Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Assistance.

The Committee met seven times during the spring semester and transacted the following business:

1. The Committee submitted recommendations to the faculty concerning the transfer of credit for C- grades, the "no third probation" rule, and the reporting of midterm grades (A through F).

2. The Committee received a report from Fred Daniels concerning 1985-86 scholarships. a) Palmetto $2,000, full renewal 3.2 GPR for 24 hrs. b) Harrison Randolph $500-$1,000 (based on need) full renewal 3.0 GPR for 24 hours.

3. The Committee discussed the W date and decided that the current policy had not been in effect long enough to make valid comparisons.

4. The Committee sent a recommendation to the President that "only students who have fulfilled all requirements for the degree should be allowed to participate in graduation ceremonies."

5. The Committee approved the formation of an Advisory Committee on Learning Disabilities and approved alternative courses to the foreign language requirement for a learning disabled student.

6. The Committee reviewed over a dozen Change of Grade requests submitted after the mandated 60 day limit.

7. The Committee approved the petitions of three students to be allowed to meet the requirements of the Bulletin under which they entered the College.
8. The Committee denied the petition of a student to transfer credit to the College earned during a period of academic dismissal from a third institution.
9. The Committee approved the petition of a readmitted student to treat previous work at the College as transfer credit.
10. The Committee approved a petition allowing 7 credits of a Biology sequence to meet the 8 credit requirement in natural science.
11. The Committee approved a petition to allow 18 hours of advanced German to satisfy the requirements of a German major.

Gary Asleson, Chair

Graduate and Continuing Education Committee

The Committee was involved in the following activities during spring semester 1985.
1. The Committee reviewed non-credit course offerings and offered suggestions for fall 1985.
2. Members of the Committee assisted the Continuing Education Office with a phone-a-thon in February to help raise funds for the Incentive Grant Program.
3. The Committee reviewed the policy recommendations regarding continuing education and adult learners presented in the Community Assessment Program (CAP) Study. Helen Ivy and Dr. Abby Smith prepared an Action Plan for Adult Learners. The Committee revised the Action Plan, made recommendations for minor changes, and unanimously endorsed the Action Plan for Adult Learners.
4. Dr. Charles Matthews continued to serve as the Committee’s representative on the Graduate Council.
5. The 1984-85 Chair of the Committee called the inaugural meeting of the 1985-86 Committee.
The incoming Committee will be represented as follows:
Chairman—Lee Drago, History.
Secretary—Marilyn Lewis, Marine Resource Library
Representative to the Incentive Grant Advisory Committee—Robert Nusbaum, Geology
Representative to the Graduate Council—Mary Berry, Biology
Helen Ivy, Chair

Faculty Welfare Committee

In the Spring Semester of 1985, the Faculty Welfare Committee was involved in the following activities and/or issues:
1. The Committee reviewed the Annual Instructional Faculty Evaluation Summary and the Annual Library Faculty Evaluation Summary documents and made recommendations concerning the numerical ratings used for merit raises.
2. The Committee reviewed and approved the proposed Sexual Harassment Policy which will be incorporated into the new Faculty and Administration Manual.
3. The Committee provided the faculty with the 1984-85 comparative salary data for instructional faculty.
4. The Committee made recommendations to the College Planning Council concerning methods of rewarding faculty and staff, other than monetarily, for their accomplishments.
5. The Committee responded to grievances over unauthorized entry of faculty offices.
6. The Committee reviewed and made recommendations to the Provost regarding procedures and formula to be used in determining the inequity adjustments and merit salary increases for faculty and unclassified administrators.
7. An organizational meeting was held for the 1985-86 Faculty Welfare Committee to select officers. Katherine Higgins was elected Chair and Rick Heldrich was elected Secretary.

Mike Katuna, Chair
The work of the College Planning Council has been divided between annual planning activities and our work as a self-study committee.

In January, the CPC met with the PPBT to discuss concerns of the CPC regarding the 1984-87 planning document. These concerns were based on information gathered from all department heads and administrators who are responsible for individual budgets and had been reported to the President and Provost in a fall semester report. A portion of that report is appended to this memorandum.

During the fall semester, the CPC solicited input from all members of the College community to determine any new areas which should be included in the list of planning assumptions to be used in the 1983-86 planning process. During the early spring semester the CPC made final a list of planning assumption areas and developed a list of internal experts from whom we wished to obtain information before writing the 1983-86 planning assumptions. Thirty administrators and faculty provided requested information relating to one or more planning assumptions each. Throughout the past six weeks, the CPC has used the information gathered to develop the proposed 1985-86 planning assumptions. This list will be forwarded to the President’s Planning and Budget Team for approval or emendation. Once the planning assumptions are completed, they will be distributed to the faculty and administration for use in developing the 1986-89 departmental plans and the 1986-87 budget requests.

As a self-study committee, the College Planning Council has undertaken three projects. They are:

1) To review and recommend revisions in the College of Charleston statement of purpose (i.e. the mission statement).

2) To review and recommend revisions in the College of Charleston Institutional Goals statement.

3) To develop appropriate measures to assess the degree to which the College is able to achieve the institutional goals.

During the spring semester, a subcommittee of the CPC has developed a rough draft revision of the current Statement of Purpose, which was approved at the time of the last self-study. We currently anticipate completion of a first draft of the mission statement to be circulated in the early fall.

Any proposed revision will be widely disseminated and, finally, voted on by the faculty. The faculty’s accepted statement will next go to the President for his approval and, finally, to the Board of Trustees, the group with final authority to change the mission.

After much deliberation, it was decided that the first draft of a revised Institutional Goals Statement should be based on 1) the current College of Charleston Institutional Goals Statement, 2) the current planning document (including planning assumptions, critical issues and all departmental plans), and 3) a large data base containing opinions of all constituencies of the College of Charleston community as to what goals are appropriate for the institution. To this end, the CPC administered the ETS Institutional Goals Inventory Survey to faculty, administrators, students, and trustees. This is the same instrument used in 1977, when the College participated in a pilot ETS study. Because the previous survey was eight years old and only the faculty were well represented, we felt the current survey was necessary. 183 faculty, 76 administrators, 12 trustees, and a stratified random sample of 254 students completed the survey. The results will be used by a CPC subcommittee to develop a first draft of the revised goals statement during the summer.

Any proposed statement will be widely disseminated and, finally, voted on by the faculty. The faculty’s accepted statement will next go to the President for his approval and, finally, to the Board of Trustees, the group with final authority to change the goal statement.

While some time was devoted to a discussion of the development of measures of institutional effectiveness in meeting institutional goals, this project was referred to a subcommittee which will develop several alternative procedures this summer, for presentation to the Council this fall.

As part of its charge, the College Planning Council is to "review the current year's budget and report any inconsistencies between that budget and its parts and the institutional planning assumptions, mission, goals, critical issues and the goals and objectives of each area or department". As part of the review, the College Planning Council sent a brief questionnaire to all administrative and department heads. Open ended questions were asked in order to allow each department head ample opportunity to express their concerns. Responses were collected and categorized according to the type of concern expressed.

