From the Speaker

Gilding the Trophy for Atrophy??

Like the clanging "liberty" bell that once summoned College of Charleston students to classes, the formal institutions of faculty government may be sliding into oblivion. At least that's the impression of some of our more vocal faculty who point to the decline of the General Faculty meeting (lower attendance, too many announcements, not enough substance) and the weakening of Faculty standing committees (lack of substantive recommendations to the faculty, displacement of business to ad hoc task forces). "And the Speaker," our friends say, "spends too much time going to committee meetings where nothing gets accomplished. The Speaker might as well be out gilding the trophy for the atrophy of faculty governance."

Our concerned colleagues are certainly right about one thing: the role of the faculty in the governance of the College has changed since the latest incarnation of formal faculty governance in 1970. These changes can be disturbing or satisfying depending on one's view of academic governance and one's professional role perception. Consider these schools of thought (observed among the College of Charleston faculty) that might describe and explain the current status of faculty influence in the governance of the College:

The democratic school. According to the democrat, all major and mid-level decisions of the institution must bear the stamp of faculty approval. All such decisions should be discussed by the appropriate faculty standing committee and come to the floor of the faculty for a formal vote. Ideally, major policy changes would be initiated by the faculty. The President would certify faculty actions. The democrat is particularly concerned about current developments at the College. He sees a burgeoning bureaucracy which displaces the faculty from its rightful role in institutional governance.

The professionalist school. As rapid change crashes into the academic community, the professionalist believes that the problems are best handled by professionals whose expertise guarantees that they can tackle the difficulties of modern life. Most of the professionals will be located in the staff of the College, and the staff must be expanded to supply the needed expertise. Major policy ideas and decisions will originate in the staff and be sealed by the President. To the extent that they possess useful expertise, individual faculty would be used in an advisory capacity. The formal faculty government is not an essential part of the governance structure. In the mind of the professionalist, the College is tracked in the right direction in the development of institutional governance.

The consultant school. The consultant is not much concerned about democracy or the need for "professionals". He understands that the primary job of the faculty member is to teach and conduct research. Participating in faculty governance is not part of his job description. However, he expects that the College administration will consult with faculty, individually and collectively, before major decisions are made. It is expected that the faculty opinion will be solicited and listened to. To the
consultant, the current state of governance at the College is satisfactory. Consultation occurs through the use of advisory task forces, faculty government, and more informal interaction among administrators and selected representatives of the faculty. If the formal faculty government does not fit the consulting role, then it properly heads the way of the dodo bird, says the consultant.

The specialist school. To the specialist, a sharp division exists between administration and faculty in higher education. Administrators govern and faculty teach and research. The administration guides the institution in planning for the future and making day-to-day decisions. The job of the faculty member is to stay in the classroom, stay out of policy controversies, and follow the decisions that come out of the central administration. The specialist would be frustrated about developments at the College. A substantial segment of the faculty refuses to keep quiet (at least some of the time), insists on advising administrators (whether asked or not), and moves easily across the role/job boundary between faculty member and administrator.

This listing of "schools" is not exhaustive and probably not mutually exclusive of all faculty members at the College. Indeed, there may be as many "schools" as there are faculty. My point is that the "disaster" of formal faculty government is a disaster only from the standpoint of certain philosophies of institutional governance. I think that most faculty at the College belong to the Consultant school. They expect to be asked to give advice and have input. They expect to offer "advice" on their own initiative if they feel the College has been set on a potentially dangerous course. But they do not expect to make governance chores a daily preoccupation.

However, I do believe that the faculty government reasonably represents major segments of faculty opinion on most issues of concern to the College. The President, Provost, and staff have an obligation (more, though not legal) to solicit opinion and advice from standing faculty committees and the corporate faculty. As Speaker, I think I am not yet prepared to gild a trophy for altrrophy. I would hope to encourage a faculty that chooses to be informed and active concerning College issues, a faculty that will help shape the future of the institution.

Editor's Note: Dr. Jacqueline Mattfeld, Provost and Dean of the Faculty, has agreed to write an essay regarding the role of faculty in governance of the College. It will appear in a future issue of Newspeak.

New Faculty Roster for '84-'85
(Continued)

Temporary Full-Time Faculty for 1984-85 Academic Year
Dorsey Condon, Computer Science
Charles Kay, Philosophy
Anne Kilpatrick, Political Science
George Richardson, History

Temporary Full-Time Faculty for Fall Semester 1984
Dorothy Marban, Languages
Terry Richardson, Physics
Jerry Spencer, Business Administration/Economics
Committee Bulletin Board

Reports from Faculty Committees and College Committees

Faculty Advisory Committee to the President. In late September the Committee met with President Edward Collins to discuss its concerns about charging an annual fee at the College of Charleston Club. Invited guests, including Richard Hayes, Vice President for Institutional Advancement, and Peter Rowe, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Club, attended the meeting.

Michael Finefrock, chair of the Committee, summarized criticisms of the club fee found in responses to a questionnaire that the committee had sent to the faculty. Negative concerns expressed by the faculty included: (1) public relations effort inadequate leaving some unanswered questions; (2) promotion of exclusivity; (3) potential removal of a meeting place for many faculty with a perceived negative effect on morale; (4) and discriminates against single faculty and staff in the amount of dues requested.

