Salaries. I have received several inquiries from Faculty members concerning (A) salary increases for promotion and tenure and (B) salary figures for new Faculty members and inequities such salaries may have created for returning Faculty.

The office of the Provost has provided me with the following:

(A) Tenure and Promotion Increases for Faculty for 1983-1984 were based on the following formula. Tenure increases were based on four percent of the mean Faculty salary for the rank of the tenured individual. Instructors received $693.00, Assistant Professors received $825.00 and Associate Professors received $1,003.00 for being tenured. Promotion increases were based on five percent of the mean salary at the new rank. Thus, those promoted to Assistant Professor received $1,032.00; those promoted to Associate Professor received $1,254.00; while those promoted to Full Professor received $1,462.00. These raises were in addition to any cost of living and/or merit raises given the Faculty. It is anticipated that this formula will continue to be used. The dollar figures should be somewhat higher this year since the mean salary for each rank has increased.

(B) Salaries Inequities: New and Returning Faculty. The national average for Faculty by rank and discipline was used to determine salaries for new Faculty members. In some cases, this did create inequities for returning Faculty members who had more teaching experience than their newly hired peers. If you feel or know that such an inequity exists you should discuss it with your chairperson this spring. The chairperson should bring this up in his or her meeting with the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs later this year. The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs has charts for each department with salaries and years of service by rank. If an inequity exists it should be corrected in future contracts.

The College of Charleston Chapter of Phi Kappa Phi, a scholastic honorary, will have its annual book sale on March 27th in the breezeway of the Stern Student Center. Members are soliciting donations for the sale. If you have any books you wish to donate please contact Chapter officers - William Moore (Political Science), Fred Watts (Physics) or Susan Morrison (Biology). Money raised from the sale is used to finance the academic awards the organization presents to students.

The Phi Kappa Phi Chapter would like to remind Faculty members of its annual award given to the senior student who submits the outstanding research paper. Faculty members who are directing research projects which they feel merit consideration for this award should contact the above officers before April 23rd.

Assistant Provost Paul Hamill reports that a review of updated vitae received over the Spring and Summer show that there were 228 professional papers and publications and 166 community service presentations in 1982-83. These figures are incomplete since many Faculty members did not update their vitae.

The Panhellenic Council will sponsor a Faculty/Greek reception in the Stern Center Ballroom immediately following the Faculty meeting on March 19th. The event marks the beginning of Greek Week at the College. The Panhellenic Council promotes academic excellence along with philanthropic and social activities.

A Faculty Fellowship/Prayer Breakfast will be held by the Campus Crusade for Christ at the Blacklock House from 9:00 A.M. to 10:00 A.M. on March 20th. For additional information please contact Frank Petrusak in the Political Science Department.

I have discussed with the Library Director, David Cohen, the possibility of having an exhibit of Faculty publications. This exhibit is tentatively scheduled for early Summer. The ultimate goal is to put together a complete collection of publications by College Faculty. Details on this exhibit will be distributed later this Spring.
Office of the President

Dr. William V. Moore
Speaker of the Faculty
Political Science Department
College of Charleston

Dear Bill:

I am pleased to respond to your request that I write a column in Newspeak. We face many challenges in the coming months and years, and this column will allow me the opportunity to address some of these issues.

The first issue that I want to write about is planning. When I came to the College of Charleston almost six years ago my vision for the institution was to lead it to its fullest potential in academic excellence. The master plan for the campus had to be completed, but the emphasis was shifted to the goal of academic distinction. That vision has not changed, and I honestly believe that we have made significant progress toward that goal.

Academic distinction does not just happen. It needs to be carefully orchestrated and nurtured. This is why planning is so important. I know that there is dissatisfaction over the time and resources being committed to the planning process. I, like others, become frustrated when I must set aside precious hours to put into writing my intentions for the College as a whole and for each of the divisions. I, too, have fussed at having to be disciplined by a format - one that forces me to make even tentative decisions on how I will carry out my intention, how long I should allow for its realization, and the requirement in time and people. In the short run, it would be easier not to ask the hard and troubling questions. Like you, I find that I have more than enough on my plate to keep me at the College's business early and late, seven days a week without adding this demanding activity. But if we truly believe that we can achieve academic distinction, then we must plan for it; it will not just happen. We must make the planning process central to our conduct of the College in every area and at every level. Unless we plan, the College of Charleston will be pushed and pulled into shapes not of its own design by outside forces and agencies. If we are aware of the environmental threats to this College and consciously grapple with the choices they put before us, we can pool our imagination and energy, and, by the process of planning discover ways to determine our own destiny.