The responses of department heads to the questionnaire identified twelve issues which are addressed below in order of the frequency cited by the department heads. The recommendations of the CPC were addressed to the President's Planning and Budget Team in the original December report. Note that the number in parentheses next to each issue represents the number of times that issue was cited.

Computing (13) Computing needs are by far the most mentioned issue. Concerns range from the unavailability of hardware, software or staff support to confusion over whether equipment has been funded and who is in charge of coordination of purchases and other computing issues. Both the administrative and academic departments have critical computing needs which must be addressed. The Council has reviewed the report of the external review team on computing needs and feels that they have provided an important start towards establishing a unified institutional plan for meeting the computing needs of the College. However, clearly defined priorities and lines of authority need to be established in this area.

Personnel/Work-Study (7) Four academic departments and three administrative departments indicated a need for support personnel in order to effectively carry out their function. These positions included laboratory assistants, technical assistants, secretarial support and student assistants. In addition Student Services indicated the position of Director of Minority and Commuter Services which was approved but not funded is needed. The need for increasing minority/commuter student services was supported by several other departments under the category of Desegregation/Student Services below.

Crises (7) A number of departments reported that events have occurred since their plans were approved which could not be foreseen and which have altered the resources needed to adequately address the objectives of the plan. We recommend that procedures for the allocation of contingency funds to meet unexpected needs be clearly described and disseminated.

Desegregation/Student Services (5) Several departments stressed the need to improve efforts to recruit and retain minority students. In addition, concern was expressed that insufficient services were available for commuter and evening students. Our state desegregation mandate indicates that the former is a particularly critical issue which must be adequately addressed. Two particular issues which should be reviewed are the unfunded position of Director of Minority and Commuter Services and the College policy against funding of pre-college student activities.

Supplies/Contractual Services (4) Responses indicated that funding for printing was not adequate to fund approved projects in some cases. In addition one department indicated the printing arrangement with the Citadel has proved to be unsatisfactory. A review of this arrangement and an appropriate policy dealing with printing costs and services should be established and publicized to all departments.

Equipment (excluding computer equipment) (4) The major concern regarding equipment is that maintenance and replacement of major pieces of equipment do not readily fit into the budget. This issue was raised by the Fine Arts Department. If the sciences have solved this issue, the same policy should apply to other departments. If not an institutional policy is needed to address this problem.

Other equipment concerns raised were that partial funding of an equipment request would prevent the accomplishment of a portion of the approved plan; needed equipment had not been provided; and funds for a piece of used equipment had not been accompanied by required
restorative maintenance funds. In each case, the underlying concern of the Council is that appropriate feedback to the department head during the planning process may have corrected the problem at the outset. This issue is raised more directly under the category of Feedback, immediately below.

Feedback (2) Feedback to the departmental supervisors is needed at each stage of the planning process. In particular department heads should be afforded the opportunity to review their approved departmental plans to identify the inaccuracies and to review the departmental budget recommended by the President’s Planning and Budget Team to determine whether sufficient funds have been allocated to carry out the first year of the approved plan. The current planning process will allow each departmental budget to be developed in light of the approved plan and has incorporated opportunities for adequate feedback to each department head. In addition we recommend approved budgets which are not sufficient to fund all portions of the approved should acknowledge which portions of the plan were not funded and why. These steps are needed to link the planning and budgetary processes.

Timing (2) Some departments or accounts do not readily conform to the timing of the planning cycle. We feel these accounts may be handled on a case by case basis.

Professional Travel (2) Two administrative departments indicated that insufficient travel funds were available for staff development. A separate staff development fund was established this year and was to provide development funds to administrative staff, just as the faculty development funds are available to faculty. The Council recommends this fund be reviewed to determine whether it is sufficient to adequately address the needs of the administrative staff. In addition, the fund should be adequately publicized to all staff.

Deferred Maintenance (1) While only one response addressed this issue, it is of great importance to the College. An adequate deferred maintenance plan is called for in the critical issues. The Council urges the review of this issue and the commitment of adequate funds to a long term deferred maintenance plan.

Facilities (1) One department head indicated that office space was entirely inadequate. Since a move is scheduled this summer, this issue has been addressed.

General Issues (1) One department head recommends the establishment of endowed chairs and increased appropriations for the library. The Council endorses both proposals.

**********

REPORTS OF CURRENT COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES (SUMMER 1985)

Committee on Academic Standards and Financial Aid This Committee has met during the summer months and has taken the following actions:

- Reviewed several cases of late change of incomplete grades. These matters are now routinely referred to the Committee for consideration. In some cases the Committee sought additional information from requesting faculty before determining whether to approve or disapprove the late changes.
- Discussed and ruled on requests of students seeking to continue financial aid after probationary semesters of low grade point averages.
- Reviewed the draft section on the Learning Disability Program for the Faculty and Administration Manual.
- Approved the petition of a student to substitute an Independent Study on Drought and Famine in Africa for the previously approved course (Ant 101).
- Rejected the petition of a student seeking to have her transcript amended by the deletion of F Grades received in the fall semester of 1982.
- Approved a request from a student to take more than 7 hours away from the College during the senior year (at the Chinese University of Hong Kong).
- Voted unanimously to allow a learning disabled student to take alternative coursework to satisfy the foreign language requirement. However, the Committee rejected the list of alternative
courses and required that a new set, providing a concentration in a specific area of study, be developed.

**Fact File**

**Facts**

**Draft Statement of Institutional Goals**

(Editor’s Note: This is a memo from Hugh Haynesworth, Chair of the College Planning Council, concerning the College’s Statement of Institutional Goals.)

During the early summer, a subcommittee of the College Planning Council, consisting of Jim Abbott, Billie Ann Brotman, Frank Petrusak, and myself (Hugh Haynesworth), met to review the results of the recently administered Institutional Goals Inventory and to draft a revised statement of Institutional goals. Based on the IGI results, the subcommittee foundattitudes of the students, faculty, and administration have not changed significantly since the last administration of the IGI in 1977. (A summary report of the IGI will appear in a future issue of Newspeak.)

In light of the stable attitudes of the College constituencies, the subcommittee felt significant changes in current goals were inappropriate unless supported by the College community at large. The subcommittee used the following guidelines in drafting a revised statement of institutional goals.

1. Restate the goals in language that is clear to the subcommittee. (This generally involved using an IGI statement which we felt represented the current phrase in the C of C goals statement.
2. Regroup the goals into a functional format.
3. Add goals which are supported by most constituencies of the College based on the IGI results, and which are not in the current goals statement. The subcommittee did not attempt to develop new goals which were not specifically addressed in the IGI.
4. Divide the longer goals statements into two or more statement which contain one main point each.

