**Fact File**

***Facts***

NEW FACULTY ROSTER

Roster Faculty - Newly Appointed for 1985-86

1. **Cynthia Boughton**, Assistant Professor, Department of History  
   Ph.D. State University of New York, Binghamton
2. **Frank Cosse**, Assistant Professor, Fine Arts Department  
   Ph.D. Rutgers University
3. **George Dickinson**, Professor and Chair, Department of Sociology/Anthropology  
   Ph.D. Louisiana State University
4. **A. Eklund**, Associate Professor, Computer Science Department  
   Ph.D. Virginia Polytechnic
5. **David Gentry**, Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology  
   Ph.D. Georgia Institute of Technology
6. **Karen Grady**, Assistant Professor, Department of Biology  
   Ph.D. University of California at Berkeley
7. **Mark Hartley**, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration and  
   Economics  
   Ph.D. Louisiana Technical University
8. **Pamela Isaac**, Assistant Professor, Department of Languages  
   Ph.D. University of Pittsburgh
9. **Magnus Lind**, Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics  
   Ph.D. University of Iowa
10. **Lawrence McNitt**, Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration and  
    Economics  
    Ph.D. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
11. **Stephanie Migne**, Director of the Language Laboratory and Instructor,  
    Department of Languages  
    M.A. (Expected 1986) University of South Carolina
12. **John Morgan**, Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration and  
    Economics
1. **Broughton Boatwright**, Assistant Professor, Department of Computer Science  
   (Replacings Prof. Pharr who is on leave)

2. **V Chien**, Assistant Professor, Department of Mathematics  
   (Filling a vacant, authorized position)

3. **Lon Dehnert**, Assistant Professor, Department of Fine Arts  
   (Filling a vacant, authorized position)

4. **Hoke Griener**, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration and Economics  
   (Filling a vacant, authorized position)

5. **Jake Halford**, Associate Professor, Department of Physics  
   (Filling a vacant, authorized position)

6. **Chad Helms**, Instructor, Department of Languages  
   (Filling a vacant, authorized position)

7. **Chris Hope**, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology/Anthropology  
   (Filling a vacant, authorized position)

8. **Warren Kay**, Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy  
   (To cover Dr Perlmutter who is on sabbatical)

9. **Yvonne Michel**, Assistant Professor, Department of Mathematics  
   (Filling a vacant, authorized position)

10. **Terry Richardson**, Instructor, Department of Physics  
    (Filling a vacant, authorized position)

11. **Norbert Schipps**, Assistant Professor, Department of Languages  
    (Filling a vacant, authorized position)

---

**Highlights of the Institutional Goal Inventory**  
**By Hugh Haynsworth**

The Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI) is a survey instrument developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) in 1972 as a tool to assist college and university communities in delineating goals and establishing priorities. The survey allows each participant to rate each of 110 goal statements according to (1) how important the goal is at this time and (2) how important the goal should be. Twenty of the goal statements are provided by the institution as a local option. The remaining ninety statements are provided by ETS and are categorized into twenty goal areas (four statements each) and one miscellaneous category (10 statements).

Each rating is on a scale from 1 to 5 with categories of:

1---of no importance or not applicable

...
2--of low importance
3--of medium importance
4--of high importance
5--of extremely high importance

The ETS summary report of the IG1 provides the mean "is" and "should be" response to each goal statement and to each goal area, as well as more detailed information. Overall and constituency (faculty, student, administrator, and trustee) means are reported.

As part of the current self-study, the IG1 was administered in April 1985. The College also administered the survey in 1977, as a participant in the ETS pilot project. In addition, ETS provides the collective results of the survey from a large sample of four-year colleges and universities, to be used as comparative data. (Note that the comparative data only reports responses to the twenty goal areas. Consequently, no comparative data of individual goal statements is available.)

The report which follows is only a brief summary of the data which is available. All members of the College of Charleston community are encouraged to ask for additional information or analysis of data. Please address your questions, comments, or requests to Hugh Haynsworth, Department of Mathematics.

II. Goal Areas. The twenty goal areas (four goal statements each) are divided into thirteen outcome and seven process goals. Most of the outcome goals relate directly to the expected outcome of our students' degree programs while the process goals relate to the method used to obtain those outcomes. Each goal area is described by a brief phrase as follows. A description of each goal area is found later in this report. An appendix also includes graphs which indicate the mean "is" and "should be" response to each goal area, by constituency.

Outcome

Academic Development
Intellectual Development
Individual Personal Development
Humanism/Altruism
Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness
Traditional Religiosity
Vocational Preparation
Advanced Training
Research
Meeting Local Needs
Public Service
Social Egalitarianism
Social Criticism/Activism

Process

Freedom
Democratic Governance
Community
Intellectual/Aesthetic Development
Innovation
Off-Campus Learning
Accountability/Efficiency

A total of 525 individuals completed the 1985 IG1 survey, including 183 faculty, 254 students, 76 administrators, and 12 trustees. The students were chosen as a stratified random sample while all faculty, administrators, and trustees were asked to participate. In 1977, a total of 273 individuals completed the survey, including 151 faculty, 95 students (all graduating seniors), 21 administrators and 5 trustees.