Peter Rowe presented the rationale for the club's decision. He noted the needs of the Blacklock House as a business operation, the need for major structural restoration and ongoing necessary maintenance of costly, valuable furnishings.

The relationship between the club and the College of Charleston Foundation was clarified by Richard Hayes. The club is run by the Foundation with the Board of Governors as an advisory body to make recommendations regarding the status of the Blacklock House and its operations. Members of the Board of Governors include three faculty, three alumni, and three foundation representatives who have voting privileges and three ex-officio members who do not vote (i.e. the President of the College, the Foundation President, and the President of the Alumni Association).

Hayes noted that the club had been losing $1,000 per month on food service and that something needed to be done to run the place like a business.

Currently, the Committee is conducting a more detailed analysis of the faculty questionnaires. It will meet again with the President in late October.

Contact person: Michael Finefrock, 2-5712.

College Planning Council (formerly the Budget Review and Planning Committee). The Committee is currently working to develop a method to determine if the current College budget is following the goals set in the Five Year Planning Document. It also is reassessing the planning assumptions of the institution.

Additional information about the work of the Committee is found elsewhere in this issue of Newspeak. See Alice Jacobson's article regarding planning at the College and Hugh Haynesworth’s letter reporting on the status of the Council’s business.

Contact person: Hugh Haynesworth, 2-5730.

Committee on Continuing and Graduate Education. The first meeting of the year was held on October 11, and the Committee has reserved the fourth Tuesday of the month as a regular meeting day. Abby Smith, Associate Dean of Continuing Education, reported on enrollments for spring 1984 non-credit courses. A total of 346 students enrolled in 25 courses during that session. She also presented a summary report of the Humanities Outreach Program, which last year provided 2,975 members of the Charleston community with non-credit courses, free lectures, a conference, and an outreach event for school children. The strength of the program, she noted, was the high quality of its lecturers and instructors and its cooperative approach with other institutions, such as the South Carolina Historical Society, Gibbes Art Gallery, and Spoleto USA.
The Committee discussed at length the procedures for recruiting adjunct faculty to teach non-credit courses. Concern was expressed that College faculty be given priority opportunity to teach such courses before a search was extended to the general community. Abby Smith noted that Continuing Education does regularly consult with relevant departments about recruitment but that course ideas sometimes originate from prospective instructors outside the College. The Committee discussed the possibility of a formal routing procedure for course proposals and viva of prospective adjunct faculty.

Providing faculty status for adjunct faculty was also considered. For example, an adjunct who had been evaluation and served at least three years at the College might be given Senior Adjunct Status, which would entitle him to be listed in the catalog and be given additional financial compensation. Traditional ranks might also be given to adjuncts.

A list of 30 fall recipients of Incentive Grants was received by the Committee. In the future the Committee will consider methods of fund raising to support these grants.

The Committee will also consider developing a College-wide policy for evaluation and award of credit based on scores received on CLEP exams.

Contact person, Helen Ivy, 2-5530.

Committee on Curriculum and Academic Planning. Two course, Geology 220 (Hydrogeology, 3 credit hours) and Geology 411 (Tectonics, 3 credits), have been approved by the Committee. They will be brought to the faculty for approval in November.

A deadline of November 30 was set for submission of proposals for minors from the academic departments. Review or consideration of new majors will be discussed with Alice Jacobson regarding procedures.

The Committee further delayed its discussion of ROTC course transfer credits to the College. Both the Business and Political Science Departments are affected by requests for such transfers. The Committee has asked both departments for comments on this problem and has yet to hear from Business.

The Honors Program and Language Department are being evaluated this year by the Committee. Subcommittees will be organized to review self study reports before they are sent to evaluators. Chairmen of departments which conducted peer reviews last spring (Business Administration/Economics, Education, and Fine Arts) will meet with the Committee to discuss the reviews.

Contact person, Jim Hagy, 2-5711.

Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics. At its first meeting of the year, the Committee heard reports heard from Marion Doig, chairman, regarding his input over the summer into selection of a new Athletic Director (John Kresse) and review of the student handbook. He noted that the student grievance procedure found in the handbook is not the same procedure proposed last year by the committee. It is one that has been in effect for some time but was unavailable previously in written form. Frank Petrusak, Speaker of the Faculty, noted that the student grievance procedure, as well as other grievance procedures for College personnel, are under review by the College counsel.

John Kresse reported on athletics at the College, past and present. He noted that students and faculty and their families will again be admitted free to athletic events. The committee agreed to consider recommending that faculty join the Cougar Club.

George Habobak, Vice President for Student Affairs, reported on current concerns in the Student Affairs area, including campus safety, racial tensions on campus, and the needs of commuter students.

Jean Hamilton, Assistant Professor of Physical Education, noted that students must apply before October 31 for Who’s Who selection. The Committee will consider applications in early November.

The Committee will meet Tuesday at noon at the request of Committee members or when student petitions are received.