There are many systems of college planning as well as many books and articles on the subject. Though they differ in some respects, all knowledgeable and experienced planners agree on several points: (1) It takes five to six years before a planning system can be introduced and brought up to a level where it is functioning smoothly. (2) Though the decisions reached in any given year may be only slightly different from those that would have been reached without institution-wide planning, the net effect of the sum of those differences over several years is likely to make a significant cumulative difference in the ability of the college to adapt to social and economic change. (3) It is the process of planning and the decisions taken as a result of it, not the resultant document, that is important to the resilience and vitality of the institution.

Let me urge that you bear with the inconvenience and even annoyance of having to accommodate this new element in our academic lives, and work with me to use it as a tool to continue to build a college of high academic distinction.

Sincerely,

Edward M. Collins, Jr.
President
Dear Bill:

Thanks for allowing me the opportunity to say why I am a candidate for Faculty Speaker.

When five years ago I resolved to devote myself solely to teaching and scholarship, I resigned my position as Maymester Director. Precisely because I am concerned about teaching and scholarship, I feel I must involve myself more fully in Faculty governance. Decisions are now being made that will have an enormous impact on teaching and scholarship. And I fail to see the philosophical underpinning of some recent academic decisions. To be sure, a number of positive things are occurring. The College has developed a more effective way of reaching our South Carolina legislators. Likewise, more money is being allotted for books in the Library. While I applaud any conscious effort to plot the College's future more carefully, I see no coherent thesis underlying most of the current attempts at planning. There appears to be no sense of what we want or how we are going to get it—no vision of where we are going. The result is that we have become more involved in planning for its own sake than in debating and deciding on a basis for the planning. For example, the history department spent four long meetings discussing an annual evaluation system when it could have spent the time more profitably in considering how the two-semester Freshman European survey should be taught, or evaluating whether the course is achieving the purpose for which it was designed. In short, I believe that bureaucratic planning is not a satisfactory alternative to an agreed upon sense of direction. Planning, even very efficient planning, is not necessarily good planning if the spirit behind it is missing or forgotten.

I am also concerned that many of our best colleagues have been drawn away (at least partially) from teaching and research into administration. Surely, there are many reasons for this, but I submit that our system offers more rewards for administration than it does for good teaching and scholarship. While we may be getting higher quality administrators, the intellectual life of the College has suffered correspondingly. Moreover, with the increase in administrators has come a concomitant increase in the paperwork we are required to do. And I fear that we are now so caught up in it that deeper philosophical issues are being lost in the shuffle. To say that this is a national problem does not absolve us from making the attempt to resolve it locally. For example, we have been intimately involved in determining the wording of those parts of the Faculty Manual which pertain to evaluation, but we have not seriously discussed the ethics of a system in which a person can be terminated without ever seeing in writing the basis for his or her termination, or what one's colleagues had to say. What empirical evidence is there to support the logic of such a process? Is your department more intellectually sound because of such a system? Have there been fewer law suits? I think not. As now constituted, the system encourages rumors and innuendos, and thereby probably increases the number of potential law suits.

In sum, I believe that if the present trend continues, we will all end up as technicians. There is an added danger, namely that we will begin to see ourselves as a besieged interest group, a conscious minority suspicious of everybody, students, colleagues and administrators alike. If this occurs, it will surely undermine our reason for being here. We will develop some of the same attitudes we associate with organizations like the A.M.A. We will be more concerned about our benefits and perquisites than about educating our youth. Such a danger would be even further exacerbated by any significant decline in enrollment—and this is a real possibility, given the declining number of college-age students in the local area. I saw first hand just how detrimental such a situation can be when I was teaching at San Jose State University in 1974.

As Bill Moore and others know full well, the position of Speaker has very little real power. But as Speaker, I think I could help the Faculty to articulate its vision. Newspeak can continue to aid us in this goal. As ex-officio member of various Faculty committees, I would encourage the process. For now, I will continue to contact the members of the Faculty on an individual basis. I'm particularly pleased with the response so far to the questions that have been raised. It is amazing how much idealism we still possess. In its Faculty the College has a great resource, and I for one believe that such a resource can be better utilized.

