Fact File

***Facts***

NEW FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION MANUAL

(Editor's note: The projected completion date for the new Faculty and Administration Manual is late June 1985. Members of the Handbook Committee are: Bob Cross, English; Fred Ettinger, Education (chairman); Sam Hines, Political Science; Diane Johnson, Fine Arts; Bob Mignone, Mathematics; Aleta Arthur, College Counsel; and Jacqueline Mattfeld, Provost and Dean of the Faculty. The new edition of the Manual, running to over 200 pages, will contain many policy statements and procedures of concern to the faculty. Below is a listing of major components of this important document as it nears its final draft. The final version received by the faculty may differ in form and substance from this outline.)

Part I. This section includes a history of the College and a statement of institutional purpose and goals.

Part II. An overview of the administrative organization is contained in this part. Included is the legislative enactment incorporating the College into the state higher education system, the Bylaws of the State College Board of Trustees, and a detailed description of the administrative organization, including a listing of duties of principal administrators.

A portion titled "Academic Department Chairs" indicates the role of the chair; selection, appointment, and term of office; administrative and faculty duties of the chair; evaluation of the chair's performance annually and at five-year intervals; procedures for appealing evaluations, compensation, and vacation and leaves. The Council of Chairmen--its purpose, membership, and meetings--is also described.

The composition of the instructional faculty at the College is discussed in detail. The following key terms are defined: instructional faculty, roster status faculty, roster faculty ranks (professor, associate professor, etc.), part-time faculty roster status, special faculty status, special faculty ranks (visiting faculty, teaching associate, senior associate, adjunct faculty, laboratory assistant, graduate assistant).

Another section defines the library faculty, library faculty ranks, part-time librarians, and library faculty holding special appointments (visiting library faculty and adjunct library faculty).

The next part outlines the organization of the faculty under these headings: Speaker of the Faculty, Secretary of the Faculty. Formal action by the faculty. Faculty meetings and proceedings. Planning and guidance of educational programs and policies, proposed faculty action, Standing committees, faculty communication with the State College Board of Trustees, and the graduate faculty and Graduate Council.
The final section in this part describes the nature of appointed committees of the College. Two standing appointed committees, the College Planning Council and the President's planning and Budget Team, are described. Provision is made for creating other appointed committees.

**Part III.** This part contains the By-laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty.

**Part IV.** In this critical part are found principal regulations and policies of the College:

- Provisions for policy change.
- Affirmative Action Policy
- Equal Employment Opportunity Policy
- A statement and regulations regarding academic freedom. This section contains many critical elements of the AAUP's 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and the 1982 Institutional Regulations.
- Faculty contracts, during the probationary period and after the granting of tenure. Length of the probationary period, non-renewal of contracts, termination for cause, and termination for financial exigency are discussed.
- Faculty appointments, including the roles of the President and Provost/Dean of the Faculty in making appointments, the statement of terms of appointment, and notification of non-renewal of contract for untenured faculty.
- Standards for third-year review, tenure, and promotion of instructional faculty. The standard and evidence is noted for each criterion (teaching effectiveness, professional growth and development, and service to the community). Criteria are listed for tenure, third year evaluation, and promotion to each rank. Requirements to be eligible for promotion and tenure are listed. The library faculty are considered in a separate section. This section includes the recommendations of the Standards Task Force, which have been submitted to the faculty for review.
- Progressive discipline of faculty members (i.e. severe sanctions, minor sanctions, and suspension without pay).
- Termination of tenured faculty members for cause and termination procedure.
- Evaluation of faculty performance. This section will include recommendations of the Procedures Task Force. These recommendations will be submitted to the faculty for discussion at "town meetings" and at a regular faculty meeting.
- Annual review of administrators, including objectives, procedures, grievance procedure, and dismissal for cause.
- Terms of faculty employment, and faculty work load.
- Faculty leave policies (i.e. sick leave, sabbatical leave, leave of absence, annual leave, leave with pay).
- Faculty research and development, including Research and Development Grants, research and patent policy, and human subjects panel.
- Distinguished Teaching, Service, and Research Awards.
- Distinguished Professor and Distinguished Emeritus.
- Honorary degrees.
- Outside employment of faculty.
- Nepotism policy.
- Political activity of faculty.
- State personnel procedures affecting faculty and administrators (i.e. assignment of offices and classrooms, scheduling of courses and class size, scheduling of teaching duties, office hours, travel, books and materials for classes, student attendance, classroom procedure and class attendance, examinations, grading, meetings and convocations).
- Handicapped students policy.
- Learning disabilities services program.
- Student grievance procedure.

**Part V.** This section describes benefits and privileges of faculty and administrators. Included are these items: payroll and insurance, workman's compensation, credit union, staff training program, and retirement.
Part VI. College facilities and their uses are the concerns of this part. These items are considered: Bookstore, Campus Shop, Stern Center, faculty lounge, use of College facilities for other than the primary goals and mission of the College, Blacklock House, Early Childhood Development Center, parking, testing information.

Part VII. This part contains policies regarding reimbursement for approved expenditures by faculty and administrators, i.e. official functions, faculty recruitment, etc.

Part VIII. This is a section containing miscellaneous policy statements, for example, a statement on smoking at faculty meetings.

Two additional policy statements, concerning faculty grievances and grievance procedure and a sexual harassment policy and grievance procedure, are currently in the final stages of development. They may be included in the draft of the *Manual* received by the faculty this summer.

Additional policy statements may be added to the version of the *Manual* received by the faculty.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**FACULTY MEMBERS AWARDED TENURE AND PROMOTION DURING 1984-85**

**Newly Tenured Faculty**
Charles Beam, Chemistry
Henry Donato, Chemistry
Phillip Dustan, Biology
Gary Harrison, Mathematics
Helen Ivy, Library
Clyde Metz, Chemistry
Alexander Ritchie, Geology

**Promoted to Full Professor**
Michael Finefrock, History
M. Sue Hetherington, English
Jeffrey L. L. Johnson, English
W. Frank Kinard, Chemistry
Jung Fang Tsai, History

**Promoted to Associate Professor**
Larry Carlson, English
Clarence Condon, BA, Econ
William Gudger, Fine Arts
David Kowal, Fine Arts
Michael Marcell, Psychology
Frank Morris, Languages
John Newell, History
Susan Schenck, Education

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY**

(Editor's note: Following is the complete text of a proposed Sexual Harassment Policy. This policy statement has been reviewed and amended by the Faculty Welfare Committee. The section on procedures is currently being considered by the Welfare Committee. This section will appear in a future issue of *Newspeak*.)

I. Policy Statement
A. In general

1. Respect for the dignity and worth of all individuals is essential to an appropriate college environment. Thus, sexual harassment of students, faculty, and staff is unacceptable and impermissible conduct and will not be tolerated. Actions which come within the definition of sexual harassment provided herein will be grounds for disciplinary action, even resulting in termination.