The subcommittee feels goal statements need not require great change; they may include those practices we currently are achieving and wish to continue. Each of the institutional goals may be addressed in the annual planning process through the departmental and divisional goals of the institution. The goals set at the departmental or divisional level should be much more dynamic. Objectives included in the annual plans will further indicate specific planned changes.

The draft, which follows, will be reviewed and revised by the College Planning Council in the early fall and then presented to the faculty for discussion and revision. At that point, a final version will be presented to the faculty for approval before it is forwarded to the President. At this time, I would appreciate any comments or suggestions you may have regarding the current draft.

**Draft Statement of Institutional Goals**

May 1983

The philosophical goals stated below reflect the College of Charleston’s commitment to education of the whole person and constitute broad guidelines for the design of educational
programs, curricula, and supporting services. It is the role of individual units within the College to articulate more precisely the goals of learning which are reflective of the unique discipline, field, or area of service. Though implementation strategies will vary from area to area, the goals address undergraduate and graduate education as well as offices of administrative services, thus providing the basic framework for goal articulation by academic and administrative units.

**Instruction**

1. To teach students to write and speak effectively.
2. To ensure that students acquire a basic knowledge in humanities, mathematics, the natural sciences and the social sciences.
3. To train students a methods of scholarly inquiry, scientific research and problem solving.
4. To increase the desire and ability of students to undertake self-directed learning.
5. To instill in students a life-long commitment to learning.
6. To help students identify their own personal goals and develop means of achieving them.
7. To help students be open, honest, trusting and cooperative with others.
8. To help students understand and respect people from diverse backgrounds and cultures and to broaden their global outlook.
9. To encourage students to become conscious of the important moral issues of our time.
10. To ensure that students develop a basic computer literacy.
11. To offer students a variety of educational programs, including those geared to important career fields.
12. To help students acquire depth of knowledge in at least one academic discipline, including:
   a. The ability to recount and explain the basic facts and postulates of the discipline and to use these in the solution of problems with which the discipline concerns itself.
   b. Proficiency in the use of the techniques and tools of the discipline.
   c. An awareness of the resources of the discipline and the ability to seek out and assimilate knowledge that has not been a part of the classroom experience.
   d. The ability to relate knowledge in the discipline to other disciplines.
   e. Experiences which will encourage continued interest in the pursuit of the discipline.

**Faculty, Staff, and Students**

1. To recruit and maintain a faculty that is well educated, sensitive to student needs, active and productive as scholars, enthusiastic and able as teachers, and of high morale.
2. To recruit and maintain a staff that is well trained, sensitive to the needs of those whom they serve, and committed to supporting the academic mission of the College.
3. To identify, recruit and retain students who indicate a good likelihood of success in a college that emphasizes academic excellence.
4. To create a community of scholars in which a sense of mutual trust and respect permeates the interaction among students, faculty and staff.
5. To encourage and support an active intellectual, cultural and social life on the campus beyond the classroom.

**Administration**

1. To ensure for all persons equal opportunity and access to the administrative, academic and student programs of the College.
2. To encourage research and provide an environment within which faculty members might participate in the search for knowledge.
3. To secure and effectively manage funds necessary to maintain a strong modern program of instruction.
4. To provide a system of campus governance which is responsive to the concerns of students, faculty and staff.
5. To acquire and maintain facilities and equipment necessary to support the primary goals of the College.
Community Service
1. To serve as a community resource for information and expertise.
2. To design and conduct graduate and other programs which meet the needs of the community and are consonant with the academic mission of the College.
3. To serve as a cultural center in the community through a program of cultural events.

College Board Report: Part III
Greater Student Enrollment at the C of C

Editor's Note: This article contains excerpts of a report of a study completed last academic year 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 Aslanian, The College Board. Previous portions published in Newspeak were: How should the College of Charleston increase its upper division enrollment?

***

How should the College of Charleston increase its commuter enrollment??

Interestingly, many ideas that commuting students had for improving their experiences at the College of Charleston would also improve the experiences of all students enrolled at the College and thus would serve to make the College more attractive to prospective students. The College of Charleston should notice some major similarities between the ideas of commuting students and the ideas of other students about increasing upper division enrollment. Therefore, in reviewing this answer, the College should consider the double advantage it might gain in making some of the improvements called for by commuting students. Furthermore, with such improvement made, the College would be more attractive only to prospective commuting students, but also to current commuting students, thus giving the College a better chance at keeping them for four full years.

Six Major Improvements
The six major improvements called for in College Board staff interviews with commuting students (35 of whom lived at home with their parents and 50 of whom lived in other types of off-campus housing) are listed here, ranked in order of frequency of mention:

1. Improve parking.
2. Improve registration procedures.
3. Improve communications with commuting students.
4. Improve bookstore policies.
5. Improve campus security.
6. Reduce the foreign language graduation requirement.

Improve Parking: Parking is a chronic problem on many college campuses, but it is especially serious at the College of Charleston, according to the students interviewed. Especially when contrasted to the ample, convenient parking facilities at other local colleges, such as Trident Technical College, the parking situation at the College of Charleston is a direct impediment to enrolling more traditional-aged commuters and more returning adult commuters. But worse yet, increasing commuter enrollment will only make the parking situation more and more difficult.

Part of the parking situation is real and part of it is psychological (although that is real, too). There are several key aspects to the parking situation. First, there is the real problem that these "public" students view the cost of parking a car in the campus parking facilities as quite high and, for some students, prohibitive. Second, students worry about the uncertainty of finding a parking place at all--either in various parking facilities or on the streets at meters which have to be fed continually throughout the day during classes. Third, students worry about the safety of the various parking facilities--both in the daytime and in the nighttime--and many do not feel safe even with a parking guard on duty, given the stories they tell each other about the lackluster performance of parking guards in various situations. Fourth, students believe that there are not enough parking facilities conveniently located near the various classroom buildings.
Again, these problems make a sharp contrast between parking downtown at the College of Charleston and parking in convenient, safe, modern settings at the colleges in outlying areas.

The solutions are obvious, if not inexpensive:

- Issue parking permits to commuter students first and to dorm students only after commuter students have been satisfied.
- Increase security measures in campus-owned parking facilities by adding television monitors or hiring better trained, harder working guards or attendants.
- Subsidize parking costs.
- Build additional parking facilities (parking facilities are far cheaper to build than new dorms and might gain the College more students in the long run).

The faculty members interviewed by the College Board staff agree that improving parking would help increase commuter enrollment.

**Improve Registration Procedures** The function of registering students for classes affects every single student every single semester—not only commuting students. The present system at the College of Charleston falls short of any reasonable standard. It should be abandoned and replaced or else rebuilt from the ground up. Minor corrections will not do, given the comments of students and faculty members interviewed by the College Board staff.

The failure of the registration procedures includes the drop/add function of changing registration for classes once the semester begins. This function is as much complained about as the initial registration procedures.