Sincerely,

Lee Drago
Dear Bill,

I appreciate the opportunity to contribute a letter to Newspeak expressing my views and ideas regarding the role of Speaker of the Faculty. For the benefit of those colleagues who do not know me, I would like to review briefly my background at the College. I have taught Spanish language and literature here for eleven years and have served on ad hoc and/or standing committees of the faculty for each of those years. I have watched the College grow from a small, somewhat provincial school to a larger institution with a more heterogeneous faculty and student body. Along with the growth in enrollment, the quality and scope of the academic programs have improved and expanded as well. I have been impressed with the faculty's commitment to academic excellence; even though we have not always agreed on the means to that end, I believe we share the same goal.

My view of the role of Speaker of the Faculty is that it is one primarily of service to the faculty in the following ways:

1. to serve as a liaison between faculty/administration and faculty/student body, and to facilitate communication between those groups;
2. to represent the faculty in an official capacity at college-related functions;
3. and to preside over faculty meetings.

As current Speaker of the Faculty, you indicated in a recent Interdepartmental Discussion Group that lack of information and misinformation were largely responsible for whatever faculty alienation exists on campus. I am convinced that the most effective method of dealing with that problem is the continued publication of Newspeak. I would like to see the format of Newspeak enlarged to include a section on faculty and administrative professional activities, and I would encourage increased faculty participation by soliciting letters and editorial statements about issues of importance to them.

Although the Speaker should convey and advocate the views of the faculty, he/she should also be capable of energetic and constructive leadership. The Speaker can play a vital role in converting the ideas and attitudes of the faculty into concrete and practical aspects of College policies through attendance at committee meetings, regular meetings with administrators, and contacts with other members of the College community.

If elected Speaker, I would expect to take advantage of the Speaker's access to members of the faculty and the administration for purposes of obtaining and exchanging information not readily available to individual faculty members or faculty committees. This ability to "cut through the red tape" is, as you pointed out, one of the Speaker's most effective tools.

This year I have served on the President's Advisory Committee; the committee's most important project has been to conduct a survey of faculty attitudes and opinions. Having seen and worked with the results of this survey, I feel that I have an excellent understanding of the primary and secondary issues which are of concern to the faculty. Such information would be extremely valuable in helping to articulate the problems perceived by the faculty.

Finally, I would hope to serve as a constant reminder to the administration that faculty members are feeling more and more burdened with the work (mostly of the paper variety) generated to feed administrative studies, projections, statistics, and evaluations. When faculty (and administrators) are deluged with such mundane detail, they often lose sight of long-term goals and objectives. As Speaker, I would try, with the help of the faculty, to focus on these goals and to encourage the administration to work with us in addressing the important long-range issues.

Sincerely,

Suzanne S. Moore
Associate Professor of Spanish
Prof. William Moore,
Speaker of the Faculty
College of Charleston

Dear Bill:

This letter is in response to your request that I express my views concerning the position of Speaker of the Faculty. I would like to divide my letter into three parts: (1) a look at my concept of the job of Speaker; (2) consideration of my qualifications for this position; and (3) an examination of what I would try to accomplish if elected to the post.

THE JOB OF SPEAKER. In 1977 I helped to design the Speaker's office and to write the description of the position that is now found in the Faculty and Administration Manual. After several years of experience with the Speakership, my current view of the job is very similar to what it was in 1977. The Speaker is an essential communications link between faculty and administration, and is an essential conscience of the institution. Specifically:

(1) The Speaker represents the concerns, ideas, and complaints of faculty to the administration. A "sense" of the faculty is gained by attending committee meetings, meeting with as many individual faculty as possible, responding to telephone and mail inquiries, and discerning the mood of the faculty at faculty meetings. As a representative he is both an active and passive agent. He must be open to any faculty opinion expressed to him and be willing to exercise good judgment in conveying that opinion. And the Speaker must be willing to solicit actively the ideas of less outspoken faculty. He should be a good listener in every sense of the word. The Speaker maintains a flow of ideas to the administration by means of meetings with key staff people, the Speaker's newsletter, and participation in staff meetings.