Contact person, Marion Doig, 2-5587.
Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Assistance. Regarding recent student petitions, the Committee voted to deny a student transfer credit for the equivalent of Mathematics 101 taken at a University of Maryland program in Germany. The student had withdrawn several times from this course at the College and did not take it in the current term. The Committee noted that the student is not eligible to take the coursework elsewhere and receive credit at the College.

The Committee is discussing the problems surrounding the "no third probation" rule which causes some readmitted students to be dropped for academic deficiency even though they are doing satisfactory work. Both Undergraduate Dean David Taylor and Bill Lindstrom, Assistant Undergraduate Dean, have participated in these discussions. The Dean's office is concerned about how the "progress contracts" it negotiates with students returning from probation relate to the "no third probation" rule.

Contact person, Gary Asleson, 2-5587.

Committee on the Library. At its first meeting, David Cohen, Director of the Library, reported on renovations and improvements, such as new carpet and changing the reference and microfilm areas. Proposed future improvements include renovation of the basement area now occupied by the Accounting Department into stocks for 30,000 books and perimeter offices for study and conferences.

The Committee also discussed:
* Providing a soundproof booth for one large microfilm reader and supplying reliable typewriters for the students.
* Conducting an audit and review of current journal acquisitions in the academic departments.
* Establishing an ombudsman in the library for department liaison.
* Encouraging faculty and staff support for developing a library automation system that would computerize catalog and search procedures. A letter of Committee support is being drafted.

The Committee met with Virginia Friedman, Director of the Learning Resource Center, to discuss the LRC's holdings and services. Ms. Friedman invited faculty to visit the LRC and described the TV studio and media production rooms as superior. Copy-stand photography is available for faculty. LRC can also produce slide shows, tapes, and TV productions for instructional purposes. The LRC contains a self-instruction laboratory, a small collection of films and videotapes, and a large media rental catalog. Susan Hill is in charge of film rentals. Corinne Potter is a producer/scriptwriter available for productions.

Lisa Segal, student representative, asked about the possibility of courses in media production and producing a College of Charleston TV show. While no classes are available, plans are in the works for a weekly College TV show on Storer Cable. A video club has been established to help students learn production skills.

Contact Person, Frances Welch, 2-5613.

President's Planning and Budget Team. The PPBT is preparing to analyze and review three year plans being submitted by the academic departments and administrative divisions of the College. The team will recommend to the President changes and points of acceptance for these plans.

Contact person, Alice Jacobson, 2-7031.

Faculty Research and Development Committee. The Committee has completed its recommendations for the awarding of College grants for the spring semester. Thirteen faculty will receive grants totaling about $20,000. A list of specific grants will appear in the next issue of Newspeak.

Contact person, Bob Mignone, 2-5730.

Faculty Welfare Committee. At the request of the Provost, the Committee is reviewing the
form that students use to evaluate faculty teaching each semester. Mike Katona, Chair of the Committee, expects the questionnaire review to be a major item on the Welfare agenda for the next several meetings. Members of the faculty are still invited to submit recommendations for reform of the old questionnaire or suggested new questionnaires.

Contact person, Mike Katona, 2-5589.

Council of Chairmen. The Council is continuing work on an agenda of items that it developed in late summer:

(1) Encouraging the use of standing faculty committees instead of task forces to deal with major college problems and issues. The Council has asked the Speaker of the Faculty to attempt to ensure that the committees have full involvement in key policy decisions that relate to the faculty.

(2) Reviewing the process of decision making by the Summer School Director for the hiring of adjunct and overload faculty. The Council will meet with Bill Moore, Director of Maymester and Summer School, to discuss this matter.

(3) Concern about the Admissions Office and College Development areas. The Council will ask Richard Hayes, Vice President for Institutional Advancement, to keep it informed about the work in his area.

(4) Review of the current status and development of departmental budgets.

(5) Role of the Council of Chairmen in the evaluation of departmental chairs.

(6) Review by the chairmen of contacts to new faculty before they are mailed out.

Several of these items will be discussed with the Provost, two Associate Provosts, and Speaker of the Faculty at a meeting in late October.

Contact Person, Bill Golightly, 2-5730.

---

Computer Peer Review Issues Report

An External Computer Peer Review Group evaluated the academic, administrative, and office automation needs of the College of Charleston last summer and made specific recommendations for the direction of computing at the College for the future in a report issued late last August. Members of the review group were: Michael Stockdell, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell, and Company, Chairman; John Tyler, Assistant Vice Chancellor for computing services and director of Systems Network Computer Center, Louisiana State University; Ronald Goldstein, Associate Professor of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Miami (Florida); Wayne Muth, Professor of Computer Science and Associate Chairman, Department of Statistics and Computer Sciences, West Virginia University; and Bart Houseman, Chairman, Department of Chemistry and Co-Director of Academic Computing, Goucher College.

Following are excerpts from the recommendations of this report:

...In our evaluation of the current environment at the College and in comparing it with the status of computing at similar institutions, and as it ideally should be, we reached a number of conclusions. In general we find that the College has acquired a reasonable level of computer service considering the investment that has been made to this point. We also view the rapid increase in expenditure over the last few years as being normal and justified. We feel that substantial additional investments are needed, however. These investments are intended to improve the academic computer situation which we believe is critical for the College to overcome the administrative computer situation which we believe is antiquated and only minimally functional.