Because of the large difference in the size and composition of the various constituencies in 1985 versus 1977, it would not be surprising to find significant changes in the results of the survey. Despite the differences in the sample populations, the results of the surveys were strikingly similar. The following table lists the seven goal areas which received the highest mean responses to the question, "How important should the goal be at this institution?" The mean is given in parentheses next to the goal area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>1977 Goal Area</th>
<th>1985 Goal Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community (4.34)</td>
<td>Intellectual Orientation (4.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Intellectual Orientation (4.28)</td>
<td>Community (4.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Academic Development (4.16)</td>
<td>Academic Development (4.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual/Aesthetic Envir. (4.06)</td>
<td>Community (4.18)</td>
<td>Intellectual/Aesthetic Envir. (4.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Governance (4.00)</td>
<td>Intellectual Orientation (4.13)</td>
<td>Academic Development (4.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom (3.93)</td>
<td>Individual Personal Devel. (4.03)</td>
<td>Community (4.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Personal Devel. (3.57)</td>
<td>Academic Development (4.03)</td>
<td>Intellectual Orientation (4.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Governance (3.95)</td>
<td>Democratic Governance (3.95)</td>
<td>Accountability/Efficiency (4.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom (3.77)</td>
<td>Intellectual/Aesthetic Envir. (3.93)</td>
<td>Individual Personal Devel. (3.95)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptions of the 20 Goal Areas in the Institutional Goals Inventory

**Outcome Goals**

1. **Academic Development**—this goal is to develop acquisition of general and specialized knowledge, preparation of students for advanced scholarly study, and maintenance of high intellectual standards on the campus.

2. **Intellectual Orientation**—this goal area relates to an attitude about learning and intellectual work. It means familiarity with research and problem-solving methods, the ability to synthesize knowledge from many sources, the capacity for self-directed learning, and a commitment to lifelong learning.

3. **Individual Personal Development**—this goal area means identification by students of personal goals and development of means for achieving them, enhancement of sense of self-worth and self-confidence.

4. **Humanism/Altruism**—this goal area reflects a respect for diverse cultures, commitment to working for world peace, consciousness of the importance of moral issues of the time, and concern about the welfare of all persons generally.
5. Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness—this goal area entails a heightened appreciation of a variety of art forms, required study in the humanities or arts, exposure to forms of non-Western art, and encouragement of active student participation in artistic activities.

6. Traditional Religiousness—this goal area is intended to mean a religiousness that is orthodox, doctrinal, usually sectarian, and often fundamental—in short, traditional rather than "secular" or "modern".

7. Vocational Preparation—this goal area means offering specific occupational curriculums (as in accounting or nursing), programs geared to emerging career fields, opportunities, opportunities for retraining or upgrading skills, and assistance of students in career planning.

8. Advanced Training—this goal area can be most readily understood simply as the availability of postgraduate education. It means developing and maintaining a strong and comprehensive graduate school, providing programs in the professions, and conducting advanced study in specialized problem areas.

9. Research—this goal area involves doing contract studies for external agencies, conducting basic research in the natural and social sciences, and seeking generally to extend the frontiers of knowledge through scientific research.

10. Meeting Local Needs—this goal area is defined as providing for continuing education for adults, serving as a cultural center for the community, providing trained manpower for local employers, and facilitating student involvement in community-service activities.

11. Public Service—this goal area means working with governmental agencies in social and environmental policy formation, committing institutional resources to the solution of major social and environmental problems, training people from disadvantaged communities, and generally being responsive to regional and national priorities in planning educational programs.

12. Social Egalitarianism—this goal has to do with open admissions and meaningful education for all admitted, providing educational experiences relevant to the evolving interests of minority groups and women, and offering remedial work in basic skills.

13. Social Criticism/Activism—this goal area means providing criticisms of prevailing American values, offering ideas for changing social institutions judged to be defective, helping students learn how to bring about change in American society, and being engaged, as an institution, in working for basic changes in American Society.

Process Goals

14. Freedom—this goal area is defined as protecting the right of faculty to present controversial ideas in the classroom, not preventing students from hearing controversial points of view, placing no restrictions on off-campus political activities by faculty or students, and ensuring faculty and students' freedom to choose their own life styles.

15. Democratic Governance—this goal area means decentralized decision-making arrangements by which students, faculty, administrators, and governing board members can all be significantly involved in campus governance; opportunity for individuals to participate in all decisions affecting them; and governance that is genuinely responsive to the concerns of everyone at the institution.

16. Community—this goal area is defined as maintaining a climate in which there is a faculty commitment to the general welfare of the institution, open and candid communication, open and amicable airing of differences, and mutual trust and respect among students, faculty, and administrators.

17. Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment—this goal area means a rich program of cultural events, a campus climate that facilitates student free-time involvement in intellectual and cultural activities, an environment in which students and faculty can easily interact informally, and a reputation as an intellectually exciting campus.

18. Innovation—this goal area is defined as a climate in which continuous innovation is an accepted way of life; it means established procedures for readily initiating curricular or instructional innovations; and, more specifically, it means experimentation with new approaches to individual instruction and to evaluating and grading student performance.

19. Off-Campus Learning—this goal area includes time away from the campus in travel, work-study, VISIT work, etc.; awarding degrees for supervised study off the campus; awarding degrees entirely on the basis of performance.