It is impossible to talk to any group of students at the College—not just commuting students—without hearing anecdotes of students waiting in line from three to eight hours to register for classes, of students having to go through the line several times to get all the classes they need, of the computer “losing” the courses students selected during pre-registration, and of the computer breaking down repeatedly during the registration process.

With regard to the drop/add procedures, students comment that the drop day comes too soon—often before a major test has been given in a course or, in the case of night classes, sometimes after only one class. Finally, students frequently complain that there are too few sections of certain courses to accommodate the students who need those courses (even to complete graduation requirements), thus causing students to elect other courses they do not want in order to fill their schedules. Students find this particularly frustrating, given the fact that many students do drop classes by the drop day, thus leaving closed classes not filled to capacity for most of the semester.

Improvements suggested by students for the registration and drop/add functions are straightforward and, for the most part, inexpensive:

- Drop the computer registration system and go back to a system of one registration table per department with several knowledgeable faculty members at each department table to advise students on appropriate course selections.
- Update the course catalog to reflect what is actually available to take or do a better job of telling commuters which classes are to be offered in that semester.
- Move the drop day later in the semester.
- Be more generous with “overrides” to enable students to get more of the courses they actually want to take.
- Overbook classes by a given percentage (based on the percentage of students who typically drop that class by the drop day).

**Improve Communications with Commuter Students** Not surprisingly, commuting students have an especially difficult time keeping up with what is going on at the campus both academically (getting exam schedules, getting drop/add information, etc.) and extracurricularly (getting information about sports events, cultural activities, etc.) Commuting students suggested several simple communication mechanisms, which are relatively inexpensive for the College to institute:

- Designate one centrally-located bulletin board for commuters and instruct all students, faculty members, and College staff who put up notices around campus to put one copy of those notices on the special bulletin board for commuters.
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• Send a weekly newsletter through the U.S. mail to commuters at home.
• Provide individual mailboxes for commuters on campus so that important communications can be placed in the mailboxes and can be picked up by commuting students (e.g., a weekly newsletter detailing upcoming events, exam schedules, drop/add deadlines, etc.).

Improve Bookstore Policies A significant number of commuting students interviewed—and other students interviewed as well—viewed textbook prices at the campus bookstore as exorbitant. This view included used textbooks as well as new textbooks. Students also felt that the bookstore repurchased used textbooks from them at very unfavorable prices. In summary, students viewed the bookstore not as a service provided by the College, but as an aggressive, profit-making enterprise operated by the College for its own benefit.

It is impossible to talk with students at the College without being told anecdotes of students finding books at other college bookstores for one-half the price at the College of Charleston bookstore, of students selling books back to other college bookstores and getting a much better deal, and of students swapping textbooks among friends to avoid the bookstore altogether.

Students had a number of suggestions for improving these bookstore policies, but all of them will cut down the income of the bookstore as it now operates:

• Lower prices on used books.
• Give students a better financial deal for selling back used books in good condition.
• Give students full refunds at any time during the semester if a professor decides that a book is not needed and the students have not yet used it.
• Extend the refund time period until the drop day for that semester.
• Allow a student-run bookstore to compete with the College of Charleston’s bookstore.

Improve Campus Security Again, campus security is a problem for all current students as well as for all prospective students—not just commuting students—at the College of Charleston. Faculty members agree with students that campus security is a problem that should be addressed. The neighborhood of the College is dangerous, the campus of the College is dangerous, and the dorms of the College are dangerous, according to students and faculty members. Anecdotes of rapes and muggings are much talked about, even though they are isolated incidents. However, isolated the incidents are, the anxiety they cause is definitely undercutting commuting students’ satisfaction with the College and may well be holding down commuting student enrollment by turning away those students afraid to give commuting a try. While students acknowledge that security guards have been employed by the College, they frequently tell stories of lackluster performance by the security guards, including eyewitness stories.

Students offer a variety of solutions—some of which cost money and some of which do not:

• Make some kind of physical demarcation of what is and what is not the College of Charleston’s campus—perhaps a perimeter around the campus: parking facilities, walls, or fences. The demarcation would be psychological and symbolic. It could accomplish that—even if it failed to keep out undesirable elements.
• Define better the role and authority of the security guards and explain that role and that authority both to the guards themselves and to the students. For example, can security guards remove individuals from the campus, or arrest them, or simply monitor their actions?
• Do not rely on the Interfraternity Council’s escort service as a strong solution to the security problem—especially for commuting students—even though it is now underused.
• Insist that the security guards be more visible and more mobile by setting up patrolling requirements for security guards and not allowing guards to sit inside buildings or parking facilities in one spot for long periods of time.
• Insist that security guards be more alert and more responsive to students’ requests for help, and institute a complaint procedure to be initiated by students who do not receive help when it is requested from security guards.

Reduce the Foreign Language Requirement The current foreign language graduation requirement seems artificially high for the market of public students that the College of Charleston now serves and may have to serve increasingly in the future. Furthermore, based on some student interviews by the College Board staff, there seems sufficient cause to review the foreign language examinations given by foreign language professors for the purpose of
exempting students from the requirement, based on their study of a foreign language in high school. (These exemption tests--or perhaps placement tests--seem to students unusually hard, even for students with a relatively good high school background in a foreign language.) Again, the foreign language requirement was mentioned by all groups of students interviewed, not just be commuting students.

Solutions proposed by students to this problem require major policy discussion by the College before it acts. (Indeed, it would have to be part of an even larger policy debate.) Those solutions include:

- Reduce the foreign language requirement for all students.
- Drop the foreign language requirement for some students--especially returning adult students.
- Simplify the examinations given to students upon entering so that they can get increased credit for the foreign language study they did in high school.

The foreign language requirement should be viewed in terms of the students the College is now serving (and others it might decide to serve henceforth) and in terms of the requirements of similar colleges around the country. The Modern Language Association can provide relevant data on the requirements of similar institutions if the College of Charleston wants to do some secondary analysis of those data.

Other Help for Commuting Students

Commuting students were also asked whether certain academic and personal support services should be provided on a 12-hour schedule (like the 12-hour class schedule), primarily so that they could take advantage of the services in the evenings, inasmuch as some commuting students are on campus in the evening rather than during the day. The most popular service according to commuting was the Skills Lab, followed by career development counseling--both of which they would like offered in the evening. Faculty members interviewed by the College Board staff agreed that both of these services should be provided in the evening. Commuting students were split about 50-50 on whether personal counseling should be offered in the evening, although faculty members thought that it should be.

Commuting students were also asked about academic advisory services, but they said that academic advisory services were so poor now that it would be useless to offer them in the evening. They did seem to feel that, if academic advisory services were improved, it would be worth offering them in the evening. Faculty members felt that such services should definitely be offered in the evening. As with other topics mentioned above, commuting students were not the only students who found considerable fault with academic advising at the College of Charleston. Many commuting students, like many other students, felt that professors were often indifferent, uninformed, and mismatched to student interests and student majors. Professors, on the other hand, felt they had such a heavy teaching load that it was impossible to do a good job in academic advising. At least, both populations agree that academic advising is not what it should be at the College, whatever the reasons.