Academic Computing Academic computing needs additional support to continue to attract high quality students and faculty to meet institutional goals. This involves the following specific needs: (1) an additional staff of four to five people to provide software support and consulting; (2) additional access to mainframes and minicomputers through terminals; (3) continued use of the University of South Carolina computer for services that can only be provided through big system access; (4)
installation of microcomputers in the areas of network education, Computer Assisted Instruction, Introductory computer courses, and the like; (5) encouragement of faculty computer literacy and computer use; and (6) expansion of the computer science curriculum.

Administrative Computing The College needs to provide a better system to administrative users. This involves several major issues: (1) the College should replace most of the systems currently in place with acquired applications software packages which provide superior technical and functional features; (2) the College should acquire a local computer facility to increase responsiveness and control; (3) the College should continue the direction of supplying effective office automation and networking services to end users and should invest in new terminals and printers for this purpose; and (4) the College should increase the user involvement in systems development and should enhance user access to data via a "fourth-generation language"...

The following are basic thrusts of (our conclusions as to the needs of the College):

Academic Computing

1. A laboratory with 12–24 networked microcomputers is the top priority for the College.
2. Academic computing should be supported by an Academic User’s Service Group of from two to four people. This User’s Service Group will assist in the institution of a computer literacy program for students and faculty.
3. The learning facilities provided under the UNIX operating system make the acquisition of a multi-workstation microcomputer operating under UNIX imperative.
4. The College should retain an Information Resource Manager to allocate both academic and administrative resources and to control all information handling facilities.
5. Other academic computer facilities should not be budgeted in the current fiscal year.

Administrative Computing

1. A formal methodology should be adopted for the development of administrative systems. This methodology should emphasize user involvement and user control and is available in academic texts and as a product from a number of vendors.
2. Software packages should be acquired to replace key administrative systems. The packages should include at least the following: an integrated student system, a payroll/personnel system, and a fund accounting general ledger system.
3. All systems should be transferred from the University of South Carolina (USC) data center to a computer center located in Charleston, S.C. In order to support these systems technically, the College should hire a Systems Programmer.
4. An administrative computer should be acquired. It should be compatible with the administrative software selected. This and other recommendations should not, however, be implemented in fiscal year 1985.
5. An information center should be installed using the Wang computer and a "fourth generation" language...

(Editor's Note: The estimated annual costs for implementing the Peer Review recommendations as one-time investments amortized over five years would be: $178,000 for 1984-85 and $228,000 for 1985-86.)

Self Study Committees Being Formed

College committees that will assist in conducting the self study for reaccreditation of the College are currently being formed. President Edward Collins has named the chairs of the following committees:
Committee on Finance, Jim Snyder
Letters to the Editor

Planning; College Club; Missing Faculty

To The Editor:

The purpose of this letter is provide an interim report on the activities of the College Planning Council, and to answer the question, "Whatever happened to the Budget Review and Planning Committee?" Based on the experience gained through the 1983-84 academic year and information provided by Dr. Ray Haas in the day-long seminar he gave to a large portion of the faculty and administration last spring, the Budget Review and Planning Committee has been replaced by the College Planning Council. While the composition of the College Planning Council is the same as that of the 1983-84 BRPC, the CPC will not be involved in activities which parallel those of the President’s Planning and Budget Team. Instead, the CPC will concentrate on activities which provide the framework for next year’s planning cycle while reviewing the previous year’s budget and approved plan to identify major concerns which should be taken into account in the current year’s planning and budgeting cycle. Consequently, this year the College Planning Council is reviewing the 1984-85 budget and the 1984-87 plan and is developing planning assumptions to be used in 1985-86 in developing the 1986-89 plan. The PPBT is responsible for developing the 1985-88 plan and the 1985-86 budget, so the two committees now have virtually no overlap in duties.

The College Planning Council is established by the President and reports to the President. The composition of the Committee consists of six elected faculty, a chair appointed by the President, a student appointed by the SGA as well as three ex-officio members. These are the Vice President for Business Affairs, the Associate Provost for Planning and Evaluation, and the Speaker of the Faculty.

The charge of the College Planning Council lists six specific duties for the Council as was reported in the Committee activities section of the September issue of Newpspeak. To date, the work of the CPC has dealt primarily with the two duties mentioned above. The Council is currently soliciting input from all academic and administrative department heads regarding the degree to which their approved
1984-85 departmental budgets will enable them to carry out the first year of their approved departmental plan. In addition, all readers of Newspeak are invited to identify in writing any broader institutional issues which were addressed in the approved institutional plan which you feel were not adequately funded in the 1984-85 budget. Please include a brief explanation. Responses should be sent to Hugh Haynesworth, Department of Mathematics, no later than November 2. The responses of the department heads and faculty as well as information provided by the Office of Business Affairs and the Provost's Office will be used to identify inconsistencies between the current plan and the budget.