2. Sexual harassment can occur in a variety of contexts. In relationships of unequal power, it contains an element of coercion, as when compliance with requests for sexual favors becomes a criterion for granting work, study, or grading benefits. In relationships among equals, sexual harassment may have a harmful effect upon a colleague’s ability to study or work in an academic setting.

B. Definition of sexual harassment

Sexual harassment is defined as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other conduct of a sexual nature when:

1. submission to such conduct is made, either explicitly or implicitly, a term or condition of an individual’s employment or education;

2. submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as a basis for an academic or personnel decision affecting that individual;

3. such conduct has the purpose or effect of substantially interfering with the affected person’s academic, professional, or work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work or educational environment; or

4. such conduct is abusive and implies, in an abusive manner, a discriminatory hostility toward the personal or professional interests of the affected individual because of his/her sex.

C. Responsible administrators

The Director of Human Relations will be responsible for disseminating information to educate the college community about sexual harassment and will be available to provide information. Our In-House Legal Counsel also may be consulted concerning this area.

---

1 The first three parts of this definition come from Guidelines on Discrimination Because of Sex, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, November 1980.


GRIEVANCES BEFORE THE FACULTY HEARING COMMITTEE

(Editor’s Note: These are excerpts from a document called “Grievances before the Faculty Hearing Committee. Bracketed sections are paraphrases of the original. The statement has been reviewed and amended by the Faculty Hearing Committee and the Faculty Grievance Committee. A motion will be brought in the fall semester to incorporate this policy into the Faculty By-laws.)

I. The following matters shall be proper subjects for a grievance to be heard by the Faculty Hearing Committee: notice of dismissal of a tenured faculty member; notice of dismissal of an untenured faculty member before the end of his/her contract term; discrimination in compensation, promotion, or work assignment; denial of tenure or dismissal at the end of the contract term on the basis of discrimination or violation of academic freedom as it relates to freedom of expression; other matters referred by the President to the Committee where a due process hearing is necessary.

II. Requesting a hearing

A. A notice of grievance must be filed by the grievant faculty member with the Chairman of the Faculty Hearing Committee... The notice must contain specific information, including date of the act, those alleged responsible for the act, explanation of why the matter comes under the jurisdiction of
the Hearing Committee, description of evidence, names of potential witnesses, relief sought, summary of results of previous discussions, preference as to whether the hearing will be open or closed to the public.]

Failure to file a notice containing this information within the specified time limitation shall be a waiver of grievance and of all rights under these procedures, absent a finding of good cause for a reasonable delay, as determined by the Hearing Committee.

B. [The Committee will meet in five working days to determine (1) if a hearing is justified; (2) if the hearing will be open or closed. If justified, a hearing must be held within 20 working days.]

C. [The Committee chairman notifies the grievant of the decision concerning the holding of a hearing; if negative, he specifies the Committee’s reasons; if positive, he gives notice of the date of the hearing.]

D. [In the event of a hearing, the Provost/Dean of the Faculty must give notice of the name of the person representing the College at the Hearing. This person may be the Provost, a Vice President, a department chair, or “any other member of the College community deemed appropriate by the Provost” but may not be an attorney.]

III. Pre-hearing Procedures

A. [The grievant must notify the Committee and the College of the person, if any, who will be his/her counsel at the hearing.]

B. [The Committee will conduct a pre-hearing meeting with the concerned parties to exchange names of witnesses and documents and “enter into stipulations of fact.”]

Witnesses and evidence not exchanged at this meeting will not be allowed to be presented at the hearing except for good cause shown, as determined by the Committee.

IV. The Hearing

A. Attendance

[If closed, attendance is limited to: members of the Committee, the grievant, the grievant’s advisor or lawyer, the college representative, the College’s legal counsel, witnesses while giving evidence, AAUP observer (if requested), tape recorder operator and/or court reporter.]

All participants in a closed hearing will be asked to maintain the confidentiality of the hearing to the extent reasonably possible.

[If open, the only parties excluded are the witnesses.]

The grievant’s advisor or attorney, if any, and the College’s legal counsel may advise any party upon request and may address procedural issues, but they may not question witnesses or make opening statements or closing arguments.

B. Conduct of the hearing

1. The hearing will not be conducted according to strict rules of evidence...
2. A tape recording shall be made of the hearing and preserved by the Chairman...
   ...(It) shall be the official record of the hearing. A transcript prepared from the tape recording will be furnished to the grievant upon request...
3. The grievant and the College representative will have the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses...
4. The Committee may grant reasonable recesses...
5. ...Public statements and publicity about the case...will be avoided so far as possible until the proceedings have been completed...
6. The Committee or any party may seek the advice of the College’s legal counsel at any time...
7. ...The Chairman may establish other necessary rules and may decide issues presented...
8. All witnesses...shall testify under oath...
9. Committee members shall not discuss the case with anyone outside of the hearing...
10. The standard proof to be employed...is the preponderance of the evidence.
11. At any point...the grievant may withdraw any portion or all of the grievance...

C. Sequence of events

[Following is the sequence of events: (1) grievant’s opening statement (optional); (2) College representative’s opening statement (optional); (3) grievant presents witnesses and evidence, subject to cross-examination; (4) College representative may request the Committee terminate the hearing]
due to lack of evidence; grievant may rebut; (5) College representative presents witnesses and evidence, subject to cross examination; (6) Committee may call new witnesses; (7) rebuttal evidence may be presented by either party; (8) closing arguments (optional) of grievant and College representative; (9) Committee may request written arguments from both parties.

V. Post-hearing procedures

A. [In executive session the Committee prepares its report, which must include: (1) purpose of the hearing; (2) issues considered; (3) findings of fact on major issues; (4) recommendations (optional). The report must be approved by a majority of the Committee. A minority report may be prepared. The report is forwarded to the President within 10 days after the hearing.]

The findings and recommendations of the Committee, if any, are advisory only and shall in no way bind or commit the President to any suggested course of action.

B. [If the findings are against the grievant, he/she has 10 working days to submit to the President specific objections to the findings. The President may ask to see the record of the hearing. If his decision is contrary to the Committee’s recommendation, he must state his reasons for not accepting the recommendation. If he decides against the grievant, he must inform the grievant of his/her right to appeal to the Board of Trustees.]

V. Appeal to the State College Board of Trustees

A. This further appeal is only allowed for grievances on the grounds specified in I. A., B., and C at the beginning of this procedure. State law precludes appeal to the Board for denial of tenure or dismissal at the end of a contract term (South Carolina Code section 8-17-380).

B. [The grievant must give notice of appeal to the Board within 10 working days after receiving the President’s decision. A tape recording of the hearing and documentary evidence will be presented to the Board.]

C. [The Board will also have available the report of the Committee and any “subsequent decisions or recommendations which followed the Committee’s report.”]