In general, faculty members and commuting students agreed that whatever support services were available to daytime students should also be available to evening students--from the bookstore to the library to the ID services to counseling--perhaps by scheduling them from noon to 8 rather than 9 to 5.

Commuting students and faculty members were also asked whether the College should help commuters obtain housing off campus. Most commuters and faculty members said that the College should help by providing lists of landlords and lists of available apartments as well as some kind of roommate matching/selection service for commuters. Commuting students went on to say that the College might provide ratings of landlords by students based on the students' own experiences with those landlords. Finally, commuting students felt that the College might be able to bargain for lower rents with landlords, thus striking a better deal for commuters who are not very powerful individually against established landlords.

Commuting students were also asked whether the College should supply a central gathering place specifically for commuting students. They were split about 50-50 on the question. Faculty members were also somewhat split. Both students and faculty members agreed that commuting
students might be able to take good advantage of additional lounge facilities, additional dining facilities, and additional study facilities, but that these facilities need not be necessarily separate from the facilities used by the other students at the College. Therefore, the College might expand such facilities in general for the benefit of all students rather than supply a special facility solely for commuters and thus run the risk of increasing the commuters' sense of isolation.

Commuting students were also asked whether the College should provide special cultural or sports activities targeted for commuters. They did not feel such special activities were necessary, but hoped that they might get better access to information about existing cultural and sports activities at the College. They recommended various communication methods described above, such as direct mail to their homes or mailboxes on campus where they could pick up flyers about various events—or even more radio spots advertising various events.

Finally, commuters were asked whether they would have preferred to live in a dorm. Three-quarters of them said they would not have preferred to live in a dorm, citing greater privacy and less crowding as two attractive features of non-dorm living. Even though most commuters said that it was easier or more enjoyable for students who did live in the dorms and that dorm life contributed a great deal to the overall experience of students at the College of Charleston, those advantages were offset by disadvantages and they themselves still preferred to live off campus. Given this preference, the College should consider active recruitment to gain additional commuting students as a way of increasing upper division enrollment. (This topic is dealt with elsewhere in this report.) If there is a sizeable market for College of Charleston students who prefer to live off campus, then the College can indeed increase its enrollment without building additional, costly dorms. (Incidentally, like the commuters, dorm students also said that dorm life contributed a great deal to the overall experience of students at the College of Charleston. But, interestingly, almost one-half of the dorm students interviewed said they would have come to the College even if they would have had to live off campus.)

Interestingly, commuting students rated their overall satisfaction with their experience at the College of Charleston as a 7 on a scale of 0 (low) to 10 (high)—the exact satisfaction rating given by dorm students. Inasmuch as commuter students are just as happy with the College as dorm students are, it seems the College should seriously consider taking the advice of commuters as a way of increasing their enrollment.

High School Students' Comments

Interviews with about 155 high school seniors in representative public and private schools in the Tri-County area who were not planning to attend the College of Charleston indicated that some of them might be persuaded to become commuter students.

When the seniors were asked to talk about attractive features of a college, they rarely volunteered "dorms". Moreover, when they were asked to imagine themselves attending the College of Charleston and imagine themselves living on campus or off campus, they gave both scenarios equal ratings. It appeared clear that other things about a college are more important to Tri-County seniors than living in campus dorms.

An idea suggested by some current commuting students at the College of Charleston (who had attended local high schools) is probably worth adopting. They pointed out that many high school students and their parents believe that seniors are "supposed" to leave home to attend college. They recommended that the College of Charleston wage a steady campaign to persuade seniors (and even younger high school students) that students are not in fact "supposed" to go away to college, but that living at home or taking an apartment in town is equally sensible—as well as a lot less expensive. The theme of lower cost should appeal to parents, said the commuters, along with the unstated attraction of having the child close to home for a while longer. Such a campaign should, according to the commuters, be accomplished by substantial claims for the quality of both academic and social life for commuting students at the College of Charleston.

Recruiting Suggestions

Here is a list of recruiting suggestions drawn in large part from current commuting students and, in small part, from faculty members and administrators. These are ways that current commuting students, faculty members, and administrators believe the College of Charleston could use to get more commuting students:
- Advertise far more in the newspaper and by direct mail—as other local colleges do.
- Use graduates of the College of Charleston and current commuting students to recruit new students.
  - Distribute special catalogs and brochures designed specifically for commuter students.
  - Hold open houses especially for prospective commuter students and their parents.
  - Publish a list of impressive College of Charleston graduates and describe their current jobs to show what kinds of jobs graduates can get with a College of Charleston degree.
  - Recruit from those Charleston residents who have just retired from work and who are not yet accustomed to sitting at home or simply doing volunteer work. (Such recruitment could be done through employers.)
  - Publicize that the College of Charleston has flexible scheduling, particularly courses in the evenings.
  - Publicize the financial aid available to students, including commuter students and adults who study part-time.
  - Publicize that it is cheaper to live off campus (especially at home) than on-campus. Tell this both to students and to parents.
  - Tell parents that it is not necessary for students to “go away” to college, inasmuch as some parents think they are supposed to encourage their children to “leave the nest”.
  - Send representatives from the College of Charleston regularly to the military bases to recruit service members and family members.
  - Have shuttle bus transportation from various suburbs to the campus.

----

Determining Faculty Salary Raises

(Editor's Note: Following are excerpts from a memorandum of understanding developed by the Provost and the Department chairs explaining the method used by the College to determine salary increases for faculty and unclassified administrators for the 1985-86 academic year. This method provides a model that will likely be used in the future.)

1. Check College of Charleston faculty salary ranges and average 9-month salaries in current year, by rank, by discipline, and make internal and external comparisons to establish the College's competitive position among peer institutions.
   and adjust base salaries of faculty to different departments.
   a. Institutional Research will continue to monitor the College's competitive position in regard to salaries offered in the same disciplines at comparable institutions. A comprehensive comparative study was done in 1984-85 by the Director of Institutional Research using selected four-year public colleges in South Carolina. It is the intention of the Director of Institutional Research to repeat this study every two years, with a check on the odd years to determine if any major salary adjustments had been made during the current year or proposed for the next year either for the faculty as a whole or for a specific discipline or disciplines.
   b. Director of Institutional Research will ask chairs for any regional or local information on comparative starting salaries or ranges for market sensitive fields such as mathematics, geology, chemistry, computer science, accounting, etc.
   c. The Provost will meet with the Director of Institutional Research and the Associate Provost to review any increases they propose for the range of any rank in any department or discipline based on information about salaries elsewhere, and to discuss the documentation and justification for that shift. Institutional Research will prepare a chart or graph showing how the College of Charleston compares to averages in four year public colleges in the State and region. After the Provost has discussed the graph and recommendations with the President, any changes
in range by rank authorized by the Provost and President will result in corresponding increases in the salary base of each member of the affected department.