The Council is currently preparing a draft list of areas in which planning assumptions are needed and are not represented. This list will be circulated and suggestions for additions will be solicited in the near future. Once the list of areas for potential planning assumptions has been completed, the assistance of the faculty will be needed to provide input to help formulate the planning assumptions to be used in the 1985-86 planning cycle.

Undoubtedly, the largest and most complex task facing the CPC this year is the review of the College mission and institutional goals statements, in conjunction with the self-study. This review will begin in November.

If any member of the faculty has questions or suggestions for the College Planning Council, please let me know.

Hugh Haynesworth, Chairman
College Planning Council

To the Editor:

After I was invited to participate in the President's Advisory Committee meeting on September 24 with reference to the recent institution of a membership fee at the College of Charleston Club, the Committee agreed that it would be a good idea to address the issue once again in Newspeak. I concurred with this idea.

During the Spring 1984 meeting of the Board of Governors of the Club held in May, the suggestion was made from several members representing the various constituencies (alumni, faculty, foundation) to institute a membership fee. The objection at that time came from one board member, with the rest agreeing that, in terms of fiscal responsibility, the fee was probably overdue. In June the fee of $25.00 was set. As I outlined in the September faculty meeting, the reasons obtain from the needs of the house as a historic structure and the needs of the house as a food service operation. The Foundation representatives to the board had outlined the consistent long term losses the Club operation was suffering on the food operation. The fee, we believe, is both just and also quite modest (especially if you compare it to other similar club facilities). Alumni have always paid the same membership fee, even though we have noted that many of the alumni members seldom use the facilities. I might add the Board is eager to have the alumni continue to enjoy the facilities also in greater numbers.

During subsequent meetings it was also agreed that the food service operation at the Blacklock House be examined to meet the needs and wishes of the chief supporters: faculty/staff and alumni. The hot buffet was eliminated owing to several reasons, but principally because few were purchasing the buffet lunch.

We feel the current sandwich and salad bar which includes an expanded selection, with the addition of breads and cheeses would satisfy the requests we heard from members. We hope to continue to be sensitive to comments regarding the food. The soups were improved and new desserts were offered. We feel the food prices are rather low and completely justifiable. Coffee/tea are now charged for and people luncheons may have both for the same price.

Some people have commented that they feel the membership fee and increased prices will, in fact, lower our revenues. We feel otherwise and have been most optimistic regarding the entire Club
operation. The fees are for the support of a facility quite unlike any other in the city and one which we hope faculty/staff, and alumni will enjoy as their own. If there has been a feeling that this was a punitive measure, we hope that this is dispelled quickly as it simply was not. We feel strongly that the Foundation's efforts for the faculty and for student scholarships do merit our support. I am happy to discuss, as board chairman this year, any facet of the operation that people wish to entertain. The total memberships have increased weekly and you are invited to join at any time.

Peter J. Rowe
Psychology Department

To the Editor:

It has been brought to my attention that there were omissions in the listing of new librarians in the September 1964 issue of *Newspeak*. Please print the following new faculty list (includes additions and corrections) in your next issue of *Newspeak*.

Dorothy Fludd (Assistant Reference Librarian), Librarian II, MA Education, University of New York; MLS Library Science, Queens College.
Katie Higgins (Assistant Cataloger), Librarian I, MA Anthropology, University of Tennessee; MLS Library Science, Florida State University.
Jacob Murray (Assistant Reference Librarian), Librarian II; MLS Library Science, Indiana University.
Phillip Powell (Assistant Reference Librarian), Librarian I, MS Education, Illinois State University; MA Library Science, Northern Illinois University.
John Schmitt (Head, Reference Department), MA Library Science, University of Wisconsin.

Thank you.

David Cohen
Director of Libraries
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My Turn

"Why Bother?" Planning at the College

By Alice Jacobson

I am aware that faculty and administrators who are already overloaded with work may consider planning an extra burden and ask, "Why bother?" I believe that planning is an essential ingredient for success for today's colleges and universities, and so I would like to begin my column with a response to that no-so-hypothetical question.

As recently as ten years ago, most colleges and universities prided themselves on the fact that they had not changed. It was important for higher education institutions to maintain traditions, to be recognizable to graduates as the same place they had attended, to offer a stable and unchanging curriculum especially in the liberal arts.

Within the last decade because of such factors as declining numbers of high school graduates (predicted through the late 1990s), rising costs of everything from salaries to building repairs to complicated machines and new technologies, diminishing respect by some consumers for the usefulness of a college education (some would argue this was a byproduct of the student revolutions of the late 60s and the 70s), the very survival of some colleges and universities has been at risk.

Although we at the College are by no means in the same precarious position of, for instance, small private institutions in the Northeast where the population is shrinking markedly, we do suffer from some of the threats to our stability mentioned above, and we have a series of approximately 20 "critical issues" which we must face to secure a strong future (see pp. 398-400 of the current planning document).

The simple answer to "why plan?" is that if we don't plan for our own future, someone else will do it for us. Of course, there are other good reasons, too. First, the State College Board has required that we annually update our three-year plans; second, the Southern Association has included planning as one of its new standards of excellence required for reaccreditation; third, the fairest way to budget in complex organizations is to base budgeting on planning; fourth, the best evaluations are ones which cover how successful a department or program has been in reaching its goals; and fifth, many philanthropic organizations feel better about giving to an institution which is proactive about its own future.