D. The Board shall reach a final decision within 60 working days of the filing of the Notice of Appeal and shall submit its decision in writing to the grievant, the President, the Chairman of the Committee, and the College representative. The decision of the Board is final.

VII. Prohibition against retaliation

A grievant shall not be harassed, intimidated, or otherwise penalized for utilizing these grievance procedures.

---

1 South Carolina Code section 8-17-380.
2 South Carolina Code section 8-17-380.
3 Discrimination is defined as differential treatment based upon race, religion, sex, national origin, color, age, or handicap. South Carolina Code section 8-17-320 (6).
4 South Carolina Code section 8-17-380.
5 If the grievance is based upon a Notice of Dismissal, a copy of the Note or letter giving notice should be attached to the Notice of Grievance.

FACULTY GRIEVANCES (OUTSIDE THE JURISDICTION OF THE HEARING COMMITTEE)

(Editor’s note: These are excerpts of a draft grievance procedure for faculty grievances not in the jurisdiction of the Hearing Committee. Changes in the Faculty By-laws will be required to implement this document. This draft has been reviewed by the Hearing Committee and the Faculty Grievance Committee. Portions in brackets are paraphrases of the original.)

I. Types of complaints about which grievances may be taken

[The following types are noted: complaints related to terms and conditions of employment, violations or misapplications of written policies, violations of academic freedom, disciplinary actions.
such as reprimands and demotions) that are not within the jurisdiction of the Faculty Hearing Committee, and other matters “deemed by the Provost and the Faculty Grievance Committee to be consideration for redress.”

II. Informal resolution

[Faculty are urged to seek informal resolution before entering the formal process. The Department Chair should be sought as a mediator. If the Chair is the object of the grievance, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs should be a mediator.]

III. Formal Procedures

A. Attempted resolution by the Provost

1. In 30 days of the act complained of, the grievant can appeal to the Provost.
2. [The Provost or his/her designee has 10 working days to investigate the complaint.]
3. [If no resolution is reached, the Provost will make a decision resolving the dispute.]

B. Appeal to the Faculty Grievance Committee

1. [If either party is dissatisfied with the Provost’s decision, he/she may appeal to the Faculty Grievance Committee.]
2. [The Committee meets within 5 working days to determine if the grievance has been properly filed, is within the jurisdiction of the Committee, and merits consideration. If the Committee agrees to consider the grievance, it so notifies the grievant and the Provost.]
3. [The Provost forwards all documents and evidence to the Committee.]
4. [Each party to the grievance submits written arguments to the Committee.]
5. [The Committee reviews all materials, may conduct an investigation, may hear live testimony. Both parties may attend Committee sessions and be accompanied by an advisor.]
6. [The final decision is sent to the parties and the Provost.]

The Committee may affirm, reverse, or affirm in part and reverse in part the decision of the Provost...or may remand the case to the Provost for a new and final attempt at informal reconciliation, which, if it fails, may not be pursued further.

C. Review by the President

If not satisfied with the Committee’s decision, either party or the Provost may request...that the President review the decision. If the President decides that extraordinary circumstances exist justifying his/her review of the case, he/she may review all of the materials in the possession of the Committee and may take any of the actions which were available to the Committee. His/her decision will be final.

D. Purging of records

An informal reconciliation between the parties may be reached at any level of these proceedings and will result in the purging of all formal records within 10 working days after the agreement is reached. All that will remain is a signed document setting forth the agreement.

Letters to the Editor

Self Study Progress Report; Midterm Grades

To The Editor:

The College of Charleston’s self-study has been underway for several months now, so I thought I should report to the faculty on what we are doing and what our future plans are. The Southern Association requires that colleges and universities go through a self-study for accreditation every ten years. The College of Charleston’s self-study focuses on the planning process. As such, several criteria
issues were identified, and the self-study will show how those issues are addressed using the College’s planning process. Two of the issues fit into the charges of standing faculty committees, so those two committees became self-study committees. College committees with representation from the faculty, administration, student body, community, and in some cases, the Board of Trustees, were created to address other issues. The Committee chairs were appointed by President Collins, and the other faculty members were selected through the normal process of nomination by the Nominating Committee and election by the faculty.

The committees are currently working and should have the first drafts of their reports ready by June 1, 1985. Over the summer several people will be involved in preparing the first draft of the self-study document. That first draft should contain several recommendations for changes in existing College policies regarding planning, recruitment, retention, administrative structure, security, and other issues.

We will suggest to the Faculty Retreat Committee that the self-study be the topic of the fall 1985 retreat. That would give us a forum for an open discussion of the recommendations made in the first draft of the self-study document and to obtain more faculty input on things the College should do to address the self-study issues. The self-study committees will then prepare the final drafts of their committee reports by November 1, 1985. The final drafts should incorporate modifications and suggestions that result from the retreat.

In a technical sense the self-study is then almost over. The final document will be printed and distributed, and the Southern Association will conduct a peer review (April 13, 1986). In a real sense we will still be very much involved in the self-study. Committee recommendations will be sent to the appropriate faculty committees or administrative offices for action.

I suppose reaccreditation is the main goal of any self-study; however, if no positive measures for addressing some of the critical issues facing the College come out of the self-study, then the self-study will have failed. To that end the self-study document will include a “followup” to determine which recommendations were implemented, how successful they were, and why other recommendations were not implemented.

Bill Colightly
Self-study Director

To the Editor:

If we do adopt a mid-semester grading system in “perpetuity”, I would like to offer some emendations to the now ponderous, circuitous, and ineffective mid-term, logistical nightmare that we are bedevilled with presently. We would be able to dispense with affidavits, putative parental addresses, and the “pawling” nuts and bolts that are wrenching the advisory machinery to a heap of administrative junk. The following form will achieve an elegant solution to the intractable problem that we now struggle with year upon year. This form would be given in class by the instructor to those students that are not performing satisfactorily up to the mid-semester point. The student would be obliged to have an appointment with his/her advisor within ten days. The advisor would return the form to the instructor with commentary. Then the student and instructor would be in a position to deal effectively with the student’s academic problem. At the present time, when the student is notified (if the notification ever lands in the student’s hands!), she/he seldom ever followsup with either their instructor or advisor. Since I have a modicum of expertise in recycling, I feel that this proposed system would allow us to “recycle” and “set-on-course” those students that are now part of the 800-student probation midden.

*******************************************************************************

Mid-Semester Progress Report
Fall 1985

Dear ________,

Presently your performance in ________ is unsatisfactory. Within the next 10 days you will meet with your academic advisor who will suggest ways to improve your performance. Your advisor will
return this form to me with commentary. You and I can now design a course of action that should improve your grade standing.

