for research, professional development, and curriculum development), and Summer Research and Development Awards are due on January 27, 1984. Information on these programs has been distributed to all faculty.
The advisory committee met seven times during the Fall Semester. Our initial task was to seek guidance from the faculty on their collective concerns and then present this information to the President.

In September a questionnaire was distributed which provided each faculty member with an opportunity to comment on faculty morale as well as specific issues at the college which should be addressed.

The results of the questionnaire were forwarded to the President and published in the November issue of Newspeak.

The advisory committee then gleaned a number of issues from the faculty questionnaire for presentation to the president.

It was decided to divide the concerns of the faculty into two parts: first those issues considered important but not mentioned as frequently as a handful of major problems and discuss these areas with the president prior to the end of the Semester.

This was done at a meeting of December 5th. A list of issues given to the president is included below.

See attached sheet.

During the Spring semester the committee will forward more frequently mentioned issues with recommended solutions. (Pay leads the list). A complete report will be made to the faculty when this has been accomplished.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas A. Palmer
Chairman, Faculty Advisory Committee to the President

FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE PRESIDENT

Secondary issues relating to faculty morale

1. Stop transferring grades from other Consortium institutions. Qualify Charleston Higher Education Consortium grades which have been transferred immediately or note institution where grade was earned on transcript.
2. Initiate a President’s column in Newspeak.
3. Improve lack of lighting on campus for safety, improve security for classroom buildings, faculty offices, and the parking lot. Inform faculty of security escort services.
4. Basic maintenance of campus buildings (it has improved but could be much better). Improve facilities in classrooms—markers for porcelain boards, heat/cold etc. Synchronize all campus clocks and keep them running accurately.
5. Provide a back-up system for critical signatures.
6. Improve final exam schedule/eliminate Saturday exams.
7. President needs more informal contacts with students. Increase number of functions in which the President meets with students.
8. Provide a faculty lounge for the Education Center.
9. Notify faculty at least two weeks in advance for week-end events in which faculty are expected to attend as part of the job (retreat, mentoring, etc.).
10. Updated records of student addresses and phone numbers.
11. Eliminate the name for category IV personnel.
12. Improve the utilization for Wang systems.
13. Increase the amount of pressure on financial aid students to earn their salaries in order to maintain jobs (student work programs).
14. President should meet with each Department annually.
15. Increase clerical support/secretarial services and ranks are uneven.
16. Reevaluate the decision to close the print shop.
17. Establish a four day week-end in mid-October.
18. Provide more time to submit grades (48 hours minimum).
19. Clarify process of evaluating administrators.

Dr. William V. Moore
Speaker of the Faculty
College of Charleston

Dear Dr. Moore:

The following is a report of the activities of the Grievance Committee during the Fall Semester, 1983.

The Grievance Committee held a series of meetings to consider complaints registered with the committee on two occasions by a group of five members of the faculty.

The Chairman of the Grievance Committee was consulted by two members of the faculty seeking information about grievance procedures.

In the conduct of its business, the committee held no official hearings.

Sincerely,

William Bischoff, Chairman

To: Bill Moore
From: Joe Benich, Chm. Faculty Welfare Committee
Subject: Committee Business for Fall 83

1. The availability and cost of faculty housing was discussed. Floyd Tyler, V.P. Business, addressed the F.W.C. on these matters. The committee concluded that it would be beneficial if one half of available faculty housing had a two year lease limit.
2. Input from recent new faculty was solicited concerning how the College could help future new faculty in their relocation to Charleston. This topic is still under study with recommendations forthcoming.

3. The College policy concerning overload pay was discussed. All full-time faculty receive $1600 for overload courses, whether they are taught during the day or at night. Overload pay data from other academic institutions is being reviewed, a recommendation will be made.

4. Vern Rivers, V.P. Administration, told the committee that 24 hour per day parking decals were needed both by faculty and students. The number of spots available for faculty will remain the same next semester.