2. **Check each Department for possible inequities and compute adjustments necessary to correct them.**

   a. Institutional Research will obtain lists of faculty at the College of Charleston and their 9-month individual salaries, for each rank in each subject in multi-discipline departments, and for each rank in the single discipline departments. The material will be displayed on a graph that depicts relationships between salary and years in rank for each faculty member, and the relative position of each to other department members at the same rank. It is of utmost importance that individuals granted tenure or promoted during the current year be placed on this graph at their new rank, and with the tenure or promotion increment figured onto the 1984-85 base salary. The graph will serve as the basis for considering whether intra-departmental equity adjustments are needed in the 84-85 salary base of individual faculty members. If adjustments are made, the adjusted base then will be used to compute merit for next year’s salary adjustment.

   b. In order to find apparent inequities among persons, it is necessary to establish a norm against which salaries can be compared. To this end each person’s salary, including the chair’s and pre-retirement members, will be plotted on a graph in reference to a line that represents the hypothetical progression through the salary range of a person who has had no years of previous experience in this rank on arrival at the College of Charleston, who “meets expectations” each year and hence reaches a salary below the lowest end of the salary range of the next highest rank by the amount of the promotion increase in the year he/she would be promoted to the next rank if recommended. Each year two chairs asked by the Provost, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, the Associate Provost for Planning and Evaluation, and the Director of Institutional Research will serve as an advisory committee to recommend to the Provost by May 15, the slope of the line to use in preparing the graph, and a rationale for their choice among alternative ways of calculating the angle of the line. (Dr. Michael Katona and Dr. William Golightly have reviewed ways of determining the slope of that line, and together with Dr. Lawton and Ms. Scott have determined a rationale for the slope they have decided upon for 1985-86.)

   c. Copies of the chart for each rank for each department will be provided (with a key identifying the faculty person represented by each of the numbered points) to the Provost and the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. A single summary chart showing all ranks for the department will also be prepared by Institutional Research and one for all departments in the same group for each rank.

   d. Each chair will study the configuration of faculty members’ salaries within each rank and will consider carefully how and why the performance of each member, as reflected in recent summative evaluation ratings, has affected the relationship of each salary to the “normal” line, and how accurately it reflects the differences of overall performance the chair perceives among departmental members.

   e. Faculty hired to enter the department the following year will normally be offered a starting 9-month salary as follows:

      1) The chair determines what salary would place the person on the norm line for the current academic year at the position where their number of years in the rank to which they are to be appointed would entitle him/her, had the faculty member completed the same number of years in rank at the College and received evaluations that indicated he/she was meeting expectations.

      2) That figure should be increased by the percentage currently expected to be authorized by the State for average salary increases the following year.

After ranges and salaries for continuing members have been established for next year, if the salary initially offered using this mode of computation is found too low in the new context of the department, a “correction” salary letter will be sent adjusting the starting salary of any new member whose original letter of appointment contained a salary too low in the new context of the department.
f. Each chair must schedule a meeting as soon as possible with the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs to review and justify the position of each faculty member in a given rank (1) in relation to the line (norm) representing the progression of a faculty member who meets expectations and (2) in relation to other members of the department in the same rank, especially to those who have had the same total number of years in rank whether at the College of Charleston, another college, or as the sum of another college plus the College of Charleston.

g. When the Associate Provost and chair have agreed that the configuration is correct, both sign the list of salaries (the key to the graph). If even after the two last years of similar reviews some previously unidentified inequity is identified, the Associate Provost and the chair will enter on the key beside the actual 9-month present salary what it should have been in the current year had the salary been correctly placed, and will initial this as their joint recommendation for an equity adjustment.

3. Compute merit increases.
   a. The Provost will receive from the Budget and Control Board the average salary increase and the range of percentage increase voted by the legislature.
   b. After the Provost has received the base salary for each member of each department, the Director of Institutional Research will verify the base salary figures and calculate the dollar increase available to the department for merit increases in the following year.
   c. The Director of Institutional Research will receive a list of faculty members and their summative numerical ratings for each department from the Provost's Office, and Mrs. James in Computer Science will run the program devised and approved by the chairs...and will establish the first-pass increases for each individual.
   d. Faculty members within three years of retirement will not be calculated in the group according to merit rating. Each must sign a statement that they will retire in a particular year no more than three years hence and that they have elected not to participate in the regular evaluation process. Their names and salaries, and those of the chair, will be removed from the department list used to determine the merit increase pool. Their salaries will be set by hand by the Provost at the highest percentage increase allowed by the State for the coming year. (The reason for this is to give each the best possible rate of retirement pay. Retirement pay is based on the last three years' salary.) Mrs. James will review the first iteration of merit increases for each member with the department chairs who will fine tune the amounts so that the sum of the increases equals the amount available to the department for those merit increases. When the chair is satisfied with the list, he/she will initial the print out, and Mrs. James will forward it to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and the Provost for final review and approval.

4. Preparation of Salaries Letter.
   The Director of Institutional Research will be accountable for the accuracy of the three sets of salary adjustments and for the accuracy with which the data is transferred from the charts to the form salary increase letter prepared for the President's signature. (The language of the President's letter is prepared by the Provost and edited and personalized by the President. The Provost's Office staff types the letter from the salary increase information generated by the above procedures. Each letter will be proofread for numerical and typing accuracy first by the Provost's Office and then by the Office of Institutional Research.)

5. Authorization from State Personnel and State Budget and Control Board for any individual's total salary increases that exceeds the established percent maximum for the following year.
   The Director of Institutional Research will compute the percentage of total increase for each salary and will make a list of any faculty whose proposed total increases will result in an overall increase that exceeds the State-mandated maximum for allowable percent of increases. The Provost will work with the Director of Institutional Research and the Budget Supervisor to prepare the necessary paperwork to request permission to grant each such exceptional increases from the two State agencies, i.e., from State Personnel and from the Budget and Control Board.

ATTACHMENT 1
On February 4, 1983, the President and Provost approved the recommendation of the Faculty Welfare Committee that the following formula be used in determining faculty salary increments to be awarded to faculty members for tenure and/or promotion beginning with those awarded during the 1982-83 academic year:

1. For promotion Five percent of current median faculty salary at new rank
2. For tenure Four percent of current median faculty salary at present rank.

ATTACHMENT 2

Procedure used to calculate merit increases for 1984-85 (Also for Academic Department Chairs and Unclassified Administrators)

Available department merit funds = 8% of total 9 month base salaries for returning faculty.

1. The first iteration for an individual faculty member's merit raise =
   Individual's Summary Rating/Dept. Average Summary Rating \times 8\% \times \text{Base salary.}

2. If the sum of the first iteration differs from the total available to the department, then the computer program does a second iteration which makes minor adjustments in the merit raises so that the sum agrees with the available pool. Chairman reviews and makes any further recommendations for adjustments to Provost.