Instructor’s Name:
Campus Telephone Number:
Department

Academic advisor, over please

+-----------------------------------------------+

+-----------------------------------------------+

Academic Advisor’s Name:
Campus Telephone Number:
Department:

Date of counseling session:

Commentary:

+-----------------------------------------------+

D. Reid Wiseman
Biology

The Speaker Announces:
The Wine Toting and Marching Society

Can’t Tell the Players Without a Score Card??
A friendly memo to the faculty at the University of New Orleans:

From: E. M. Socol
To: Full-Time Faculty
Date: October 1, 1984

Dr. Seraphia Leyda, who has just been named Acting Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, was elected last spring to a two-year term in the University Senate (1984-86). On the basis of our spring election results, her replacement in the Senate while she is serving as Vice Chancellor will be Dr. Jerah Johnson.
As it happens, Dr. Johnson is already serving in the Senate during the fall semester as placement for Dr. Jean Cranmer, who is on sabbatical leave. Someone else must therefore replace him as Dr. Cranmer’s replacement for the remainder of the semester.

In last spring’s election, Dr. Carolyn Kolb, Dr. Edward Lazzerini, and Dr. Thomas Schluinz were tied for the next largest number of votes after Dr. Johnson’s; but Dr. Kolb is also on sabbatical leave during the fall semester, and Dr. Lazzerini and Dr. Schluinz are ineligible since not more than two members of the same department can be elected in the same year to serve in the Senate. (Dr. Lazzerini will be serving in the Senate during the spring semester as replacement for Dr. Norton Nelkin, who will be on sabbatical leave; but his status as replacement was determined by our 1983 election results.) At this point, the temporary position would go to Dr. Malcolm Webb, but for the fact that he, too, is already serving in the Senate during the fall semester (as replacement for Dr. Shirley Laska, who is also on sabbatical leave).

The next largest number of votes after Dr. Webb’s was received by Dr. George Branam; hence he will serve during the remainder of the fall semester as the replacement for Dr. Cranmer.

---

**Committee Bulletin Board**

**Reports from Faculty Committees and College Committees**

**Notice:** All outgoing chairmen of faculty committees are asked to submit their spring semester committee reports to the speaker of the faculty by May 15. These reports will appear in the summer issue of Newspeak.

**Faculty Welfare Committee** The Committee has been meeting with Aleta Arthur, College Counsel, to discuss a proposed draft of a Sexual Harassment policy for the College. A copy of the latest proposed draft of this policy, which will be incorporated into the Faculty-Administration Manual, is found elsewhere in this issue of Newspeak.

The new chairman of the Committee for the 1985-86 academic year is Katy Higgins, Library. The new secretary is Rick Heldrich, Chemistry.

Contact person: Katy Higgins, 2-5530.

**Faculty Advisory Committee to the President** This Committee has not met since it last reported to the faculty.

Major items discussed at the March 7 meeting were:

- Midterm grades. (This matter was also discussed during the year by the Academic Standards Committee).
- Improvement of faculty advising of students at the College.
- Having the Administration inform the Speaker of major administrative actions that impact on the faculty.
- Reporting of travel reimbursements and the claiming of travel expenses on the Federal income tax form.

Minutes of this meeting were circulated to the faculty.

The new Chairman of the Committee is Andree Parrott, Languages. Charles Kaiser, Psychology, was reelected Secretary.

Contact person: Andree Parrott, 2-5535.
Council of Chairman  At its March 4 meeting, the Council heard from its Chairman, Bill Golightly, of the need to review course descriptions in the Bulletin for accuracy and to review the numbering system, prerequisites, and times when courses are offered in preparation for updating of the Bulletin.

Professors Fred Carter, Institute for Public Affairs and Public Policy, and Marty Perlmuter, Philosophy, reported favorably on the discussion that they and Prof. Dick Crosby, Computer Science, had with Roy Jones, Director of Human Affairs, concerning a revision of the College's faculty recruitment procedures. A revised draft of these procedures has been circulated to the chairman for review.

Concern was expressed about the Freshman seminar course proposed in the President's desegregation plan but not yet considered by the faculty's Curriculum Committee. It was noted that the chairman assumed that a course proposal, once developed, would follow the normal course of review by the faculty.

During a general discussion of evaluation, some chairs expressed concern about evaluation of tenured faculty on an annual basis, the timing of annual evaluation for chairs and faculty, and the difficulties involved in evaluating teaching performance.

At the April meeting, the chairman:
- Heard a report from Dick Crosby concerning initiation of student fees for students taking Computer Science or BA/Econ courses involving computer use.
- Were informed by Howard Rudd, BA/Econ of new procedures for ensuring that students taking BA/Econ courses fulfill course prerequisites.
- Discussed the role of the chairs in analyzing course transfer credit.
- Reelected Bill Golightly as chair of the chairman. Clarence Davis, History, was elected secretary.

In its April meeting with Provost Jacquelyn Mattfeld, the Chairman discussed a proposed revision of the seven point scale used on the annual evaluation form for faculty. A three point scale was considered: 1 - Fails to meet expectations 2 - Meets expectations 3 - Far exceeds expectations. The proposed scale will not be used in this year's evaluation. However, it was suggested that a few chairman redo the current evaluations using the shorter scale to see the resulting effects on recommended salaries in the departments.

Provost Mattfeld reported on the Administration's study of purchasing software to give the College an integrated computing package in finance, personnel, and student records. She noted that a Wang developed package had been reviewed and that a second company would make a presentation to the College. Also, she said that the current Wang computer is close to saturation and that purchase of new hardware must be considered. By fall semester the College expects to decide on the purchase of hardware, software, and the selection of a coordinator of the College's information systems, the Information Resource Manager. Creation of this position has been mandated by the State.

Contact person, Bill Golightly, 2-5730.

Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Assistance  The Committee has been busy considering student petitions. Following are examples of decisions concerning such petitions:
- Denied a motion to approve a correspondence course. The Committee urged that an independent study be approved for the student in the Languages Department.
- Approved a petition to graduate with only 7 hours in science because laboratory credit did not transfer.
- Denied a request to change several grades of Incomplete to Withdrawn because these grades had occurred too long ago (1979) and because there were many W's on the student's record.

In other action, the Committee has discussed consortium grade transfers. Concern was expressed that the original intent of the consortium agreement be upheld and that approval by the department for a student to take a course be strictly enforced.

A motion was approved that a person seeking a second degree (either a B.S. or a B.A.) will not be awarded a second diploma, but the dual degree will be noted on the transcript.

Late grade changes by faculty were discussed. All petitions for late changes were approved. The Committee noted no objection to late changes if the professor makes a request.

After discussion the Committee unanimously concluded that only students who have fulfilled all requirements for the degree should be allowed to participate in graduation ceremonies.

New chairman of the Committee for 1985-86 is Amy McCandless, History.
Committee on Curriculum and Academic Planning  The new chairman of the Committee, Clyde Metz, Chemistry, reports about its recent work:

"I represented the Committee at the opening and exit interviews with Dr. Robert L. Gannon, USC, and Dr. T. Nanney, Furman. These gentlemen are the outside visitors for the self study of the Computer Science Department. Their written report is due early this summer and we will review and discuss the report early next fall.