5. The request of the Council of Chairmen to have all courses evaluated with results going to Chairmen and the Provost was reviewed. The F.W.C. essentially agreed with the Chairmen and last year’s F.W.C. The committee voted to divide the request into two motions. 1) That all courses be evaluated with results going to the respective faculty member, and 2) that copies of evaluation results be sent to the Provost and Chairmen.

6. The F.W.C. has agreed to review the reports of the task forces on standards and procedures for evaluations. We will begin after the initial changes have been made.

Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Assistance

The following is a summary of the Committee’s activities for the Fall semester, 1983.

1. The committee approved the admissions policy submitted by Fred Daniels.
2. A proposal concerning continuation standards was submitted to the faculty.
3. A proposal to move the W date to four weeks was submitted to the faculty.
4. The committee is presently studying a proposal to change the grading system.
5. The committee is presently studying the criteria used for retention of scholarships and the dollar amount of scholarships.

6. A petition relating to credit for ROTC courses was referred to the Curriculum committee.

7. The committee is investigating the issue of transfer of grades for consortium courses.

8. The committee denied three student petitions and accepted two petitions.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bill Moore, Speaker of the Faculty

FORM: Rick Heldrich, Chemistry

RE: Activity Report for Graduate and Continuing Education Committee

Our committee focused on several key issues concerning graduate and continuing education. We were aided by the assistance of Dean Sue Sommer’s office.

Jose Escobar (Language Department) investigated the Center for Continuing Education efforts to promote continuing education in the Charleston community. An advisory committee has been formed. Members include: Sue Sommer (C.E.), Abbie Smith (C.E.), Teresa Farris (Foundation), Margaret Moody (Honors to C.E.), Betty Kinloch (Donor to C.E.), Trudy Cooper (Alumni Association), Sally Sinkler (returning student-College of Charleston graduate), Martha Ohlinger (Incentive Grant Recipient), Annie Stockenbroeker (Incentive Grant Recipient), Rev. Henry Grant (community representative), Doris Meddin (community representative), and Jose Escobar. The advisory committee recommended: (1) that letters be sent to college alumni and interested community groups to solicit donations; (2) committee members will personally contact potential donors; (3) avoid fund raising efforts that will conflict with foundation efforts; (4) public awareness of continuing education programs needs to be emphasized. It was also noted that the Incentive Grant Award program should be better publicized.

To that end, a reception at the Blacklock House will be held on January 31, 1984 with the President, Provost, Advisory Committee members, Graduate and Continuing Education Committee members, Incentive Grant winners and families in attendance. In late February, an Incentive Grant Awareness program will be held in the Continuing Education building. Potential donors to the program, past and present Incentive Grant winners, and College representatives will be in attendance.

Helen Ivy (Library) investigated the copyright policies for Masters Thesis in South Carolina colleges and universities. There is no mechanism in existence at the College to help a student obtain a copyright on their Masters Thesis. The rest of the S. C. schools have established copyright procedures. Investigations are under way to determine the best procedure to help our students to copyright their thesis.

Linda Greene (Education Department) reported on the activity of the Graduate Council meetings. The Graduate Council has recommended that the C grade be reinstated for graduate students. Currently, graduate students receive grades of A, B+, B, C+, or F. Final resolution of this issue is
pending. Also a new graduate course, Ed. 691-Computer Education, was approved. Dr. Matthews, a member of the Graduate Council was selected chair of the Graduate Task Force.

The committee also participated in the Advisory Search Committee for the position of Director of Professional Development. About 60 candidates applied for the position. The search committee interviewed 6 candidates and the search will be continued with at least one more interview scheduled for January, 1984. A final recommendation has not yet been reached by the committee.

Dean Sommer reported that a proposal to investigate the needs assessment of Charleston for continuing education is being entertained by the Consortium. The total cost of the study, under Consortium auspices, is anticipated to be $30,000 - $35,000.