(2) The Speaker represents the concerns and ideas of administrators to the faculty. Information is obtained by attending staff meetings, analyzing internal communications and reports, and meeting regularly with the President and the Provost. The Speaker reports this information to the faculty at faculty meetings, in the Speaker's newsletter, at committee meetings, and in more informal settings.

(3) The Speaker serves as one of the consciences of the college community. Since he relates to so many in the community, he has a responsibility to discern, assess, and articulate the aspirations of his colleagues. He should work to erode the "we/they" divisions among faculty, staff, and students. The Speaker can be one important rallying point in sustaining and shaping the institution's sense of mission. His power to perform these tasks is not provided in the Faculty Bylaws. It is the effect of being at the center of a communications net in the College and being able to use the Speaker's newsletter, introduction of motions, and formal "State of the College" speeches to address the community.

THE SPEAKER PRESIDES OVER FACULTY MEETINGS. The business of the faculty should proceed efficiently but with fair representation of all positions on the issues. Since major issues are generated in faculty committees, he must have a clear understanding of faculty government at the College. The Speaker must work to maintain the viability of faculty government, which is a major voice of the faculty in the affairs of the institution. To this end he also must understand the successes and the problems of faculties and college governments in South Carolina and across the country. And he needs to know how the governance of the College relates to the government of the State, which is asserting greater controls over higher education in South Carolina.

QUALIFICATIONS. Of the candidates for the office of Speaker, I think that I am the most qualified to do the job effectively. Regarding the communicator and conscience roles of the Speaker, I have already carried out similar functions for the past several years as chapter President for the American Association of University Professors. I have a good grasp of how the institution operates because of my AAUP work and my three years service on the Budget Review and Planning Committee. As a former journalist, I have the skills to continue, expand, and refine the Speaker's newsletter. I know that I have a solid knowledge of faculty government at the College because of my work as Parliamentarian (I have worked with
every presiding officer since 1974), my service on key standing committees (such as Welfare), my chairing of two major committees (Hearing and the Appeals Committee on Tenure and Promotion), and my membership on several important ad hoc committees (such as the Provost Search Committee and the committee which negotiated changes in the Faculty Manual in 1976).

As Parliamentarian to the faculty, I have attended almost every faculty meeting since 1974 and believe that I would be an effective presiding officer, sensitive to the needs of all groups within the faculty. Legislative politics is one of my political science specialties, giving me insights into the dynamics of faculty meetings. In addition, I have an understanding of faculty and college government that goes beyond the institution. I am currently District Delegate to the South Carolina State AAUP. I have contacts with AAUP officers and college administrators throughout the state. Also, my contacts with the national AAUP have educated me regarding college government in other parts of the country. As a political scientist, I am particularly sensitive to the problems of state government as it relates to higher education in South Carolina. I spent my last sabbatical conducting a study in the S.C legislature, have taught state politics, and have completed various studies of S.C. politics.

PROPOSED GOALS. I will work to carry out all of the responsibilities that I have mentioned above. I would also seek to achieve the following:

(1) Reviewing the faculty benefits package to inform the faculty about the current package and to initiate possible additions, such as dental insurance and increased life insurance.

(2) Thoroughly examining the relationship that is developing between the College and the Consortium.

(3) Encouraging the College community to study the problem of student retention and working to develop faculty based programs to promote retention.

(4) Analyzing the systems used for evaluating administrators and faculty, especially those concerning formative evaluation.

(5) Addressing with faculty committees and administrators the projected problem of declining Charleston enrollments at the College in the future.

(6) Promoting a continuing examination of the salary structure and of reports of inequities in salaries.

(7) Helping the faculty government and administration to develop a policy regarding financial exigency.

(8) Reviewing the “policy” and “regulation” structure of the College as it relates to unclassified employees.

(9) A College wide examination and critique of the new Faculty and Administration Manual.

(10) Initiating a discussion of the meaning of faculty rights (especially academic freedom and free speech) in the small college community.

(11) Analyzing and evaluating the structure and operation of faculty government within the College.

No one could accomplish these goals in one year. But it is time to begin.