With that brief overview about why we plan, let me turn to a description of how we will do it at the College for the 1984-85 planning cycle. All academic department chairs and administrative directors have been asked to update their three-year plans (for the period 1985-86 - 1987-88), review them with the Provost or vice-president to whom they report, and have them handed into my office by mid-November. From that point through January, each department chair and academic unit will discuss its new plans with the President's Planning and Budget Team. After that group (the President, the Provost, the Vice-Presidents, the Speaker of the Faculty, the Chair of the College Planning Council, the President of Student Government, and me) reviews the plans, suggests changes as necessary, and makes final recommendations to the President, he will determine exactly what to accept, and the plans' goals and objectives will be printed and shared with the Trustees and the community at large. On February 1, department heads, both academic and administrative, will create budgets for the 1985-86 year based on their accepted plans.

In the meantime, the College Planning Council, chaired by Hugh Haynesworth, is hard at work. I understand that Dr. Haynesworth has a letter in this issue in which he explains what the Committee will be doing during this year as preliminary work for the 1985-86 planning cycle. As most readers know, this group used to be called the Budget Review and Planning Committee, but they
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requested a name change to reflect more accurately their new roles. We have put in motion the suggestions of our planning consultant, Dr. Ray Haas, and the CPC and the PPBT are working on discrete tasks for the first time this year. The faculty committee will be creating planning assumptions for the 1985-86 cycle as well as reviewing and suggesting changes in the institutional mission and goals statements. There are several other ways in which that group will lead the planning effort, and I am sure that Hugh's letter will spell them out in great detail.

As you can guess, planning processes evolve and, I hope, improve over time. Our main thrust for improvement this year is to provide better feedback to the departments which produce the plans. I hope that the Speaker will ask me to comment on the connection between our "regular" planning effort and the self-study in the next issue. I would also be happy to describe how individual and departmental evaluations tie in to planning, and I would be more than happy to respond to questions which this article prompts from readers.

---

**Fact File**

***Facts*** ***Facts*** ***Facts*** ***Facts*** ***Facts***

Desegregation Plan Status Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 1981-8</th>
<th>Fall 1982-83</th>
<th>Fall 1983-84</th>
<th>Fall 1984-85</th>
<th>Fall 1985-86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal Actual</td>
<td>Goal Actual</td>
<td>Goal Actual</td>
<td>Goal Actual</td>
<td>Goal Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Time</td>
<td>6.8% 6.4%</td>
<td>8.7% 5.6%</td>
<td>11.3% 5.7%</td>
<td>13.6% 6.2%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering</td>
<td>(69) (65)</td>
<td>(93) (60)</td>
<td>(106) (54)</td>
<td>(125) (58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.0% 6.6%</td>
<td>7.0% 6.8%</td>
<td>8.0% 6.5%</td>
<td>9.0% 6.8%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>(294) (323)</td>
<td>(361) (351)</td>
<td>(408) (332)</td>
<td>(465) (353)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.0% 15.0%</td>
<td>13.0% 14.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>(40) (39)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

Undergraduate enrollment
1. Goal column represents percentage and numerical goal for the College.
2. Actual column represents actual number of black students for both categories.

Graduate enrollment
1. Institutional goals have not been set for our graduate programs. Figures represent total non-white enrollment and percentage of non-white enrollment for all graduate programs.
2. Figures used as the base for undergraduate and graduate enrollments include part-time and full-time student headcount.

Source: Roy Jones, Director of Human Relations
Deadline for November Newspeak The deadline for sending in copy for the November issue of Newspeak will be November 19, 1984. Faculty and staff are invited to submit articles for Letters to the Editor, the My Turn column, the Speaker's Wine Toting and Marching Society, and for Newsnotes. Special calendar items, if requested, will be included in Newsnotes for December 1984 or for 1985.

New Columns for Newspeak At the request of members of the faculty, new columns will be added to Newspeak that will appear on an irregular basis. Questions! Questions! will answer any question submitted to Newspeak by a member of the College community. Anonymously submitted questions will be considered. Other columns will include articles on faculty professional and service activities.

A Guest Essay

The Rape Problem on College Campuses: Pt. 2

Source: Project on Status of Women, Association of American College

The Hidden Dimension: The Impact of Rape on Women's Educational Opportunities

* I feel unsafe on campus at night. I never take classes with finals scheduled at night. Unfortunately, several classes were required and I have to wait until next year to take them.
* Because of recent incidents of rapes on or near my campus, I avoid classes that meet in the evening, and classes that have finals in the evening. These are classes that I would have enrolled in if they met during the day.

Comments of women students at a major university

Few people realize the effect which fear of rape can have upon a woman's life. One does not have to be a rape victim to be affected by rape and the fear of rape. Aside from trauma suffered by friends and relatives of the victim, knowledge of a rape incident, no matter how removed, often increases fear in many women. The threat of rape can prove damaging. Some women begin to structure and limit their normal daily activity around avoidance of crime.