The issue of adjunct faculty status has been addressed by Dean Sommer and Associate Provost Gibson. To help clarify adjunct faculty status, all paperwork concerning adjunct faculty will be channeled through Dean Sommer's office. The hiring and evaluation of adjunct faculty will remain within the providence of the academic departments.

To: Faculty and Staff
College of Charleston

The South Carolina Desegregation Plan for Higher Education commits the State to strive to improve the retention rate of black students where there is demonstrated need to do so. Institutions have reported a need to create a campus-wide group to focus on the retention of all students who are "drop-out" prone. Therefore, each institutional president of public senior institutions was requested to establish a student retention task force and to appoint a senior advisor to coordinate retention efforts on the campus. A student retention task force on each campus would help create an awareness that student retention is a campus-wide responsibility. Accordingly, membership or our task force includes administrators, faculty and students.

The purpose of the task force includes: (1) evaluating current retention data-gathering procedures to determine if usable, timely information is being gathered; (2) documenting and evaluating the institutional retention efforts which are currently underway; (3) making recommendations for any needed improvements in student retention; (4) helping design student retention programs and evaluation systems, if needed; (5) providing information for the entire campus on student retention activities and results; and (6) communicating with the Institutional Representative to the Desegregation Plan concerning student retention rates and retention programs.

The coordinator of the task force is Bill Kubinec. Our institutional representative for the Desegregation Plan is Roy I. Jones. The faculty members are Dr. Bill Kubinec (Chair), Dr. Genie Mann, and Dr. Sue Prazak. The administrative members of the task force are currently Mr. John Burns, Mr. Chip Jackson, and Dr. David Taylor (Senior Officer). The two student members are Mr. Reynard Blake (Graduate Student) and Ms. Cora Minter (Junior).

If you have any suggestions or recommendations for the task force, feel free to call on Dr. Bill Kubinec (792-5593) or Dr. Roy Jones (792-5580).
Fall Semester 1983 Evening Program Information

Evening sections paid by the Evening Program budget

Taught by College of Charleston Faculty Overload 27
Taught by part-time adjunct 59

Total sections supported from Evening Program budget 86
Fall Semester

Total student enrollments in these sections 2,086

Average number of students per section 24.6
Student Credit hours 6,246

FTE (Total divided by 15) 416.4

Non-Credit Courses

Total number of courses taught 30
Total number of enrollments 388
Average number of students per course 12.93

Continuing Education Student Enrollments

Note: Continuing Education students may register for both day or evening courses. Returning adult students entering through Continuing Education who become degree candidates are not included in this count.

Total credit enrollments (headcount) 738
Total audit enrollments (headcount) 65
Total enrollments (headcount) 803

Staff Training Program

Several weeks ago a letter was sent to all faculty and staff regarding the staff training program. Apparently this notice did not reach everyone. The deadline for application has been extended to January 9th.

The purpose of this program is to provide an opportunity for a College of Charleston employee to improve his/her performance in the present position or to acquire skills necessary to perform additional duties to meet college needs.

To be eligible the employee must be employed full-time holding a permanent position and having completed his/her probationary period. The employee's supervisor must approve the course. For an application form and more information call the Center for Continuing Education (792-5620).

Last but Not Least

If you have not completed your Christmas shopping, why not give a "Gift of Learning"? Gift certificates are available in the Center for Continuing Education for credit or non-credit courses.
Dear Bill,

Thank you for inviting me, as an older statesman, to give my views on the state of the College. I would like to take this opportunity to discuss (pontificate), and try to put into a historical perspective, some of my thoughts on faculty and administration.

Each year, since my arrival at the College in 1976, more has been expected from and produced by our faculty. I wish I could add "and students" to the preceding sentence, but that is -- or should be -- another letter. Professional credentials of faculty being considered for positions at the College now often exceed those of many tenured members. An institution whose faculty and reputation were primarily regional has developed a more national and in some cases international flavor. Unfortunately, as the results of the questionnaire published in the previous issue of Newspeak indicate, the increased productivity has not evoked a concomitant elevation in morale.