Sincerely yours,

Frank Petrusak
Dear Bill,

Thank you for your invitation to present my impressions on the state of the College. I wish that I had a general solution to the dilemma I shall describe, but unfortunately I do not. One discovers that the democratic process requires extraordinary patience and stamina.

Historians are especially aware that institutions usually reflect the values and concerns of the larger society. As much as faculty would like to believe that their institution is well insulated and can be shaped to fit the ideal, there are, I believe, limitations on what we can accomplish. We know that this College serves a varied constituency—from the bright, inquisitive scholars who are the intellectual leaven to the poorly prepared students who are thoroughly bewildered by their inadequacies. In between lies the great majority who, as an earlier generation might have said, "to get ahead." Common to all groups is the social pressure exerted by contemporaries as well as the moral, ethical and intellectual problems exposed by the higher learning. Furthermore, about forty per cent of our students have some form of outside employment. Not every youth thus engaged needs the money to get by; some reveal that they want spending money that will lift them from the "genteel poverty" that may be remembered by their elders as usually associated with student life. A few confess that gainful employment gives them a moral justification for not doing as well in college as they are capable of doing. This becomes the lower middle class equivalent of what used to be known at fashionable universities as "the gentleman's C." The student must be free, of course, to make this kind of decision, but every teacher will silently lament that part of the youth's academic potential was needlessly sacrificed.

All of this is to suggest that our role as teachers may now be more important than it has ever been. We cannot substitute for parental guidance that was seldom given; we cannot swiftly inculcate skills that ideally should have been gained in primary and secondary schools; and we will not, in the circumstances, produce the Little Oxford on the Ashlawn hill, which we may dream in the rapturously when we are young. But we can try ever more conscientiously to do the work which has been given to us in this time and place. It is undeniable that a significant number of our students—especially freshmen and sophomores—will be more interested in more than one discipline. In certain cases our help may be too late to avert disaster, but it is important, if possible, to prevent the student's alienation from the thought of future study. The best way to do this is to show by word and deed that we are true to our vocation. Surely this will help to combat the anti-intellectualism that has periodically beset us as a people.

My frustration at this point in my career is that an inordinate amount of our time seems to be devoted to attending, oiling and adjusting the organizational apparatus of the College. Instruments and procedures for faculty evaluation created at one time are later deemed inadequate and then revised. That the justification for this is perfectly appropriate consoles me not at all. That the next revision may bring these instruments and procedures closer to perfection consoles me only slightly more. Student evaluation forms have passed through a similar history, the current one receiving the imprimatur of a consultant who has worked on this problem for a professional lifetime. Yet its duration, I suspect, may also be limited. Numerous other tasks—in our departments or in the College at large—command our time, energy and consideration. Large or small, they become important to our collegial relationships. Failure to submit a form, do our homework, or meet a deadline are deficiencies that become sand in the bureaucratic machinery. We know that friction can cause everything to grind to a halt. One learns very early in failure to discharge these matters will bring marks of collegial or administrative displeasure.

To judge by an anecdote told by the late Richard Walsh, my graduate advisor at Georgetown University, the problem is widespread. Apparently the departmental chairman had made a request or circulated a directive but got no response from one colleague. Rather miffed, he confronted the offender with the question, "Did you read my memorandum?" Rising to the full stature of his five feet three inches, Dr. Lee, the professor of Chinese history, replied quietly, "I read only books." One is tempted to add that this may be the only recourse.

I cannot speak for others, but this relentless grind has had a deleterious effect upon the quality of my teaching and upon my general morale. The gist of my discontent is that all of this institutional labor, as important as it may be, seems out of proportion to the results momentarily gained. Years of this activity have worked a subtle but persistent reorientation of my mind toward the details of the institutional process. I have occasionally recoiled in horror, for example, at the thought that I want to get through a day's classes because I have an assortment of odds and ends that must be completed. Thus, means can be transformed into ends, and the governing process made to seem more important than learning and teaching. Certainly no one intended this.
If there is fatigue among some of our colleagues, it is fatigue that is less the product of age than of the system. It reminds me of one historian's observation about the condition of France during the later decades of the Old Regime—that Frenchmen fell to "finding despotism everywhere and the despot nowhere."

In my negative moments, which fortunately are few, I savor Dr. Lee's reply. Four words that could change the world! Not only that, they epitomize at least two cardinal virtues of scholarship: precision and economy.