20. Accountability/efficiency—this goal area is defined to include use of cost criteria in deciding among program alternatives, concern for program efficiency, accountability to funding sources for program effectiveness, and regular submission of evidence that the institution is achieving stated goals.
Observations: Comparison to the 1977 College of Charleston Survey

Faculty The same seven goal areas received the highest ranking in 1965 and 1977 with only minor exceptions in the order.

Students The top six rated goal areas in 1977 remained in the top seven in 1965. The seventh goal area, Freedom, was replaced by Vocational Preparation. This is probably due to a combination of a change in student attitudes and the fact the 1985 survey included a large number of underclassmen and continuing education students.

Administrators Despite a broader participation of administrators in the 1985 survey, six top ranked goal areas remained unchanged, with only minor changes in the order. The seventh goal area, Freedom, was replaced by Accountability/Efficiency.

Trustees Even though the 1977 sample size consisted of only 5 trustees, the six top ranked goal areas remained unchanged, although the order of these six goal areas changed significantly. In particular, Accountability/Efficiency moved from fifth-ranked in 1977 to first-ranked in 1965. Democratic Governance, the seventh-ranked goal in 1977, was replaced by Meeting Local Needs in the 1985 survey.

Total The top seven ranked goal areas in 1977 and 1965 are identical, with only minor changes in the order. Note that the seven highest ranked goal areas for the total sample is exactly the same as the faculty list for both 1977 and 1965. The 1985 student sample shares six of the seven top ranked goal areas, as do the 1965 administrators. The 1965 trustees share five of their top ranked goal areas with the total sample.

Observations: Comparisons to Other Institutions

Two sources of data which allow comparison of the College of Charleston results with other institutions are available. One source is a research report provided by NCHEMS and the other source is the previously mentioned Comparative Data Report provided by ETS.

A 1976 NCHEMS research report compared the seven goal areas which were top-ranked by faculty, administrators, and trustees among various types of institutions. Although the survey instrument used in the NCHEMS report was not the IGI, their instrument used the same 20 goal areas, and the author of the report indicates a comparison to the IGI showed the results were comparable.

The recent CAP study, conducted by the College Board, indicated our faculty was typical of a liberal arts college faculty while our student body was typical of a public comprehensive college. The NCHEMS data allows a comparison of the College of Charleston with institutions of both types. Based on a comparison of the IGI results with the NCHEMS report, our current faculty shares six of the seven top ranked goal areas of both public comprehensive colleges and liberal arts colleges. The only goal area we share with liberal arts colleges, but not with public comprehensive colleges, is Individual Personal Development, the third ranked goal area of our students. The only goal area shared with public comprehensive colleges, but not with liberal arts college, is Freedom, the only faculty goal area not included in the student list.

Four of our administration's top ranked goal areas are included on both lists and one additional top ranked goal area is included on the list of liberal arts administrators. The goal area administrators share with liberal arts colleges, but not with public comprehensive colleges, is Individual Personal Development, and goal areas our administrators do not share with either of these groups are Democratic Governance and Accountability/Efficiency.

Our trustees share five top ranked goal areas with each of these groups.

The IGI Comparative Data Report, provided by ETS, is based on IGI use from 1979 through 1983. The institutions included in the report are a mixture of private and state-supported four-year colleges and non-doctoral degree granting universities. Observations regarding a comparison of the College of Charleston survey results with the Comparative Report follow.

Faculty The two groups of faculty ranked the same seven goal areas as the seven goal areas of highest "should be" importance. The means for the two groups were very similar except for Individual Personal Development (C of F faculty ranked this somewhat higher than the sample group).

Students The two groups of students ranked the same seven goal areas as the seven goal areas of highest "should be" importance. The means for the two groups were very similar except for Academic Development (C of S students ranked this somewhat higher than the sample group).
Administrators The two groups of administrators had six goal areas in common in their lists of seven highest ranked goal areas. While the Comparative Data Sample included Vocational Preparation as one of the most important goal areas, this area was replaced by Democratic Governance on the C of C administrators list.

Trustees The two groups had six goal areas in common in their lists of seven highest rated goal areas. The seventh rated goal area among the Comparative Data Trustees was Vocational Preparation. This goal area was replaced by Meeting Local Needs among the C of C trustees. The greatest differences between groups occur between the trustees. The C of C trustees rated Accountability/Efficiency as the most important goal area with a mean of 4.29 compared to a 3.98 rating by the sample (ranked fourth). The top six rated goal areas of the C of C trustees received very high ratings, all significantly higher than the corresponding sample group means, suggesting the trustees of the college are in agreement as to the highest priorities of the College at this time.

Total The two groups had six goal areas in common in their lists of top ranked goal areas. The sixth ranked goal area among the Comparative Data sample, Vocational Preparation, was replaced by the seventh rated goal area among the C of C sample, Freedom. The mean response for Academic Development and Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment among the C of C sample is significantly higher than the Comparative Data sample means, while the mean for Individual Personal Development is somewhat lower.

A comparison of responses by our constituencies to the ETS data suggests that overall our faculty, students, administrators, and trustees could be chosen as a typical sample of four-year colleges and universities. The most significant distinction between the College of Charleston and Comparative Data institutions appears to be the great importance assigned to Academic Development by all constituencies of the College. Otherwise, when considering the broad goals of the institution, we appear to represent a cross-section of American undergraduate higher educational institutions.