Most of us have chosen our professions for love, certainly not for money. That is why faculty morale, our most precious fringe benefit, should not be ignored. Low morale may interfere with our enjoyment of and performance in teaching and research. In serious cases, we may also hinder the work of our colleagues. I believe that the majority of morale problems originate within ourselves, but we are still susceptible to idiosyncratic or erratic behavior by our colleagues or administrators. Departmental harmony, for me, is the single most important external morale factor. The words "harmony" and "unanimity" are not synonymous. Though I have never been in a more harmonious department, our votes are rarely unanimous. While feelings may be strong, issues are discussed in a reasonable fashion by reasonable people whose opinions are listened to and respected. Most notably, decisions made are usually accepted without grudge or rancor, enabling us to move onward in an atmosphere conducive to work.

I understand that not all departments are as concordant as is the Mathematics Department. I think, though, that discordant departments should seek external mediation only as a last resort. Departmental members suspicious and mistrustful of one another are not likely to accept without animosity the judgments of outsiders with whom they disagree. Occasionally, departmental harmony may only be achieved through changes in personnel. This is not to say that such changes need always be made. Compatibility, while desirable, is not an ultimate. Better to have a productive disputatious department than an unproductive agreeable one. In recent years, some previously quarrelsome departments seem to have begun working much better together and a couple (one for sure!) seem to have become more contentious.

I wish I could also say that this is the most harmonious faculty with which I have been associated. There are probably factions at all academic institutions, the most common consisting of what are usually called the "Old Guard" and "Young Turks". Typically, the Old Guard have served at the institution longer and they are older, of higher rank, more united, more powerful, and more resistant to change than the Young Turks. Before stating my views on the Old Guard vs. Young Turks at the College, let me offer some disclaimers: (1) The majority of faculty do not try to ally with either camp; (2) there are no real camps, just loose alliances and sympathies over some issues; (3) no faculty member always follows one or the other alleged camp.
Now that I have disclaimed, I will also claim that the Old Guard vs. Young Turks division is more prominent here than at any other institution in which I have taught. Contributing factors include significant changes in size, composition, and direction in the past fifteen years — from a preponderance of 500 students and 30 faculty with no encouragement, incentives, or rewards for research to a public institution of 5000 students and 200 faculty who are urged, exhorted, and expected to develop professionally. The seeds of discord, I believe, were sown in the mid-seventies when it became apparent that President Stern and Academic Vice President Bevan, both strong-willed forceful individuals, had very different visions of the College (for their biographies, see Newspeak Vol. 2, issues 4 and 7). Neither could be accused by friend or foe of being a remote or apathetic administrator. Each encouraged visits and freely dispensed advice, aid, information, and — sometimes contradictory — decisions. Each liked to be involved in all facets of the College and, perhaps, in unconscious and subtle ways, occasionally undermined the authority of the other. The Old Guard and Young Turks of those days were, respectively, Sternites and Bevanites.

I'm administratively optimistic today because Jackie Mattfield has continued and expanded upon the goals and aspirations of Jack Bevan while Ed Collins has been more open and flexible and has not been authoritarian or as paternalistic as was Ted Stern. Despite somewhat austere times, there are more funds available at the College for travel and professional development, more opportunities to obtain release time for research, and — in the previous year — there have been more and bigger adjustments for salary inequities than ever before. I presume from these accomplishments that the top level administrators are communicating more efficiently and working with each other more effectively than those in the recent past. If so, and if it becomes clear what responsibilities are to be discharged by whom, perhaps the faculty legacy of bypassing one administrator for another will die along with some of the faculty factions. In other words, I believe there to be a symbiotic relationship between administrative dissection and faculty dissection.