Note: For 1985-86, the procedures are the same except that the percent allowed by the State will change, and anyone receiving a summary rating of one or two will not get a merit raise. The money that would have gone into merit raises for people getting ones and twos last year will go into a central fund for inequities.

---

From the Speaker: Spring Semester Report

Finding the Faculty's Right Stuff in 1986

How tough it is to review any semester of the College's history! Because of its unusual vantage point, the Speaker's job provides access to the offices and minds of almost all members of the College staff. One quickly discovers that there is no single "faculty position" confronting an "administrative/staff position" on most issues (so much for the joys of we/they thinking). One finds that generally there are plausible arguments on all sides of issues. (However, there is also a good supply of ridiculous arguments.) And one discovers that those making the arguments, and criticizing the process from the sidelines, have their foibles and strengths.

With these thoughts in mind, I offer some specific lessons I have learned in 1984-85 that may be helpful as we move into a new academic year. These are lessons that have been summarized or specified in Newspeak in various ways, but they are worth looking at again as we seek the "right stuff" to meet the challenges of a new academic year.

- #1. The best laid plans and budgets may come to naught... Despite a planning and budgeting process that is becoming more sophisticated, the College still must confront the reality of external actors (the State Legislature, the CHE, the Budget and Control Board) who make decisions near the start of new budget year that affect the size of the budget. These actors can be affected by the College, but their behavior also is influenced by such factors as the state of the economy, particularly as it affects tax revenues. Also, the College must take a careful look at its process of arriving at the final budget to insure that the final product articulates with the work of institutional planners.
• *2 A mission is a mission only when all agree... As the College Board study indicates, there is a good deal of disagreement among College staff and between students and staff about the mission of the College. Such disagreement fragments our energies and makes it difficult to plan a strategy for developing budgets and charting the institution's future. Difficult questions yet to be answered are: What strategies can be adopted to increase FTE's, the fiscal lifeblood of the College? In developing these strategies, how do we relate to the types of students currently enrolling? Can they be made to measure up to the faculty image of the model C of C student? Or must we revamp our recruiting to ensure enrollment of "model" students? We cannot long put off answering these questions.

• *3 The voices of the faculty need some amplification... There is nothing wrong with hearing a dissonant note or two from the faculty in most forums where it has a voice. Faculty meetings, especially under "the good of the order", provide the opportunities for concerned faculty members to describe their concerns. So do the "Letters" and "Question" columns of Newspeak. The Speaker is always available to hear such concerns, but the Speaker, as an officer of the whole faculty, cannot be expected to champion the cause of each faculty member. He/she, however, must be concerned to listen and to advise.

• *4 The salve of close living quarters is civility and willingness to communicate... In some areas of the institution, personal complaints have turned to out-and-out warfare, and all parties seem to lose in the midst of the emotional trauma. The current number of law suits pending at the College is another measure of the level of warfare. I strongly advocate maintaining civility in the relationships of the academic community. This is not an abandonment of principle or right; it is the requisite for sanity, communication, and the group effort of the academic community. It is surprising how often we misunderstand one another because we do not know one another and do not really talk to one another.

• *5 Change is becoming a primary value??? As in past years, 1985 brought its share of new policies and revisions in old policies (for example, changes in the method for annual evaluation of faculty). The codification of these policies contained in the faculty manual will require considerable faculty patience and persistence to learn and to absorb. Some sections may be criticized by the faculty; others may be praised. (Sections I have reviewed in detail, such as the discussion of academic freedom, are much better than those found in previous Manuals.) We need to more carefully examine policy changes to determine if they are genuinely needed or if the carrousel of change is itself a detriment. Change has also occurred in profound ways in the ranks of the College staff. The President's reorganization and various personnel changes create an air of expectancy of new things to come but also an air of uncertainty.

And so it goes. The "right stuff" for the faculty in 1986 seems the same "right stuff" as for years past: patience, persistence, a critical eye, and an ability to grin in the midst of it all.

*******

Speaker's Log
For the Faculty's information, the following statistics—gathered from an analysis of phone records and appointment books—indicates in summary fashion activities of the Speaker for the 1984-85 academic year:

Number of Committee meetings attended: 141
Number of staff meetings attended and personal conferences: 82
Conferences with individual faculty: 101
Number of specific faculty complaints received: 56
Number of issues of Newspeak completed: 6

*******

Hope for 1986
I hope to talk to every faculty member on the phone or in person at least once during the coming academic year. Please share your concerns about the College: its problems, its present, its future. As always, individual "complaints" are gladly received in confidence and will be responded to as quickly as possible.

Letters to the Editor

Thank You Note; Latest Foundation News

To The Editor (and Faculty and Staff):

(Editor's Note: Mildred Donaldson, a long-time staff member of the College and most recently a data and research analyst for the Provost, retired in late June. Known for her dry and sometimes biting wit, Mildred was highly respected because of her knowledge of the people and institutions of the College. A farewell party was held June 28. Following is a note in which she responds to that event.)

I am totally overwhelmed by your gifts and greatly honored that so many of you came by to say good wishes. I will always treasure my time at the College and the opportunity to be associated with each of you. This was a perfect ending for a very important part of my life and each of you were a part of making it so.

Thanks for everything. It meant so much to me.

Mildred Donaldson

To the Editor:

I want to thank you for the opportunity to update the faculty through Newspeak on a few things I believe the faculty may wish to be aware of regarding the Office of Institutional Advancement, its relationship with the College of Charleston Foundation, and recent activities of both. First, for those of you who may be unaware, the College of Charleston Foundation is a 501 (c) (3) eleemosynary non-profit foundation, a totally separate and independent entity from the College of Charleston.

The Foundation was established in 1970 with these principles in mind:

1. To be the sole, authorized (volunteer) organization dedicated to raising gifts on behalf of an distributing private gifts to the College of Charleston. The Foundation is managed by a fund raising Board of Directors. Gifts are solicited (in the name of the Foundation) from alumni, faculty and staff, students, parents, friends, private foundations, business and industry.

2. The Foundation collects, records and acknowledges all private gifts intended for use by the College of Charleston.

3. The Foundation invests and manages all gifts intended for use by the College (a) according to the instructions of the donors, or, (b) where unrestricted the Foundations uses its own discretion in the investment and use of the funds.

4. The Foundation Board approves and distributes to the College of Charleston all gift income annually, less administrative costs which generally do not exceed 15 percent, in keeping with the needs of the College as recommended by the President of the College.

The Foundation does not have its own staff per se. It is served, rather, by members of the College's fund raising staff, part-time, who are compensated, in part, by the Foundation. This part-
time work consists primarily of providing the Board with fund raising staff assistance, day-to-day office management and accounting responsibilities.

The Vice President for Institutional Advancement, a state employee like his fund raising staff, is not permitted, by statute, to be an officer of or to make decisions for the Foundation. The Vice President is an ex-officio member of the Board and works closely with the Foundation President and Board members as a fund raising consultant, advocate and senior staff assistant in the solicitation of gifts.