Sincerely,

Editor's Note: Malcolm Clark was Speaker of the Faculty during the 1982-83 school year.

The Consortium and Grades: A Progress Report

Office of the
Dean of Undergraduate Studies
February 22, 1984

Dr. William V. Moore
The Department of Political Science
The College of Charleston
Charleston, South Carolina
29424

Dear Bill:

In the past few months our office has become aware of the faculty's concern over courses taken through the Consortium Program by cross registration. I thought we could allay some of the concerns by clarifying how our office works within that agreement.

Two applicable sections of the Charleston Higher Education Consortium Cross Registration brochure state:

"...Under the Consortium Cross Registration agreement, a student in good standing at any one of the Consortium institutions may enroll in a course at any other Consortium institution provided:

a) that the course is not offered concurrently at the student's home institution;
b) that the student meets the qualifications stipulated by the offering institution;
c) that the Dean at both the home institution and the host institution approve in writing;
d) that there is space available..."

"...Any course taken within the Consortium, whether or not the student is full-time or part-time and whether or not the courses are taken "tuition-free", will be handled by the home institution as an in-residence course rather than as a transfer course. In the case of courses applicable to the student's degree program, this policy means that the course grade as well as the course credits will be entered on the student's record."

The cross registration form which this office uses contains a space to be marked by the home institution Dean indicating that the course will or will not be applicable to the student's degree program. This approval and the Dean's signature is given only after a separate form (which I have attached) is signed by the department chairman of the course or major concerned. The department chairman makes the
determination as to how or if credit will be granted. No signature indicates that the department chairman has decided that the course should not be applicable to the student’s degree program. The student’s option is to ask that the course be treated as a transfer course, in which case only the hours will be listed on the student’s transcript.

We have requested that the Academic Advisory Council of the Charleston Higher Education Consortium be convened to discuss a substitute for the current policy on "in-residence" grades (see attached letter). We would caution that other consortial institutions are very sensitive about any discussion concerning the quality of teaching faculty and courses. If our efforts to clarify existing policy are perceived negatively, we will have needlessly alienated participants in the very process we are trying to strengthen.

Sincerely,

W. A. Lindstrom
Assistant Dean for Upperclass Advising

Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies
February 20, 1984

Dr. John Bevan
Executive Director
Charleston Higher Education Consortium
171 Ashley Avenue
Charleston, South Carolina 29425

Dear Dr. Bevan:

Recently the College of Charleston faculty has expressed concern over the policy of granting "in residence" grades for courses taken under the auspices of the Consortium cross-registration policy. There is a great deal of uncertainty with respect to the process by which the "in residence" policy was conceived and implemented. There is also concern that the College of Charleston is being placed in the awkward position of refusing to grant student requests for cross-registration. Many of our faculty perceive instruction at other participating institutions as not being as rigorous as our own.

Although it is understood that any of the participating institutions has the right to accept or not to grant credit for courses offered under the auspices of the Consortium cross-registration policy, there might be an opportune time to engage in a review of this particular policy because of the controversy it has generated at the College. As you are well aware, consortia work well when member institutions are kept informed and see the collective effort as a distinct advantage. Opportunities for clarification of policies or issues usually serve to strengthen bonds that bind institutions in a collective effort.

The administrative staff of the College of Charleston is formally requesting the convening of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Charleston Higher Education Consortium at its earliest convenience to address the consortium cross-registration policy as it specifically relates to the acceptance of grades for courses taken under consortium auspices.

We are requesting that the following statement be substituted for paragraph four under the heading "What are the cross-registration policies?" in the brochure on cross-registration.

Sincerely,

W. A. Lindstrom
Assistant Dean for Upperclass Advising
Any full or part-time student taking courses within the consortium, whether or not the courses are taken tuition free, will be granted credit for those courses by the home institution. Each participating institution will reserve the right to set its own policy regarding the award of grades for courses taken through cross-registration.

Sincerely yours,

David V. Taylor
Dean of Undergraduate Studies

Dear Bill,

I am writing to update the faculty on the activities of the Budget Review and Planning Committee, particularly with regard to the development of the 1984-87 planning document. In late January, both the BRPC and the President's Planning Team received copies of the available academic and administrative departmental planning documents. The PPT met and formulated a list of 'critical issues' which members of that group felt must be addressed over the next three years. This list was forwarded to the BRPC with the request that we review the list, raise questions regarding any of the issues, and add 'critical issues' of our own. The BRPC added five issues to the list for a total of nineteen.