Ever since coming to the College, I have heard grumbling about erosion of faculty power. I think some faculty have inferred loss of collective power from loss of individual or personal power. Certainly, we are likely to have more of an impact as one of thirty than as one of two hundred, just as each of us has more departmental than institutional influence. I do share faculty concerns over proliferation of administrators. My major disappointment about the appointments of new administrators is that they are rarely replacements. It appears much easier for an administrator than for a faculty member to obtain some (unwritten) version of tenure. I find it hard to believe that the job performances of administrators who have been here for at least five years are all superior to those of faculty who have been denied tenure.

One important administrative position yet to be filled is that of Vice President for Institutional Advancement. When I was on sabbatical leave last year at the University of Michigan, the student newspaper printed the salaries of all university employees. As expected, the football coach was the highest paid. I was surprised to discover that the highest non-athletic salary went not to the president, but to the public relations officer. Internal expertise in acquiring public, legislative, and financial support is essential here because of our ineffectual State College Board of Trustees — representing the College, Francis Marion, and Lander. Though generally amiable, its members seem to care little about the mission of the College and do not take a very active role in communicating College concerns to legislators, alumni, and other influential citizens in times when higher education is becoming increasingly more politicized.

I don't like to see faculty take an Us vs. Them attitude toward the administration. Many of our goals are mutual and can better be accomplished working together. Neither the faculty nor the administration is monolithic. There are some faculty and administrators I like and respect, and some I don't. I was disturbed after the first issue of Newspeak this year to hear faculty complain of too much administrative input since I welcome any administrator's willingness to deal openly. More legitimate criticism would be the lack of faculty input, which we can certainly rectify if we so choose.

Even a well-meaning administration may abuse its power by assuming responsibilities that are within the purview of the faculty. It is sometimes difficult to decide whether a standing faculty committee or an appointed committee is a more appropriate vehicle to handle an issue. I am pleased that a dedicated faculty task force was willing to devote countless hours in order to produce a document on procedures, criteria, and standards for faculty evaluation. Though technically within the scope of the Faculty Welfare Committee, as is almost any College business, it would not have been fair to subject its members to a summer-long task. Whenever an administrator does appoint a committee whose recommendations could affect faculty, we should be watchful that diverse faculty views are represented.
Perhaps I am still feeling the effects of a rewarding sabbatical year at a university where faculty involved in research and teaching seemed not to know or care much about administrators outside their departments, an insouciance that afforded faculty more time to pursue their own interests. I recognize that faculty governance is important, especially at a smaller institution, but I don't want to oversee administrators dotting i's and crossing t's. I view their chief responsibility to be freeing us from the need to dot and cross so that we may fulfill our primary missions. If governance begins to absorb more of our time and energy than teaching and research, then we may become an institution not worth governing.

Sincerely,

Herb Silverman
Speaker Emeritus

Editor's Note: I have asked each of the former Speakers to submit a letter to Newspeak on their views of the College of Charleston today. Professors Tom Falier and Malcolm Clark have said that they will submit their letters for the January issue. Professor Silverman preferred to have his comments published in the December issue.
December 6, 1983

TO: Newspoll

I have read with interest Miss Rebecca A. Linton's letter to "Newspoll" expressing dissatisfaction with the functioning of the Faculty Grievance Committee. Personally, I feel no need to explain the actions of the committee. However, as chairman of the committee, I feel constrained to reply.

Miss Linton and her colleagues approached the Grievance Committee with several matters on each of two occasions. The difficult question that the committee had to address was whether or not the complaints presented were matters which should be considered by the Grievance Committee. The question was complicated by the fact that, although some librarians hold faculty rank and status, the Library is not an academic department in the usual sense of the term, but an administrative unit, providing academic support services to the curriculum, faculty, and students. To answer the question, it was necessary for the committee to become familiar with a number of documents (including numerous statements, letters and affidavits presented by Miss Linton and her colleagues), and to consult with many officials of the College. After a number of meetings and due deliberation, the committee expressed the opinion on both occasions that the complaints presented did not constitute proper matters for faculty grievance. The committee communicated its opinion to Miss Linton and her colleagues, stated the bases for the opinion, and suggested positive actions that could be taken.