As an administrative officer of the College, reporting to the President, the Vice President for Institutional Advancement and his fund raising staff are also available to the faculty to advise and assist in the raising of gift support to help underwrite parts of the College’s financial needs which are not met by income from the state, federal agencies or college auxiliary enterprises.

For those interested in more details about Foundation activity, it will be discussed again this fall in the first of four 1984-85 quarterly Institutional Advisory Council meetings in the President’s Board Room at 3:30 p.m. on September 26, December 5, March 27, and June 26. Although an initial representative group of faculty was appointed in 1984 to the Council by President Collins, all faculty are welcome.

You may be interested to know that the Foundation, in cooperation with the Office of Institutional Advancement, will print and distribute to faculty, staff and prospective donors in the fall, a new booklet entitled “College of Charleston Foundation Policies on Gifts and Contributions and Solicitations”. This booklet has been developed by the Foundation with approval by the College administration. Among other things, it will introduce procedures to clarify, simplify and hopefully enlarge faculty interest and successes in the private gift area.

On other matters of note, the faculty is sure to be pleased with an announcement by Richardson M. Hanckel, President of the College of Charleston Foundation, about a new food service to be offered at the Blacklock House beginning September 3 when it reopens for the fall semester. Kudos to Mr. Hanckel, Foundation Treasurer and alumnus O. Johnson Small; local bank executive and Board Subcommittee Chairman for the Blacklock House Club, N. Winfield Sapp, Jr., and others who worked with faculty and staff through the summer to come up with a new membership structure and food contract with ARA Food Service. This will mean “hot” quick-order food like hamburgers and a number of other attractive features.

Murray A. Kaplan, who was Visiting Assistant Professor for Marketing, Department of Business Administration and Economics at the College of Charleston, has been named Director of Planned Giving in the Office of Development… Another new face is Paul DuPont who is our accountant serving Institutional Advancement as well as the College of Charleston Foundation. For your reference, other Institutional Advancement professional staff members returning to the College in 1983-84 are: Bob Lyon, Director of Annual Giving; Theresa Farris, Director of Corporate and Foundation Relations; Tony Meyer, Director of Alumni Affairs; Susan Sanders, Director of Special Events; and Jane Lareau, Director of College Relations.

Finally, overall gift support to the Foundation totaled $303,622 up 88 percent through August 14 year to date. Unrestricted gifts totaled $103,560 vs. $90,203 in 1984 YTD; restricted gifts totaled $200,062 vs. $71,000 in 1984 YTD. During 1983 to date, we have raised new monies to establish the first full (all cost) 4-year endowed scholarship to be awarded in the fall of 1986 and a number of new "full-tuition" endowed scholarships. The biggest challenge before us at the moment is to appeal to more alumni and faculty to support the Foundation’s Annual Fund Drive. The more success we have “within the family”, the greater our success will be raising money outside from business and industry.

Frank, we are all looking forward to the coming issues of Newspeak and thank from time to time we will have articles to contribute.

Richard Hayes
Vice President
for Institutional Advancement

To the Editor:
In an effort to stabilize telephone costs, enhance service with touch-tone and other features, and also reduce the time required to implement orders for changes, moves and/or additions in service, the Information Resources Division of the State Budget and Control Board has entered into an agreement with AT and T Information Systems for the purchase of an advanced telecommunications switch—System 85. The College's monthly charge includes pro-rated payments for a seven (7) year period. This new system will replace the present Bell Centrex System, shared by the College, Medical University, the Citadel, and other state agencies in Charleston. The central office facilities, now housed in the Bell Central Office, will be transferred to each respective campus, and the software changes (numbers, features) can be made at the location of the main switch. The main switch will be located at the Medical University and is tied to the College and the Citadel with a fiber optic cable. Several strands of this cable are used to control the diagnostics of the system and several strands will be available for the development of future applications. The system's modular design will allow for such additions as voice mail, message service and the simultaneous switching of voice and data.

Due to problems with the distribution of cable, the initial "cut-over" date of August 17 has been changed to November 28, 1985. Every effort is being made to make the transition as simple as possible. Almost all of the administrative telephones, with the exception of a few locations, will have single line touch-tone instruments that are equipped with separate numbers and the following features: call forwarding, call conferencing, call transfer and automatic call back. While some of the departments have expressed an interest in having the departmental numbers ring at the individual locations/desks, others would like the calls forwarded to one central answering point. Each department can decide on a plan that will address their unique needs.

Floyd Tyler
Vice President for Business Affairs,
Physical Plant, and Public Safety

(Editor's Note: Floyd Tyler has also supplied a copy of a memo regarding the moving of various academic departments)

The Departments of Computer Science and Computer Services are moving to the former Souther Bell Building at 9 Liberty Street. Computer Science is moving on Monday August 12 and Computer Services on Tuesday August 13 (Programmers) and Friday August 16 (Operations personnel)...

Monica Scott
Director, Institutional Research and Campus Planning

^^^^ Newsnotes for Summer 1985 ^^^^
schedule, you would be expected to consider this part of the ‘full-time effort’ for which you are compensated under the terms of your twelve month administrative contract. Although any course you might offer would be counted in records of the instructional FTE faculty for that semester or summer term, the Department would not record you on a state line in its approved staffing plan."

"It is indeed an honor that the department...has recommended that you be offered membership in that department, and is tangible evidence of the high esteem and personal liking you have earned from these colleagues. I congratulate you."

***

A reorganization of the administration of the College was detailed in a July 9, 1985 memo to the faculty. Major changes resulting from the reorganization are these:

- Creation of a new position, reporting to the Provost, called Associate Provost for Enrollment Management. Reporting to the Associate Provost will be the Dean for Recruitment and Admissions, the Registrar, Director of Financial Aid, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Director of Maymester and Summer School, and the Dean of Continuing Education.

- Reconstitution of the position formerly known as Associate Provost for Planning and Evaluation. The new position is called Associate Provost for Planning, Information, and Evaluation. Reporting to this Associate Provost will be the Director of the Libraries, the Director of Personnel, the Director of Institutional Research and Campus Planning, and two new positions: the Director of Information and Communications Resource Management and the Coordinator of Planning, Evaluation, and Outcomes Measurement.

- Two areas are now included under the Vice President for Business Affairs: the physical plant and public safety liaison with the Medical University.

- Reorganization of the academic departments into divisions, with division heads reporting to the Associate Provost for Faculty and Departmental Affairs, is being considered.

- Creation of a position in the Office of President called Assistant for Special Projects.

***

Abbie Smith, Associate Dean of Continuing Education, has provided the following information concerning Venture, a program designed to attract and retain adult minority students:

As of May 6, 1985:

- Number of letters, application forms mailed: 140
- Number of application forms completed: 28
- Number of interviews conducted: 26
- Number of active files: 36
- Interviews scheduled: 13
- Inquiries from others in the community (whites): 9