The written reports for the self study of the Languages Department are in the hands of Alice Jacobson and will be distributed to Committee members. We will review and discuss the report early next fall. [Editor's note: The Committee will also review memos in rebuttal of the written reports.]

I have received a series of proposals for curriculum changes for the Languages Department... These proposals will have to be one of the first agenda items for next fall.

I represented the Curriculum and Academic Planning Committee at a meeting of several faculty and academic administrators that dealt with increasing the black experience for students at the College. Attending were: Myrtle Glasgow, Dorothy Flood, Eugene Hunt, Roy Jones, Ed Lawton, Alice Jacobson, and Jacquelyn Mattfeld. Topics discussed included ways to increase awareness of faculty and students to the black experience; methods to integrate more black experience within existing 101 courses; a possible minor or concentration in the black experience; recruitment, tenure, and identification of new black faculty and existing faculty that have interests in the program; and establishment of lectureships (similar to the Minority Chemist program in Chemistry) and exchange faculty positions. I indicated that the role of the Curriculum and Academic Planning Committee would be to help establish any proposed program just as we would for any academic area or interdisciplinary program.

There is to be a meeting of Provost Jacquelyn Mattfeld, Dean David Taylor, Josephine Reed-Taylor, and myself to discuss the "University 101" course.

Several weeks ago Alice Jacobson, David Taylor, Susan Morrison, Julia Goode (Registrar and Dean of Admissions for Allied Health for the Medical University), Valerie Reigart (Vice President, Allied Health), and I met to discuss a joint program leading to dual bachelor programs, mainly a 3/2 plan. Currently Sue is working on establishing the curriculum requirements within the College of Charleston Biology bachelor degree program."

The new Secretary of the Committee is Doug Friedman, Political Science.

Contact person, Clyde Metz, 2-5587.

Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics  The Committee is continuing its work as the Self Study Committee on Planning for a Positive Environment for Students. Currently the reports for subcommittees are being gathered and will be analyzed and rewritten by the full committee, which expects to submit a final report by June 1.

The new chair of the Committee is Marsha Hass, BA/Econ. Ernest Rigney, Sociology, is secretary.

Contact person, Marsha Hass, 2-4066.

President's Planning and Budget Team  A series of hearings is being conducted by the Team to review the proposed budgets of the academic departments and administrative divisions of the College. Using last year's budget figures as a base line, the Team has asked each division head to form two lists of rank ordered priorities: (1) monies beyond the base line committed for the next budget year because of previous policy decisions or uncontrollable circumstances (e.g. utility rate increases); and (2) a listing of other items beyond the base line which the division wishes to spend. It is estimated that the total of all items on all lists beyond the base line, plus additional expected revenues, is close to $5 million.

In May the Team will consider a critical examination of the lists to recommend which items should be cut to maintain a budget in line with expected revenues. Also, the Team will be looking at the revenue side of the budget. For example, the Administration is currently reviewing the use of user fees to determine if the income from such fees is covering the designated cost. Specific fees being studied are: orientation, duplicate ID, application, graduation, late registration, returned check, science laboratory, computer lab, language lab, supervising teacher, library use, applied music, sailing, golf, student
organization, health, athletic, dormitory, and meal plan. Recommendations will be made to the Board of Trustees to increase certain fees to insure that revenues cover the costs for the specified activities.
Contact person, Alice Jacobson, 2-7031.

**College Planning Council** This semester the Council has devoted most of its effort in its role as a Self Study committee. It is currently reviewing and revising the institution’s planning assumptions and mission statement. The Committee has also coordinated the administration of the Institutional Goals Inventory and will assist in the analysis of the results of the inventory.
Contact person, Hugh Haynsworth, 2-5730.

**Faculty Research and Development Committee** The Committee has served as an advisory board for recommending a candidate for the Faculty Research Award.
Temporary contact person, Bob Mignone, 2-5730.

**Graduate Council** At its April 1 meeting, the Council heard a report from Charles Matthews, Education rep, concerning a NASDTEC review of the M.A.T. programs in early April. The Commission on Higher Education will review all education programs in 1985-86. Sam Hines, M.P.A. rep, reported on the NASPA site review of the College’s M.P.A. program. He noted that the written report was positive and that a final decision regarding accreditation of the program would be announced at the Fall 1985 NASPA conference.
A draft of graduate student grievance procedures was received from Aleta Arthur, College Counsel. After discussion and amendment, the Council approved the procedures and sent them to the Graduate faculty.

The matter of an honor code for graduate students was discussed. Ms. Arthur noted that the honor code for undergraduates also applies to graduate students. She suggested that the honor code be placed in the graduate bulletin for the coming school year and that the issue be forwarded to a student/faculty committee for review and recommendations.
Contact person, Sue Sommer, 2-5620.

**Graduate and Continuing Education** The Committee has devoted two meetings to a discussion of the implications of the recommendations published in the Community Assessment Program (CAP) study. The report contains these chapters relevant to the Committee’s work:
- Should the College of Charleston increase its adult credit enrollment?
- In what subjects, on what schedules, in what off-campus locations, and at what prices should the College of Charleston offer credit programs for adult students?
- Should the College of Charleston increase its adult noncredit enrollment?
- In what subjects, on what schedules, in what off-campus locations, and at what prices should the College of Charleston offer noncredit programs for adult students?
Temporary contact person, Helen Ivy, 2-5530.

**Committee on the Library** A report by David Cohen, Director of Libraries, concerning experimental extended hours during exam week was heard by the Committee. The Library will be open 7:30 a.m. to 1 a.m. from April 26 to May 5 with added security. Statistics will be kept concerning student use of the building during this period.

Mr. Cohen reported to the Committee concerning automation systems in the Library. Total cost of the system will be $250,000 - $300,000 over a three year period. Funding will be generated by a student user fee that will provide about $100,000 per year. The Provost and the President have approved funding for this project. Currently the Library staff is working in subgroups of the Library Planning Team to contact suppliers and study other aspects of this project.

The Library budget request for 1985-86 was presented to the Committee. Mr. Cohen reported a significant increase in funding for new books and journals, allowing the addition of 40-50 journals. Departmental book budgets were also presented to the Committee. These budgets called for a 60 percent allocation to books and 40 percent allocation to journals for the departments. The budgets were approved by the Committee.
Recent Faculty Activities: A Chronicle
By Paul Hamill, Jr.

In Fine Arts, Barbara Duval and Michael Phillips have each been awarded an Artist Fellowship by the South Carolina Arts Commission ($5,000). Fortunately for SCAC’s reputation for fairness, these were awarded after review by out-of-state jurors and reflect the pre-eminence of our visual arts faculty in this state. Professor Duval also has been awarded residency this summer at the McDowell Art Colony, a signal honor.

Patricia Jenks of Fine Arts has received two small grants from SCAC, one for her own arts residency and one for partial support of Michael Phillips’ splendid exhibit at the Simons Gallery.