For clarification, it should be mentioned that searches to fill openings in the Library administration are being conducted in the same way as recent searches for professional staff with faculty status in other academic support units, e.g., the Search for the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. In this process, the entire Library Staff will have access to the vitae of candidates, they will have opportunities to interview these candidates, and they will be invited to submit written comments on the qualifications of the candidates to the Search Committee.

The Grievance Committee sincerely regrets that its deliberations consumed so much time. Considering the frequency with which the committee met, the difficulty of scheduling meetings, and the amount of work that had to be done, I feel that the committee acted as promptly as it could.

Let me assure Miss Linton that the members of the Grievance Committee are neither especially "lazy" nor noticeably "intimidated by the administration." Beyond doubt, like all members of the faculty they are "overworked", but not "too overworked" to attend to their duty.

Cordially,

William Bischoff

Prof. William Moore
Speaker of the Faculty
College of Charleston

Dear Bill:

The members of the College of Charleston Chapter of the AAUP have asked that I remind the faculty that the local organization will provide information to individual faculty regarding peer evaluation, faculty governance, academic freedom, and other matters. In addition the Chapter will assist the faculty member who wishes to contact the national organization.
This semester the Chapter has initiated the practice of providing observers to attend meetings that are part of the appeals process in the annual evaluation procedure.

We seek to serve the members of the faculty and the College community in any way that we can.

Sincerely yours,

Frank Petrusak,
President

December 12, 1983

Dear Bill,

Two weeks ago, Alice Jacobson and I had the pleasure of attending a University of Texas Institute of Higher Education seminar on "An Integrated Approach to Planning." The seminar was excellent, providing liberal quantities of information on planning methods and examples of how those methods have worked at various institutions. Based on the seminar and the interaction with other participants, it is clear that the College has progressed a long way towards establishing a fully functional planning and budgeting process. It was equally clear that we still have some significant gaps which need to be closed. We have an institutional goals statement and an annual planning process which closely approximates the model presented but lack a strategic planning document which provides the framework for departmental planning. Departmental and institutional planning will continue to be only slightly more popular than measles until it becomes clear that the planning has produced positive results. The usual time frame required to establish an administrative record of clear responsiveness to the plans is 3-6 years. If through planning, the College reallocates only 2-3% of the operating budget per year, significant changes in the budget will have been implemented within a very short period.

The Southern Association will soon require all institutions to have an institutional goals statement as part of their self-study. In a more radical departure from the standard self-study evaluation, based on published standards of the Association, several colleges have been allowed to conduct a self-study which evaluates their success in meeting their own institutional goals. This method of evaluation may be adopted for all institutions within another year. Such a proposal was considered this year but was withdrawn when it became clear that many institutions would not support such a change at this time.

Very little time has elapsed since the last issue of Newspeak appeared, so I have no new information regarding the activities of the BRPC to pass on to the faculty. The last letter summarized our activities for this semester and will serve as the semester report. Something like giving a party to which no one comes, offers of more information in the two previous editions of Newspeak have failed to generate a single inquiry. Once again, I will be happy to provide more detailed information to any interested member of the faculty.

Sincerely,

W. Hugh Haynsworth
Chairman, BRPC
The following letter is reprinted in Newspeak at my request. I feel the topic of evaluation of Faculty is important and Professor Petrusa's letter thoroughly addresses the issue.

Ms. Alice Jacobson
Associate Provost for Academic Planning
and Evaluation
College of Charleston

Dear Alice:

I am pleased to have the opportunity to respond to your request for comments on the revised annual evaluation form for faculty that you are helping to develop. My remarks fall into two categories: (1) my critique of the approach that the College has taken recently regarding annual evaluation; and (2) some specific comments regarding the form itself.