TO BE CONTINUED

_________________________

Committee Bulletin Board
Reports from Faculty Committees and College Committees

Committee on Curriculum and Academic Planning
Actions of the Committee this semester include the following:
- Approval of an increase in the French major to 30 hours.
- Approval of an increase in the German major to 24 credit hours beyond 200 or 202, addition of new courses, and deletion of six courses.
- Approval of an increase in the Spanish major to 30 credit hours, deletion of specific Spanish courses, addition of new courses, and changes in prerequisites.

The Committee has invited chairmen of Languages and Computer Science to discuss the self studies of those departments. The peer review of the Physical Education Department will occur November 21-22.

The role of the Committee in the self study process was discussed at length. Questions raised included the Committee's responsibility in the process and the Committee's role in implementing recommendations. The Committee agreed to continue its current role in which the Committee chair participates at opening and closing interviews, the Committee receives reports, and the Committee reviews those reports with the chairs of the departments evaluated.

The proposed freshmen Seminar 101 course is being studied by the Committee. Curriculum changes in Anthropology and Geology are being studied.
Contact person, Clyde Metz, 2-5587.

Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics
The Committee is meeting with student representatives to discuss the Honor Code revisions and judicial procedures that were presented to the faculty last spring.
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A broader base of student representation is being sought for the Committee. Several students, representing commuter students, dorm students, etc., may be asked to attend committee meetings.

Contact person, Mersha Hass, 2-5627

Committee on the Library

A presentation of the Library budget was recently made to the Committee by David Cohen, Director of
the Library. Mr. Cohen noted that the Library has cut $53,000 from its budget. Cuts were made to
preserve the size and quality of the Library's collection. However, the budget changes mean that no new
journal titles can be added. The approval budget will be reduced $4,000, and 786 microfilm subscriptions
will be cancelled. Mr. Cohen expressed concern about maintaining the level of excellence of the Library
for the future if additional budget cuts must be faced.

The Committee will discuss ways for generating money for the Library at a future meeting.

Mr. Cohen also informed the Committee about the status of the automation system for the Library. A
200-page proposal developed by Library staff is currently being studied by vendors. Proposals from
vendors will be studied, and vendor "finalists" will be brought to campus to demonstrate their systems. An
automation plan should be operational by next summer.

The Committee also discussed the experiment during the exam period last spring with extended
Library hours. The data indicated high usage during the week with less usage on the weekend. Mr.
Cohen announced plans to extend hours again during the exam period, but on a more limited basis (for
one or two days). The Library is also revising its hours in order to make them more consistent.

The Committee will discuss a revised borrowing policy at its next meeting.

Contact person, Pam Clements, 2-5664

Graduate Council

At its October meeting, the Council heard reports from a representative of each graduate program:

- In the Marine Biology Program, ten new students were accepted. A new video tape promoting
the program has been developed, and the tape will be presented in various schools in North Carolina, South
Carolina, and Georgia this fall. The search for a program director continues.
- The graduate education program is preparing for a NASDTEC evaluation visit in the spring. The
team will be reviewing all education programs.
- A letter from NASPAA has been received which indicates that the public administration program
has been approved for professional accreditation.

The Council discussed graduate enrollments, which have increased over last year.

Proposed procedures for development of graduate programs were also discussed.

Contact person, Sue Sommer, 2-5620

Council of Chairmen

The Council normally meets the first Monday of the month.

At its September meeting, the Council discussed topics for consideration, including: budget cuts,
workload, contractual period for chairs, physical plant performance, efforts to enhance revenues,
publicity, faculty participation in the Presidential search, the audits now in progress, faculty workload
committee, effects of the end of sovereign immunity, overtime management, specialized training for
staff, and admissions and retention.

The Council determined that a letter would be written to the News and Courier affirming that
despite recent adverse publicity the academic quality of the College remained unimpaired and that the
school was continuing to educate its students.

Also, the Council received the following: In the event of further budget cuts, the academic program
should be given first priority in maintenance of funding. It was further requested that a report of cuts
undertaken in non-academic areas be prepared for the faculty.

At its October meeting the Council heard a presentation from Richard Hayes, Vice President for
Institutional Advancement, and Sonny Hankel of the Foundation concerning fund raising activities and
expenditures by the Foundation. Chairman Frank Kinard, Chemistry, asked for an accounting of special
funds restricted for use by certain departments. It was generally agreed that more publicity is needed
concerning the use of Foundation monies at the College.
Chairman Dick Crosby, Computer Science, asked about rumors concerning a slush fund operated by Provost Jacquelyn Mattfeld. Mr. Hanckel indicated that all expenditures are approved by the Foundation Board. Guidelines for the use of such funds, intended to fill gaps where State funds may not be used, are also provided.

Prof. William Moore, Director of Maymester and Summer School, reported to the chairmen. He indicated that only six or seven courses had been cancelled last year. In response to a question concerning income, he indicated that Maymester does make money. In the future, he noted, the State will provide some funding for Summer School.

On the November agenda are these items: the new administration organization chart, sections in the Faculty and Administration Manual dealing with the Chairs, the new contractual period for Chairs, and requests from the administration for this year.

Contact person, Bill Golightly, 2-5730.