Indirectly, rape can similarly limit a woman's educational opportunity. Students who learn of rape incidents involving women who attend night classes or had night examinations may choose to drop or not to register for such courses. Older women in some instances have been fearful of resuming their education when classes are at night and parking areas are dimly lit and/or unguarded.

Fear of rape and uncertainty about campus security also often prevent women from:
* Attending extracurricular activities scheduled at night,
* Using the library, and
* Applying for jobs or maintaining employment during evening hours.
Thus the fear of rape may restrict women students’ activities and independence.

The Legal Implications of Campus Rape

**Title IX and Other Laws**  Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 prohibits discrimination based on sex in all federally assisted educational programs. Institutions are prohibited from subjecting any person to separate rules of behavior, sanctions or other discriminatory treatment. When re-evaluating existing security systems, a university should determine how to ensure campus safety without restricting the mobility of women or subjecting them to discriminatory regulations. For example, university imposition of tighter living regulations, such as curfews for women but not men students, would be considered a violation of Title IX. Similarly, other restrictions or “protective measures” which apply only to one sex may constitute discrimination under Title IX.

**Discriminatory regulations may also be challenged under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.** For example, one pre-Title IX lawsuit successfully contested a Southeastern Louisiana College requirement that women students under 21 live in dormitories although no such requirement was imposed on men.

It should also be noted that in order to comply with Title IX, university protective services must provide substantially equal security for both men and women. Therefore, providing locks or guards only for women’s dormitories might violate Title IX unless such extra security measures are necessary to ensure an essentially equal level of safety for both sexes. In instances of demonstrably higher risk for one sex, however, extra safety precautions would probably be consistent with the law. To date, the Department of Health and Human Services, which enforces Title IX, has not directly addressed the question.

Additionally, providing services for rape victims such as special counseling, or health procedures will not violate Title IX. The regulation specifically allows institutions to provide health benefits and services which may be used by a different proportion of students of one sex than of the other.

**Prohibiting women from working on campus at night or failing to employ women for night shifts in order to “protect” them would violate not only Title IX but also Title VII of the Civil Rights Act which prohibits discrimination in employment.**

Other issues under Title IX concern the impact of policies or procedures which are ostensibly fair but may have a disproportionate impact on one sex. For example, because of the fear of rape, some women have raised the issue as to whether the scheduling of classes or exams at night is discriminatory. As far as is known, no charges have been filed relating to this issue nor has HHS made any ruling. However, it is possible that this and other rape-related Title IX questions will be raised in future complaints.

**Institutional Responsibility and Liability**  The total burden of rape prevention does not lie with either the potential or the actual victim. According to recent court rulings, a university’s physical environment and insufficient security may contribute to the incidence of rape. Thus, the failure to provide adequate rape deterrence may increase institutional liability for assaults occurring on campus. In the future women may be more likely to bring a civil suit claiming damages against a university which has failed to provide sufficient security. Such negligence suits are particularly likely when an institution has been informed of a dangerous condition but has failed to take remedial action.

Presently, the rape victim has three legal courses of action:

* **Criminal charges against the rapist**  Anger, revenge, and outrage often motivate a rape victim to overcome any concern for personal embarrassment or fear of treatment by the criminal justice system and bring criminal charges against the rapist. Criminal charges provide
the state rather than the individual with an opportunity to obtain a remedy for a crime committed against the state. The rape victim serves primarily as a piece of evidence to obtain this conviction. However, many choose not to prosecute due to fear of intimidation, harassment, and further degradation which women have sometimes experienced during criminal suits.

* Civil charges against the rapist  The rape victim may also choose to bring a civil suit claiming damages against the rapist. Civil proceedings require virtually the same evidence as criminal suits, but the burden of proof placed upon the victim is less. Civil suits provide the individual with a means of redress. Significant financial recoveries from offenders may be awarded for mental and physical suffering. However, for most rape victims, civil suits against the rapist are not a realistic alternative, because the rapist not only must be apprehended but also be solvent.

* Civil charges against a third party A rape victim could also choose to bring civil charges against third parties who might be held responsible. Recent court decisions have held that institutions, landlords, employers, and transportation systems may be held liable for a higher degree of protection than previously, particularly in the case of violent rape by strangers. This theory was applied to a large university for the first time when in October 1975, a female student was raped in a women's locker room at the Catholic University of America. She filed a civil suit against the university contending that it had been negligent and careless by not providing better security. The U.S. District Court ruled in favor of the complainant and awarded the student $20,000 in damages.

Next: Campus Rape: How to Stop It

Department Codifies Policies

History Adopts Set of By-Laws

(Speaker's Note: The History Department recently adopted a set of by-laws governing the operation of the department. Excerpts from this document are found below.)

History Department By-laws

These by-laws shall constitute the method of government of the Department of History. They may be amended by the vote of a majority of the total number of tenure track members of the department.

Membership. Members are persons teaching in the History Department. All members may participate in the meetings, but only full time members of the Department will be allowed to vote. In personnel matters, only tenure track members may vote.