First, regarding the evaluation process, it is apparent that we are rapidly moving in the direction of a more rigorous, systematic, detailed evaluation of faculty each year. I concur with the recent report of the national AAUP's Committee A which opposes "full scale" evaluations of tenured faculty on an annual basis. Such a system could be used by a future, malevolent administration to severely curtail the academic freedom of faculty. The faculty must strongly resist putting in place any system that could undermine freedoms that we have fought so hard to protect over the years.

Second, I am disturbed that recent changes in the evaluation process seem so undirected in purpose. Why are we conducting annual evaluations? Who benefits? It is not enough to say that the "State requires it". As we all know, State requirements can be satisfied in many ways. If evaluators and evaluatees do not know the purpose or uses of evaluations, I think the process can become an empty exercise, creating severe psychological strain. We do not want to replicate the experience of Charleston County in developing and implementing its teacher evaluation system. That process has produced severe emotional strains and a decline in the morale of the school system's faculty.

Also, I find that the current process for dealing with faculty complaints about individual evaluations is flawed. The idea of "negotiating" an evaluation with an evaluator is difficult to accept. I think this is a misapplication of the art of diplomacy. The faculty member is at a considerable disadvantage in confronting the evaluator together with the Provost "team". A better system would focus on "mediation", conducted through a third, neutral party such as a faculty member elected to serve as an ombudsman.

Turning now to the evaluation instrument, I wish to make the following comments:

1. I do not understand how the summary rating is to be derived. Is this a statistical operation or a subjective summary of all the other ratings?
2. The use of the seven point scale throughout this document is open to criticism. Much of the testing and measurements literature is critical of this kind of scale.
3. What comments could be entered by the chairperson or faculty member at this point in the evaluation process?
1. What are "support materials"?
2. How is the chairperson to judge it a reading list is out of date?
3. Other specific measures for determining "skill in planning and organizing courses" are needed.
4. I do not see that "assignments, exams, and grading procedures" occupy a single dimension.
5. What data would the chairperson have available to determine "thoughtful correction of student work"?
6. Because of continuing debates over testing procedures in the various disciplines, I doubt that a chairperson could reasonably judge the quality of exam design.
7. Participation in "full faculty curricular discussions" is a rare opportunity.
8. What are specific actions that would constitute "stimulating discussion of curriculum"?
9. Apart from updating reading lists, what specific actions constitute "revision of courses"? Also, I wonder if revision of courses is always a good thing. In some courses, continuity (but not rigidity) may be necessary and/or desirable from year to year.
10. Since the Provost now receives copies of the student evaluation, the item regarding student ratings does not seem essential.
11. In the student ratings item, what is the questionnaire reference for the numerical indicators? It would be unfair to refer only to one item on the questionnaire as a summary rating.
12. One could argue for a long time about what student rating constitutes the mark of excellence.
13. What constitutes "feedback"?
14. What are the contents of the "dossier"?
15. Attempts to improve teaching could include many other specific actions, such as consultations with colleagues or developing a relationship with a master teacher.
16. "Teaching effectiveness" is primarily the result of classroom activity. Nothing in the form relates to this activity.
17. "Teaching effectiveness" also results from interactions with students outside the classroom. Nothing in the form relates to this activity.
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1. Examples of "scholarly projects" should be given.
2. "Professional training" of the faculty member involves many activities conducted by the faculty member himself. These activities are not detected in the questionnaire.
3. "Professional recognition" is not an essential dimension of "professional growth and development".
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1. "Improving departmental morale" or "supporting the goals of the department" is the collegiality criterion in a different form. If we officially endorse this "value", we open the evaluation process to highly subjective judgments. The unfriendly colleague could become the object of the evaluator's punishment.
2. Attendance at meetings is no indicator of "quality" service.

I would be pleased to provide any additional information or evaluation that you might request.

Sincerely yours,

Frank Petrusak