Faculty Advisory Committee to the President
This Committee has not met this semester.

Graduate and Continuing Education Committee
The Committee has met twice this semester. It has:
- Placed committee minutes prior to 1983 in Special Collections in the Library
- Appointed Robert Nusbaum to serve on the Incentive Grant Advisory Committee. He helped determine the 24 winners of grants.
- Heard various reports on several programs, including the CAP Report (recommendations for expanding enrollment), and the Venture Program (which identifies qualified minority adults interested in continuing their education). Forty-one persons are currently enrolled in each program.
- Worked with Continuing Education to encourage faculty to teach courses at off-campus sites, including local malls.
- Viewed the proposed procedure for developing Masters Programs.

Contact person, Lee Drago, 2-5711.

Faculty Welfare Committee
In September the Committee reviewed the insurance benefit package for College employees and heard presentations from Pilot Life representatives concerning group disability insurance and hospital supplement insurance. After reviewing these proposals and discussing them with Floyd Tyler, Vice President for Business Affairs, Security and Physical Plant, and Dollie Pettit of the Personnel Office, the Committee decided not to recommend a group disability plan at this time.

The Committee determined that the faculty should be advised to purchase a disability income plan on an individual basis. Also, the Committee asked that the Personnel Office inform the faculty concerning currently provided benefits.

More recently, the Committee reviewed the Task Force on Evaluations document. The following concerns were expressed:
- That mandated inclusion of negative comments is seen as a way of acquiring ammunition against faculty members to be used during tenure and promotion evaluations.
- That annual evaluation materials should be included in packets for third year, tenure, and promotion evaluations.
- That a 20% discretionary percentage should automatically be placed in the area of evaluation which is rated the highest.

By unanimous vote, the Committee recommended adding violation of due process as a basis for appeal at all levels of evaluation.

The Committee agreed to take no further action regarding the document until it has been presented to the general faculty.

Contact person, Katy Higgins, 2-5530.

College Planning Council
This fall the Committee has reviewed its charge as a College committee and suggested recommended changes to the President's Planning and Budget Team. It also has completed work on a draft statement of institutional goals for the College. This statement is undergoing further revision and will be presented for adoption at a faculty meeting. Also, the Committee is reviewing the College’s mission statement. During the semester the CPC met with the PPBT in order to share information.

The Council's report on the Institutional Goals Survey is found elsewhere in this issue of Newspeak.

Contact person, Hugh Heynsworth, 2-5730.

President's Planning and Budget Team

Most of the Committee's work this fall has been devoted to realignment of the 1985-86 budget in order to keep it in balance. As noted in an October 1 memo from Floyd Tyler, Vice President for Business Affairs and Physical Plant, to President Collins, the Team has already had to deal with two budget cuts. The third cut, a result of decline in FTE's, is currently being dealt with. A third cut is possible and should be known by November. Notes Mr. Tyler:

"The Senate Finance Committee reduced the College's budget by $217,426 during the last day of the budget process. This was done by delaying the hiring date for new employees. The Budget and Control Board reduced our budget again by further delayed hiring of new employees. This amount to $162,350."

"The decline in FTE students for the fall semester will reduce our College Fees by approximately $327,000 if this decline carries over to the spring semester. As you know, last spring's enrollment was down by approximately 10% from the fall of 1984.

"In addition, the Governor's recent letter indicating another possible cut, based on a revenue shortfall, could cost us from $250,000 to $350,000 depending upon the percentage of the reduction (1 1/2% would amount to $245,437, 2% would amount to $327,316)."

"The total of all the above mentioned reductions could exceed $1 million for 1985-86."

The Committee is studying recommendations for making further budget cuts. These will be considered by President Edward Collins and by Harry Lightsey, Designated Acting President.

The Committee has also reviewed its charge and that of the College Planning Council. The CPC and PPBT have held a joint meeting in order to exchange information.

Contact person, Alice Jacobson, 2-7031.

Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions and Financial Assistance

As usual the Committee is hearing a large number of petitions from students. Examples of actions from recent meetings are:

- Denied the request of a student with a 2.7 grade average for continuation of his scholarship.
- Approved the request of a student to delete from his transcript 'F' grades for courses for which he claims he was never registered in 1973.
- Approved a request for transfer credit earned from several other institutions while dropped from academic deficiency at the University of Vermont because of subsequent achievement at reputable institutions.

A large number of requests for late grade changes have also been reviewed by the Committee.

In other action, the Committee studied a memorandum from then Dean Bill Lindstrom concerning the effect of the four week drop date on grades awarded. The Committee concluded that the purpose for the change of drop date had been achieved and that there was no need to propose a different drop date.

Contact person, Amy McCandless, 2-5711.

Faculty Research and Development Committee

The Committee has met regularly since the beginning of the semester. It considered several temporary measures to deal with the severely cut budget in this area and is currently finishing a review of proposals for the first round of College Grants, covering projects for next semester. The Committee hopes to announce the awards by early November.

Because of the limited resources available to the Faculty Research and Development Committee, the Committee suggests that faculty who are planning to submit proposals for subsequent rounds of internal grants should first discuss their project with Paul Hamill, Assistant Provost for Faculty Services, to explore possibilities for external funding.

Contact person, Larry Carlson, 2-5664.
From the Speaker:

Reflections on Our Time of Troubles...