Chair. The chair shall be first among equals and responsible for conducting departmental business and appointing departmental committees. ...the chair shall conduct meetings according to Robert's Rules of Order...shall also present an annual report to the department (which shall include) an account of who received (and what amount) travel money, released time, and other funds... The chair shall consult with each member of the department at least once a semester...shall treat members of the department equally...shall seek to promote the interests of all members...will be responsible for mediating grievances...will make every effort each year to improve the pay of the members of the department. During the summer and between semesters, the chair shall contact all available departmental members before making any major decisions...

Secretary. ...shall be responsible for taking the minutes of departmental meetings. These shall include a record of those present and absent, topics of discussion, decisions of the department, and pertinent announcements...

Meetings. Meetings shall normally be held prior to the regular faculty meetings at 4 p.m. on the
second Monday of the month... Whenever possible, the chair shall give a week’s notice for additional meetings, and shall present an agenda for both regular and additional meetings...

Committees. There shall be two kinds of committees: standing and ad hoc. Standing committees shall be of two types: major and minor. Major committees shall be considered of greater importance than minor ones for the purpose of annual evaluations of departmental members. The major committees shall be: Budget, Personnel, Goals and Objectives, Scheduling, Library, and Curriculum and Standards. The minor committees shall be: History Club, Publicity, Audio-visual, and Special Programs. Committees normally consist of three persons.

Two weeks prior to the beginning of the fall semester, the chair shall ask all departmental members to submit a list of three committees on which they desire to serve. The chair shall publish the list of requests and consider them in appointing committees, making every effort to insure that all members will have an opportunity to serve on a variety of committees. No members shall serve for more than three consecutive years on the same committee, or serve on more than two major committees at the same time...

(A listing of committees and their duties follows.)

Teaching. Teaching is the primary function of members of the Department. Therefore, the chair shall review what members of the department are doing in their classes and shall insist on high level of performance. Members are normally expected to meet all their classes. If members are absent from class, they shall notify the chair as to the cause...

Everyone in the department will normally teach at least two sections of History 101 and 102, or their equivalent, each semester...

The following guidelines have been established by the department to maintain the basic content of History 101 and 102...

The following guidelines govern the methodology to be used in teaching History 101 and 102...

Independent Study/Senior Paper/Bachelor’s Essay. Members directing independent studies shall give the department chair a brief description of the topic of the study. The Senior Paper may be directed by any member of the department. Another member of the department will normally serve as second reader...

After directing six Independent Studies or six Senior Papers, or three Bachelor’s Essays, or any combination thereof, a departmental member shall receive three hours of course reduction as compensation subject to scheduling requirements of the department...

Released Time. At the beginning of each semester the departmental chair shall advise members of the department of the availability of released time. Each person seeking released time shall prepare a proposal to be distributed to each member of the department... Those members not applying for released time shall decide to whom released time will be granted. Those awarded released time will submit to the department a statement of accomplishments at the end of the semester. Persons seeking released time as a result of extra-departmental grants shall follow the same procedure...

Annual Evaluations. The following shall be the method for determining annual evaluations:

Part I. Teaching Effectiveness
1. Syllabi and support materials used by the faculty member:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Syllabi distributed first week of class. Syllabi reflected high degree of organization and planning (all aspects of course material mentioned and philosophy and purpose of the course detailed). Study questions provided for discussion books in introductory courses. Handouts well-written and appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Syllabi generally well-written and organized. Study questions and handouts for most assignments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Syllabi inconsistent; few handouts.
1. No syllabi or handouts.

2. Assignments, exams, and other methods of evaluating student progress used by this faculty member were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Explanatory material and topic choices for exams and written assignments reflected considerable thought and effort. Assignments complemented readings and lectures and increased understanding of the philosophy of the course. Considerable emphasis shown in grading written examinations and exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Essay exams and written assignments show careful preparation. Emphasis put on written assignments and exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unresolved student complaints to the chairman about the nature of assignments and/or grading. Exams and written assignments haphazardly executed. Few written assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No essay exams or written assignments. Considerable unresolved student complaints to the chairman about grades. Great variance between grades and student GPRs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Contributions to curriculum development by this faculty member were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Frequently updates reading lists and revises own courses. Proposes curricular improvement (new courses, interdisciplinary courses, timing of related course offerings) in response to perceived needs. Stimulates discussion of curriculum in department and in other faculty groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Frequently updates reading lists and revises own courses. Cooperates in curricular improvements. Listens to discussion of curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Obsolete course material or readings lists. Rarely supports or participates in curricular improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Overall ratings by students of this faculty member were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Average of #15 on Student Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiply score (1-7) by four. Thus, line 4 on teaching category would be

28 24 20 16 12 8 4

Totals would then be read

63 54 45 36 27 18 9

Final teaching effectiveness number would then be found by dividing total by 9

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
5. Evidence of attempts to improve teaching were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Showed active concern for improving teaching by seeking and acting upon feedback from colleagues and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Regularly gave or sought feedback on teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Occasionally gave or sought feedback on teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rarely gave or sought feedback on teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Availability to students was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Encouraged students to come for extra help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Available during posted office hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Normally available to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usually available to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasonable number and time of office hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sporadically kept office hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Occasionally available to see students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did not keep office hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely available to students for extra help.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To Be Continued