In Political Science, Chairman Sam Hines notes renewal of his NIA grant (on aging legislators) and a $3,500 grant from the National Council on U.S.-Arab relations for a teacher workshop (with Professors Kline, Palmer, and Finefrock).

Luther Carter, who has received, will colleagues, several contracts from employee classification studies, has co-authored two volumes: Personnel: Managing Human Resources in the Public Sector and Mobilization and the National Interest.

Craig Zimmerman has published an article “Citizen Participation” in Public Administration Quarterly and presented a paper in the same field at the Midwest Political Science Association.

Douglas Friedman has offered “Popular Dictatorship and Democracy in Latin America” at the Citadel Symposium on Latin America; and with Irene Silverblatt, “Reindianization of the Andes” at the Latin American Studies Conference in New Mexico.

David Mann offered a paper on Solomon Blatt at the USC Symposium on South Carolina.

The Institute for Public Affairs and Public Policy has received contracts from the City of Goose Creek, S.C. and the Charleston County Parks, Recreation, and Tourism Commission to conduct personnel studies.

Among administrative presenters, Frank van Aalst served as consultant to Duke University’s Talent Identification Program this winter for a guidebook on career planning. He also will offer the keynote address at the annual Labor Day convocation of Berea College in Kentucky.

Monica Hamill of CHEC has asked me to mention that Hugh Wilder and Pam Clements offered splendid talks at the March retreat on “Revising the Literary Canon”. Attendees took note of the title of Pam’s paper on women writers, “Canon Fodder”.

Rose Varner, International Advisor, received a grant-in-aid from the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs for training in host family programs.

The Chemistry Department is pleased to note that among a group of unusually fine graduating seniors, Howard Hall received an NSF fellowship, which he will use at Berkeley. Charles Beam was invited by Eli Lilly Corporation to address its research chemists’ group at the Indianapolis headquarters on new compounds emerging from his research.

Ed Lawton addressed the National Elementary School Principals Conference in Denver on “Reexamining the Middle School Concept”.

Abdul Aziz, BA/Econ, presented a paper entitled “An Empirical Study of Social Factors, Job Satisfaction, and Absenteeism in a Saudi Arabian Organization” at the Northeast Regional Meeting, Academy of International Business, in March.

Bob Dukes of Physics gave a talk on microcomputer use in teaching astronomy at Franklin and Marshall College, drawing upon results of his NSF grant in this topic.

Your correspondent offered a paper on “Mid-level Leadership Development” at the American Association of Higher Education Convention in Chicago. For those who want to end Spoleto with inner fireworks, I will be reading my poetry in the Twilight Series of Piccolo Spoleto on June 7 at the Dock Street Theatre Courtyard at 6:30 p.m.
Greater Student Enrollment at the C of C

Editor's Note: This article contains excerpts of a report of a study recently completed by the Office of Adult Learning Services of the College Board called "Policy Recommendations for Expanding Enrollment". The principal authors were Henry Bricknell, Policy Studies in Education, and Carol Astranian, The College Board.

How should the College of Charleston increase its upper division enrollment??

There are two ways for a college to increase its upper division enrollment: 1) hold onto its freshmen and sophomores through all four years of college, or 2) attract new juniors and seniors to replace the freshmen and sophomores who drop out for one reason or another.

To advise the College of Charleston about the best way to hold onto its current students, The College Board staff conducted interviews with about 55 freshmen and sophomores now living in College of Charleston dorms (the most "traditional" population of students at the College and the kind whom the faculty most wants to retain), 50 students currently on academic probation (one population of students likely to drop out), and 35 students who recently stopped studying at the College.

To advise the College of Charleston about the best ways to attract students from Trident Technical College to the College of Charleston to finish a four-year degree or start a four-year degree, the College Board staff interviewed about 90 students at Trident Tech.

In addition, the College Board staff interviewed small groups of faculty members for two days to get their views on two of these populations: students on academic probation and Trident transfer students.

Here are the results of those student and faculty interviews.

Dorm Students

When dorm students were asked what the College of Charleston could do to make things better for them (and presumably make them more inclined to stay four years), they gave the following answers, ranked here according to frequency of mention:

- Improve campus security (better lighting, more guards, increased patrolling time).
- Improve cafeteria services (more space, better food).
- Improve advisory services (better access to advisers, better informed advisers, advisors in the student's own field of interest, better career advice, more personalized services, plus more descriptive catalog entries).
- Improve parking.
- Improve registration procedures (more sections of popular or required courses scheduled) and drop/add procedures (a later drop date coming after the first exams).
- Improve roommate selection procedures.
- Improve bookstore pricing and refund policies.

What is most noteworthy about this list is that it contains little mention of academic life at the College—quality of teaching, intellectual stimulation, flow of ideas, even access to laboratories and libraries. It deals largely with what may be called the logistics of college life... The dorm students do cite getting good academic and career advice as a substantive (as well as logistical) problem and they do call for fewer required courses, which can be construed as a complaint about intellectual demands. But the list is largely logistical.

Four interpretations are possible: 1) academic life is quite satisfactory, 2) logistical matters are quite unsatisfactory, 3) college students pay more attention to logistics than to academics, or 4) all of the above. The third seems most likely, given the finding (presented later) that students on academic
probation are just as satisfied with their experience at the College as students who are academic successes. Students do seem to have more on their minds than study. But that serves only to emphasize the importance of their complaints about the logistics of life at the College. It is quite clear that a satisfactory academic life does not make a satisfactory college life.

One theme in the dorm students' list of desirable improvements is that the College of Charleston may not be equipped for the number of students currently enrolled—that is, the cafeterias, the dorms, the parking facilities, and the course sections themselves all suffer from unpleasant crowding, according to dorm students.

When asked to rate their overall satisfaction with their experience at the College of Charleston, dorm students gave a median rating of 7 on a scale from 0 (low) to 10 (high), thus indicating general satisfaction with the College. However, only a handful of students gave the College a rating of 9 or 10, thus indicating that there is room for improvement.

Inasmuch as dorm students are the ones in whom the College is making the greatest investment and to whom it is giving the best treatment—and, according to many College Board interviews, the population of greatest interest to and most liked by the faculty—the College should not settle for ratings of 7 from its freshman and sophomore students if it wants to hold onto all of them until graduation.

**Students on Academic Probation**

About two thirds of the students on academic probation indicated that they already had used some of the help provided by the College of Charleston, such as attending the Skills Lab, using various counseling and advisory services, and seeking help from their professors. Most of the remaining students said that help was available, but that they had not used it. (The fact that two-thirds of these students on academic probation said they had used available help counters somewhat the opinions of faculty members, who said that students who need help most are least likely to seek it.)