These indeed are days of stress and strain at the College of Charleston. Most of us want to believe that it is "business as usual" because we want to believe that nothing has really changed. But things have changed, and most of us sense that all of the change will not be for the better.

I want to take the opportunity to address some of the questions and points that faculty have raised with me in recent weeks. I do so with a sense of urgency because I recognize as your Speaker, as something of the conscience of the faculty, that we are fast losing our political innocence as a faculty. We need to prepare for a new age of institutional politics.

The First Question I would like to respond to--Have we lost control over our own affairs to those outside the College?

The answer is yes and no. Insiders like the President and Provost still provide direction, but we are seeing something entirely new: the direct injection of outsiders into the internal decision making process. Legislators and auditors, invited into our politics at the behest of some faculty and staff, are putting us under the proverbial microscope. Their work and their input will influence the course of the College for the next several months, perhaps years. Something else that is new for us: members of the Board of Trustees are directly involved in the making of detailed administrative decisions for the College. Our new Acting President is also likely to be a critical political actor long before he officially begins his work in January.

It is hard to know what will be the outcome of these changes for the welfare and politics of the College. One probable result will be a change of top administrative personnel, something passionately desired by those who have encouraged legislators and others to enter the College's political process. Considerable reorganization and restaffing at lower levels in the administrative structure are also likely over the next few years.

The open question is: How long can we expect to remain under the microscope? How many and what kinds of decisions will be examined not just in the past but for the future? Again, our innocence is lost. For some time to come, we have lost whatever relative autonomy we had achieved in our academic community in the 1970s. The News and Courier says this is a good thing, that everything we do should be open to public scrutiny. Perhaps the editors are right. What concerns me is that we faculty need to prepare for a period of constant, meticulous scrutiny that will touch our departments, touch us as individuals, even perhaps penetrate to the level of our work in the classroom.

My second question--Why has our current time of troubles degenerated into such personal conflict?

I wish I had the complete answer to this question. I only know that a small group of faculty and staff (and a few students) has chosen to twist our normal, at least semi-rational discourse with rumors, innuendo, and half-truths about some of their colleagues. I am particularly disturbed that some were willing to charge, try, and condemn people before the official audits of the College had even begun. I am sensitive about the level of personal rancor since I have been the recipient of a series of crank letters and phone calls telling me not to interfere in the "plan" to eliminate key administrative personnel. I make the plea: let us stop such destructive behavior and words! Let us accept due process. Let us have some presumption of "innocent until proven guilty." If we act like McCarthyites in our treatment of one another, we can hardly be surprised when outsiders deal with us in the same way.

My speculation is that much of the behavior of this small minority of faculty and staff is motivated by an ancient desire in any organization: getting even with those in authority. Over the time of any administration (whether that of a U.S. President or that of a College President), the aggregate of disgruntled people grows as the organization makes decisions, inevitably decisions that offend people. At the first sign of weakness, the disgruntled attack, in this case, with an outpouring of documents, rumors, and accusations.

What is sad, truly sad, is that some of us are our own worst enemies in this regard. As Walt Kelly's Pogo has said: "We have met the enemy and he is us."
The third question I would like to consider—How does Andree Parrott’s resignation relate to our current troubles?

I believe Mrs. Parrott’s resignation was one of the precipitating factors of our current woes. Many faculty have asked me about this situation, and I have tried to deal with specific questions. As Speaker and President of the American Association of University Professors Chapter at the College, I have been kept informed about this matter since it developed in spring 1985.

Unfortunately, all of the facts cannot and should not be discussed in a public forum. When Mrs. Parrott resigned, she insisted that College administrators not discuss specific allegations against her. The Administration agreed to follow her request. However, I assure you that the allegations were serious, that Mrs. Parrott was given the opportunity to have them heard in a due process proceeding before our colleagues of the Faculty Hearing Committee, but that she chose to resign instead.

Some are saying she was forced to resign. I do not find that the facts support this view. However, if Mrs. Parrott feels she has been unfairly treated, she should ask the Hearing Committee and the AAUP to consider the allegations against her and the circumstances surrounding her resignation. I would welcome this opportunity to clear the air of a continuing flurry of charges and counter charges.

Some clearly saw that the administration acted in an evil way in this matter. This was the last of a series of frustrations that encouraged a few faculty and staff to open their files and agitate legislators and media, with results we are all familiar with.

Frankly, I see no evil on the part of the administration. With hindsight, a better decision would have been to take the case immediately to the Hearing Committee. But I find no sinister motivations in wanting to deal with what were, again, very serious allegations. To have done nothing would have been a much greater evil.

If people are attacking our colleagues and the College only because of this incident, I must say that they are doing the wrong thing for the wrong reason.

Next, there is the question of how our current financial difficulties constitute a part of our time of troubles.

Colleagues, the College is facing an extremely difficult financial situation, and the prospects for the next few years are equally as bleak. Because of actual and probable state mandated budget cuts and because of a decline in FTE’s, our revenues in this year’s budget will be down approximately $1 million dollars.

We have already gone through a series of budget cuts and have excised paperclips, fat and some bone. To find the final $600,000, it will be necessary to cut flesh. In critical meetings of the President’s Planning and Budget Team, the difficult question is being asked: what operations of the College can be cut to achieve the $600,000 figure?