With the list of critical issues in hand, the BRPC reviewed each of the planning documents to determine whether the goals and objectives in each document were congruent with the institutional goals statement and the planning assumptions and whether each objective addressed a critical issue.

In a report to the PPT, the BRPC addressed these questions and provided additional comments. The PPT has now discussed each of the departmental plans and agreed on a number of general policies which will guide the preparation of the final draft of the plan. The planning document was to have been completed in time for the March Board meeting. However, at this point, the institutional plans from the President and the Provost are still in preparation, there are no plans from the division of Advancement, and most of the departmental plans require some revision. Consequently, it is unlikely that the complete plan will be ready by mid-March.

The past few weeks have involved a great deal of effort and time on the part of both the BRPC and PPT accompanied by a large measure of frustration and anxiety on the part of both groups as to how we should interact and as to the final product of our labors. The process has been cumbersome and the relationship between the groups has been tentative. This should not be surprising in light of the fact that this is our first college-wide planning document and that this is the first year that the BRPC and PPT have operated as separate groups.

On the positive side, it is clear that we will produce a college-wide plan this year and that plan should begin to help both the faculty and administration formulate a vision of what we want to and can become. This vision will not come easily and we will undoubtedly be divided on some issues. Typically, there are two definitions of the 'university' which coexist in most institutions. The faculty's definition is that the college is the faculty while the trustee's view the college as a corporation. Any vision of the future of the College must respond to both definitions and will need the support of all constituencies of the College. I don't expect a shared vision to crystalize overnight, but I do believe that no long-term direction for the College will be developed without a planning process. In the future, I expect the process to be smoother, the calendar to be more realistic, and the final planning document to more accurately reflect our budgetary constraints. However, we have made a beginning and that's not bad.

Sincerely,

W. Hugh Haynsworth
Dear Bill:

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to share with Newspeak readers some positive observations from a Registrar's point of view. My comments are focused on a general and specific concern of most faculty members. Although at this time in the semester this issue may seem to be of little concern and past observations, an insignificant point, nevertheless I feel it's imperative that I state them at this time. The deadline for submission of final grades by the faculty is the specific issue. The academic calendar as it relates to final exams and limited turn around time provided after the last exam is the topic of some general comments.

The past fall semester 1983 proved to be one of the most cooperative semesters between the faculty and this Registrar that has ever been experienced. It became vividly clear at the end of the semester when final grades were due that the "team work" concept really did exist in the faculty academic arena. The control that the Registrar had in establishing the deadline for submission of grades was minimal at best. Exam ending dates were set, commencement program printing dates were set and commencement itself was set and within those parameters, a deadline for grades was asked to be established. The faculty response to this was overwhelmingly supportive. Ninety-six percent of all grades were turned in on or before the deadline. Of the 4% that weren't, 3% were adjunct temporary members. Most of whom, had never taught at the College. The issue is greater than just submission of grades. It was a clear and visible sign of solidarity behind a common goal.

The academic calendar as it relates to final exams and the close of the semester has been getting increasingly tighter for the past two years. This tightness has "bottlenecked" at the time following the last exam and preceding the official close of the semester, historically identified with Spring or Fall commencements. We would all like to wrap up the work in our perspective areas as quickly as possible to enjoy the break between semesters. However, our obligations to our students is paramount.

The elimination of a mid-year commencement, contrary to popular belief was not because of a time element need by the Registrar to have grades checked for seniors. This issue really is a mute point, when you consider that whether or not there is a ceremony on the last day of the semester, candidates for December graduation will still have to be certified by the Registrar, prior to that last day. Also, grades for all other students will still have to be processed in the same amount of time and mailed out before we leave, as it has been done in the past. Unless all senior candidates were required to wait until we return in January and all other students wait for their grades to determine success or failure; the cancellation of a December commencement changes the complexion of this office barely. Therefore, in my opinion, deadlines will remain tight and the support and cooperation of the entire faculty critical in continuing to have some success throughout this chaotic period of the semester.

Sincerely,

Calvin "Chip" Jackson