When asked whether the College of Charleston might do anything else to help them stay in school, the students on academic probation volunteered the following, ranked here according to frequency of mention:

- Improve advisory services (use professors in the student's own field of interest as advisors, counsel students to work fewer hours outside of classes).
- Improve academic support services (better communications about what help is available, better information about the drop/add procedures, better information about academic probation itself).
- Provide more tutoring (free tutoring, private tutoring, nighttime tutoring).
- Improve student orientation.
- Encourage faculty to be more helpful to students.

Surprisingly, a substantial number of students interviewed did not seem to know that they were on academic probation. Like those students, a number of the faculty members interviewed said that they often did not know which of their students were on academic probation.

Some faculty members said that academic standards should be raised so that students are put on academic probation earlier and, thus, have a better chance of getting off it. (Those faculty members said that the definition of academic probation is so low now that students who get on it cannot work their way back up out of it.) Faculty members also said that students should be more actively encouraged to attend the Skills Lab. (However, almost one-half of the probationary students are already attending the Skills Lab and must not be finding it sufficiently helpful.)

Finally, faculty members also agreed that these students needed better advisory services, but felt that faculty members could supply such services only if other burdens on them were lightened by the administration.

When asked to rate their overall satisfaction with their experience at the College of Charleston, the students on academic probation—just like their classmates living in the dorms—reported a satisfaction level of 7 on a scale from 0 (low) to 10 (high). Again, like dorm students, only a handful of students on academic probation gave the College of Charleston a rating of 9 or 10. Evidently the
success that students have academically does not seem to influence significantly their ratings of satisfaction with the College.

**Students Who Recently Stopped Studying**

Students who recently stopped studying at the College of Charleston were asked what the College could have done to have prevented them from withdrawing and what the College could do to get them to return. These students listed the following actions, ranked here according to frequency of mention:

- Improve academic support services and faculty helpfulness.
- Provide more financial aid.
- Improve registration procedures (better advice for students choosing courses, streamlined registration procedures).
- Improve campus security.

Like those students on academic probation, a number of the students who had recently stopped studying indicated that work and school together were more than they could handle. If students now on academic probation were to be counseled better on this particular topic, some of them probably could be prevented from withdrawing later. However, some students who withdrew had to have the financial support from a job in order to attend the College of Charleston. (In fact, a significant minority of students interviewed said that they already had plans to return to the College of Charleston when they were able to afford it.) Thus, some financial aid probably needs to be offered to students on the verge of withdrawing, in addition to more sensitive targeted counseling.

**Trident Technical College Students**

When Trident Technical College students were asked what the College of Charleston could do to attract community college student transfers like themselves, they offered the following suggestions, ranked here according to frequency of mention:

- Provide more information about the College of Charleston.
- Send mail directly to Trident students.
- Hold meetings at Trident—organized according to specific academic disciplines—with College of Charleston professors and current College students who are majoring in those disciplines and interested in discussing their academic work.
- Provide campus tours at the College of Charleston for Trident students.
- Provide specific information about credit transferability in specific programs, financial aid, types of programs available, and flexibility of scheduling.
- Improve parking and campus security.
- Provide more financial aid.
- Open a satellite campus of the College of Charleston in the Trident area.
- Reduce the liberal arts requirements (suggested by those students not currently in A.A. or A.S. programs).
- Improve helpfulness of professors (suggested by those students not currently in A.A. or A.S. programs).

Here are some additional ideas mentioned by some Trident students as well as by some faculty members interviewed at the College of Charleston: 1) offer workshops at Trident on what a four-year college is like, 2) offer workshops at Trident on how to transfer to the College of Charleston, 3) use recent alumni who have transferred from Trident into the College of Charleston to recruit additional transfer students, 4) bring the community onto the College of Charleston campus more often for seminars and programs to introduce more people to the College.

Further, a significant number of minority students pointed to racist attitudes at the College and to snobbishness of typical students at the College as two insurmountable problems. Some students said that it was difficult to find someone at the College of Charleston to talk to about transferring there and—indeed—that administrators at the College did not seem interested in talking to Trident students about transferring.
Those student comments match neatly the comments of most faculty members and some administrators interviewed, who felt it was not desirable to attract students from Trident inasmuch as they were not prepared to meet the academic standards at the College of Charleston.

This is an interesting policy question for the College of Charleston. Trident offers an extremely convenient audience that is easy to target for recruitment purposes and that is virtually uninformed about what the College of Charleston has to offer. (When Trident students were asked how much they knew about the College of Charleston, the median rating was a 3 on a scale from 0 (low) to 10 (high), thus indicating they knew very little about the College.) But should Trident students be recruited? The faculty does not want them recruited, and at least some staff members are giving negative signals to interested, perspective transfers. Moreover, current restrictions on transferability of credits would cause most Trident students to lose some credits, regardless of how high their grades were.

**Summary**

Thus, to hold onto current students in all three populations the College Board staff interviewed—dorm students, students on academic probation, and students who recently stopped studying—the College of Charleston should do three things which will appeal to all three groups:

- Improve advisory services (including improving the helpfulness of faculty members in general).
- Improve campus security.
- Improve registration procedures (including drop/add procedures).

While other improvements would assist one or two of these three key populations, these particular improvements would help improve overall satisfaction with the College on the part of all three.

If the College decides that recruiting students from Trident is desirable, it could make substantial progress in recruitment simply by making information about the College available to Trident students. No other single action would be as powerful as that, according to the Trident students themselves.

---

**Academic Calendar for 1985–'86**

**Fall Semester 1985**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August</th>
<th>Dormitories open; Orientation begins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 Sunday</td>
<td>Orientation for new students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Monday</td>
<td>Registration for new students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Tuesday</td>
<td>Late registration for returning students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Wednesday</td>
<td>Classes begin; Drop/Add</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Thursday</td>
<td>Drop/Add</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Friday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September</th>
<th>Drop/Add</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Monday</td>
<td>Last day to withdraw from Classes with a Grade of W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Wednesday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October</th>
<th>Midterm grades due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 Friday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
27 Wednesday  Thanksgiving holiday begins at 5 p.m.

December
2 Monday  Classes resume
6 Friday  Classes end
7 Saturday  Reading day
8 Sunday  Reading day
9 Monday  Final exams begin
16 Monday  Final exams end

(Final grades due by noon Wednesday December 18)

Spring Semester 1986

January
8 Wednesday  Dorms open; Orientation begins
9 Thursday  Orientation/Registration of new students
10 Friday  Late registration of returning students
13 Monday  Classes begin; Drop/Add
14 Tuesday  Drop/Add
15 Wednesday  Drop/Add

February
7 Friday  Last day to withdraw from classes with a grade of W

March
3 Monday  Midterm grades due
7 Friday  Spring recess begins, 5 p.m.
17 Monday  Classes resume

April
25 Friday  Classes end
26 Saturday  Reading day
27 Sunday  Reading day
28 Monday  Final exams begin

May
5 Monday  Final exams end
11 Sunday  Commencement

(Final grades due by noon, Wednesday May 7)

1985 Nominees for Faculty Awards

Following are the nominees being considered for faculty awards for the 1984-85 academic year. These awards will be presented at the Graduation ceremonies on May 16.