As your representative, I will work to assure that faculty salaries and budgets directly affecting faculty remain protected areas as in the past. For the future, we will probably see the need to make cuts in the upcoming budget year. To do this, we may need to rethink our mission and find whole programs and areas that can be eliminated without affecting our essential services to students. Again, I need your advice. Write me and let me know where you think the College can make the future, long term cuts needed to assure our financial stability. And I also ask that you think in a more positive vein. Let me know what new or augmented sources of revenue the College can obtain that might completely or partially offset the need for a budget cut.

I must add that for the short term, especially given our current negative publicity, I do not think it is likely that the miracle of the rising FTE’s will save us from a crunch of revenues for the coming budget year.

Finally, there is the bottom line question: what will be the outcome of this time of troubles? Unlike some, I do not foresee destruction of the institution or its merger with a large university. If the College can survive a civil war, it can easily make it through its current problems. But the cost will be more than lost innocence:

- There is the cost of time and energy and effort in aiding the work of investigators. As Speaker, I know that too much of my own time now relates to the “crisis,” to helping the staff answer questions about the faculty and the College. Certainly the questions must be answered. But in the meantime, what of the other problems of the College? What of declining FTE’s? What of the struggle to define and refine our mission? What about the decisions for our future? for our students? for us as faculty? Can we afford to postpone these matters until the “crisis” has ended?
• There is the probable cost of lost donors, lost students, lost research projects that faculty are unable to develop. We have enjoyed the reputation since 1970 of being a stable, predictable academic institution. If we acquire the image of being unpredictable and unstable, can we remain attractive (let alone expect to become more attractive) to prospective students, faculty, and financial contributors? In academia, uncertainty and instability seem to breed a sense of malaise that can sap the essential purposes of a college community.

• Finally, there are the human costs of reputations tarnished, careers derailed, and civility destroyed. As a member of this community, I have always cherished the good relations I have had with my colleagues. This has made up for some of the more unpleasant features of academia. If the faculty remains as divided as it is in this current situation, then we will all have lost a great deal of what is worthwhile in our lives and our work. God forbid, the ulcer producing environments of IBM or a public school classroom may seem more appealing to us.

I ask again that we stand together to talk about and think through our problems. I ask that the guerrilla war of rumor cease. I ask that we think about and work together for the welfare of this College community, which has done so much for us, and is so much a part of us as individual faculty and staff.

---

**College Board Report: Part IV.**

**Increasing Summer School Enrollment**

*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 Aselsen, 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 summer enrollment??**

Survey current students to find out what they want to study in the summer; advertise what is being offered to prospective students not now attending the College.

Currently, summer school at the College of Charleston is a “supply dominated” extension of the regular academic year. In other words, it is a “third semester” of the same types of courses taught during the regular academic year and consists mainly of whatever courses individual professors decide they want to teach.

Department chairpersons select all summer school professors (about 80 percent of whom are regular faculty members). Typically, department chairpersons use these criteria in deciding what to offer in summer school:

• Does the department teach it already?
• Do our own students need it?
• Does any professor want to teach it this summer?

The final criterion for what to offer in summer school is supplied by the summer school administrators, namely:

• Will it draw enough enrollment?

In summary, then, the professors in each department are the sole sensors of demand. Neither they nor department chairpersons nor summer school administrators have any way of judging what courses are being demanded by students, except to look at past enrollment. And none of the three groups has any way to sense demand from potential new kinds of summer students—high school students, college students at other colleges, or adults now enrolled in college study.

The effect of designing the summer school solely from the supply side of the equation has been to put a ceiling on its enrollment. The simplest proof that this ceiling exists lies in such basic statistics as these:

• Almost 20 percent of the courses in the 1984 Summer Sessions I and II were filled and had to be closed to additional students who wanted them.
This statistic understates the actual situation. A basic summer school policy is not to turn students away when a course is being offered. Class limits are frequently raised and “overrides” beyond class limits are frequently granted to students. The result is that, among the 80 percent of the 1984 Summer Sessions I and II courses which were reported as not being filled, there were in fact a number in which the initial limit was raised to accommodate excess demand.

Or, to put the matter in other words, more than 20 percent of the courses were filled to their limit.

- Almost 10 percent of the 1984 Maymester courses were filled and had to be closed to additional students who wanted them.

Just as with the 1984 Summer Sessions I and II, this statistic understates the situation—for the same reason.

- Only 5 percent of the 196 courses in the 1984 Summer Sessions I and II listed in the Summer Bulletin had to be cancelled for low enrollment, 95 percent attracted enough students to be held.

While this statistic can be construed as proof of excellent planning on the part of faculty members, department chairpersons, and summer school administrators, it can also be taken as demonstrating an extremely conservative, unimaginative, unadventurous approach to scheduling courses for summer school. It demonstrates clearly that the limits of the market for summer school are not being tested.

- Only one of the 40 Maymester courses listed in the 1984 Summer Bulletin had to be cancelled for low enrollment.

The double interpretation offered for the similar statistic on Summer Sessions I and II applies here with even more force.

- Summer evening courses are seldom cancelled—almost none during the past four years.

Again, the double interpretation applies.