Faculty Teaching award
Nominees: Linda Greene, Education; Anna Katona, English; Betsy Martin, Chemistry; Peter McCandless, History; Tom Palmer, Political Science; Jim Snyder, BA/Econ; Pam Tisdale, Education; Michael Tyzack, Fine Arts; and Hugh Wilder, Philosophy.

Selection Committee: The selection committee is composed of the four most recent recipients and the president of the student body. This year’s members are: William Moore, Political Science; Bob Cross, English; Harry Freeman, Biology; Becky Herring, BA/Econ; and John Busch, Student Government President.

Faculty Research Award

Nominees: Lee Drago, History; Doug Friedman, Political Science; Ken Severens, Fine Arts; David Maves, Fine Arts; Larry Carlson, English; Billie Brodman, BA/Econ; and Fred Carter, Political Science. Prof. Severens asked that his name be withdrawn.

Selection Committee: Members of the 1984-85 Faculty Research and Development Committee are the members of the selection committee.

AAUP Legislative News

Reagan's Proposed 1986 Budget

Highlights of Fiscal Year (FY) 1986 Budget

- Reduces federal student assistance funds by 25% ($2.3 billion).
- Eliminates 1 million students from Pell grants and other campus-based programs.
- Eliminates 900,000 students from Guaranteed Student Loans.
- Eliminates or cuts in half state grants for 300,000 students.
- Establishes a $4,000 cap for federal grants and loans (National Direct Student Loans and Guaranteed Student Loans) for any one student.
- Establishes a family income cap of $25,000 for Pell Grants and campus-based programs.
- Establishes a family income cap of $32,500 for Guaranteed Student Loans.
- Requires an $800 student contribution before federal assistance will be made available.
- Eliminates funds for graduate fellowships, research libraries, the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, and most categorical grant programs administered by the Department of Education.

President Reagan’s FY 1986 budget for programs administered by the Department of Education would provide $15.3 billion, approximately the same amount approved by Congress in FY 1982, FY 1983, and FY 1984. Only in FY 1985 did the President agree to an increase in funds for education programs. The FY 1985 appropriation provided $17.9 billion. Almost all of the decrease requested by the President is in funds for the federal student assistance programs. It is now estimated that, if approved, the cuts would eliminate or sharply reduce by 50% or more over 2.2 million grants and loans. All of the 5.3 million students currently receiving some form of federal student aid would be affected by the cuts.

The massive cuts in funds and the major changes in eligibility criteria are of such a major dimension that they would seriously affect the millions of students currently enrolled, discourage an exceptionally high percentage of those students who have already been admitted for 1985-86, and adversely affect the financial stability of all institutions of higher education.

The Administration is attempting to succeed in accomplishing its goal of reducing federal support for education by proposing the same changes in the federal student assistance programs it has advocated in earlier budgets. What it has not succeeded in doing in previous years it is determined to do this year. The Administration would eliminate the last vestige of assistance to middle income
families, reduce the amount of funds available to each student to a pre-1976 level, and begin in FY 1987 to shift authority for the student assistance programs, except Guaranteed Student Loans, to the states through a block grant. While the Administration claims it wishes to concentrate on the neediest students, the changes in eligibility criteria and the family contribution and the $800 required student contribution would make it difficult for low-income students to obtain adequate support.

President Reagan has requested Congress to reduce maximum Pell Grants for FY 1985 (Academic Year 1985-86) from $2,100 or 60% of the cost of attendance, whichever is less, to $2,000 or 50%. Congress had approved the higher award level in the FY 1985 Appropriations Bill, which the President signed. Now the Administration has told Congress that if it does not approve the reduction by April 15, the Department of Education will reduce the maximum awards to an amount less than $1,900 under a statute that requires use of a linear reduction formula when there are insufficient funds for the program. Under the statutory reduction approximately 300,000 students, according to the Reagan administration, would lose their eligibility for Pell grants.

Why are there insufficient funds for Pell Grants in FY 1985? Because in FY 1983 and FY 1984 the Administration failed to request sufficient funds for Pell Grants to meet deficiencies and merely borrowed the funds from the budgets of succeeding years. Now the time has come to pay the deficiencies and the amount is estimated at $835 million. But the Administration does not want to request a supplemental appropriation for Pell Grants. In the past Congress has not been willing to rescind funds or make changes of this nature. Since the Administration has already requested an additional $665 million for Guaranteed Student Loans, an entitlement program, in FY 1985 as a result of deficiencies in that program in both FY 1984 and FY 1985, it is evident that Congress will be aware of the increases in student applications for both Pell Grants and Guaranteed Student Loans.

The Reagan Administration has requested a 4.4% increase in National Science Foundation funds for a total budget of $1.569 billion. The budget includes $1.397 billion for basic research, which represents a 7% increase over FY 1985. Controversial is the deferral of $31.5 million for science and engineering education from FY 1985 funds into the FY 1986 budget.

Funding for graduate research fellowships remains at the current level and supports 1,520 fellowships. The College Science Instrumentation program will continue to provide matching funds of $5.0 million for the acquisition of modern instrumentation at four year institutions. Support for predominately undergraduate institutions will increase. Research opportunities for women will double in funding from $500,000 to $1.0 million while Visiting Professorships for Women will remain at its current level.

Source: American Association of University Professors, AAUP Legislative News

In accordance with our policy of providing the latest possible news, we offer the following note from Dean David Taylor:

All incomplete grades awarded during the spring semester 1985 must be completed by Monday July 8. Change of grade forms submitted after that date will be reviewed by the Academic Standards Committee.

***

For the second time in less than a year, Winthrop College has toughened its academic requirements.

Beginning with the Fall 1985 freshman class, general education requirements will include an additional 3 hours of arts and humanities, an upper-level writing course, a two-hour contemporary issues course, and an optional mathematics course concerned with graphing, statistics, and probability. The number of credit hours students will need to graduate was increased from 122 to 124.
The curriculum changes were prompted by concern among Winthrop's faculty and administration that students were not receiving sufficient instruction in areas outside of their major.

"We want to ensure that Winthrop graduates have a strong foundation in the traditional areas of writing, computation, natural and behavioral sciences, and arts and humanities before specializing in their major fields," said Dr. Michael Smith, Academic Vice President.

The new requirements also include more training in writing at the advanced level as part of students' major fields.

In April 1984 the faculty overhauled the basic core of courses required of all students. The recent changes are a continuation of Winthrop's efforts to improve the quality of the academic program.

***

**IT WAS INCORRECTLY ANNOUNCED AT THE LAST FACULTY MEETING THAT THE BACCALAUREATE SERVICE WOULD BE HELD AT 1 P.M. AT GRACE EPISCOPAL CHURCH ON APRIL 11. THE CORRECT TIME IS 2 P.M.**
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