What this means is that the potential summer school enrollment—even from students enrolled at the College of Charleston during the regular academic year—is not being realized. But what about other kinds of students, entirely different kinds of students who might become fresh additions to summer school enrollment at the college?

The college board of staff interviewed a number of current and prospective students about summer school at the College of Charleston. Interviewed summer school administrators, gathered opinions from faculty members about their summer school preferences, and talked with officials in 12 organizations about summer courses. Here are those findings.

Current Students

The most important finding is that an extraordinarily high percentage of College of Charleston students already have attended summer school at the College and/or plan to do so in the future.

Among freshmen and sophomores living in the dorms, about one-quarter already had attended summer school at the College, and almost twice that many plan to do so in the future. Among students living with their parents at home, almost two-thirds had attended summer school at the College, and about one-third plan to do so in the future. Among other commuting students, about one-half had attended summer school at the College, and almost one-half plan to do so in the future. Among students on academic probation, about three-quarters had attended summer school at the College, and about one-half plan to do so in the future. In addition, a number of students in these four groups said they would consider attending summer school if they could get what they wanted at a convenient time.

Of these four groups of current students, few had attended or planned to attend summer school at other colleges. Students who had attended or planned to attend another college for summer school were asked why they chose that other college over the College of Charleston. They gave only one reason that the College of Charleston could do anything about: the other college offered a course which the student needed, but either could not get at all or could not get in a convenient time in the College of Charleston summer school program.

When students were asked why they attended summer school, their most common answers were:

- To lighten the load during the academic year
- To make up work or catch up on hours needed
- To get specific courses needed for graduation.
Inasmuch as current students seem to go to summer school at the College of Charleston routinely, it should not be hard to win over those who are considering summer school by simply surveying them to find out what they want to take and on what schedule and offering it. Such a survey would add missing weight to the demand side of the summer school equation.

Prospective Students

The three prospective student populations interviewed were quite different from each other and thus represented quite different segments of a possible new summer school market. Their opinions deserve to be considered separately.

High school students. Only 10 percent of about 155 high school seniors interviewed had attended a summer session at the College of Charleston and only 20 percent planned to attend one after high school graduation. Nonetheless, 25 percent of them said they would have been very interested in a summer session after their junior year (a rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale, with 5 being high). One-third said they would have been very interested in a summer session after their senior year (a 4 or 5 on the same scale).

A brief survey of what courses high school students would be interested in taking in a summer session at the College of Charleston revealed that the most popular courses would be:

- Freshman English
- Computer science
- Mathematics
- Music appreciation/theory

When asked what the College of Charleston should do to attract high school students, high school seniors suggested that the College simply advertise its summer sessions for high school students and offer a wide variety of courses.

Given the limited awareness of high school students about the availability of summer sessions at the College, it seems that the College could gain a much larger share of the market just by advertising the existing summer program. But the College could do even better by surveying these students about what they would like to take and offering that.

Community College Students

Of about 90 students who were interviewed at Trident Technical College by the College Board staff, an appreciable number had attended summer school. While most had attended summer school at Trident itself, about 15 percent of those interviewed had attended summer school at the College of Charleston. (Some additional students had attended other local colleges during the summers.)

Perhaps more interesting is the fact that Trident students in A.A. and A.S. degree programs were somewhat more interested than other students in attending summer school. In fact, some of those interviewed planned to attend school in the upcoming summer, most at Trident, but some at other local colleges, including the College of Charleston.

If the College of Charleston were to advertise its summer school offerings more extensively to Trident students (who know very little about what is available at the College of Charleston, as reported elsewhere), they might be attracted to enroll. Such advertising would tend to appeal to Trident students in two-year degree programs--indeed, it could be designed to do exactly that. If the advertising succeeded, and if Trident students enjoyed a good summer experience at the College of Charleston (either before or after receiving an associate's degree from Trident) in order to complete four-year degrees.

Of course, the matter of attempting to attract Trident students to summer school at the College of Charleston--either to enlarge summer enrollment or to entice them to transfer permanently--is but one part of the larger policy question facing the College of Charleston: does it want Trident students?

Individual Adults

In the telephone survey of 530 individual adults conducted as part of the Community Assessment Program, adults were asked about their past study in the summer and their future preferences and willingness to study in the summer.
About 30 percent of the adults surveyed had studied individual college credit courses in the summer, while about 25 percent of the adults had studied individual noncredit courses during the summer. While only 15 percent of these adults prefer to study credit courses in future summers and only 20 percent prefer to study noncredit courses in future summers, virtually all are willing to do so. Indeed, over one-half of the adults interviewed were willing to study in the summer on the same schedule as they had chosen for the academic year. (For those adults who wanted to change some aspect of their winter schedules for summer study, the times that classes were offered was the most frequent nomination of something to be changed.)

Therefore, given a relatively large learning market among adults in Charleston (this topic is dealt with elsewhere in this report), the percentage of adults willing to study in the summer should give the College of Charleston a large market to target in advertising and in recruiting. Of course, the College would have to introduce some new credit and noncredit summer courses designed specifically to attract adults and would have to advertise them energetically in media most likely to reach the kinds of up-scale adults interviewed in this study.

Organizations

Officials interviewed in 12 organizations wanted, in most cases, as demonstrated in the Technical Report profiles, to avoid scheduling courses for employees, clients, or members in the summer months because of family vacation schedules.

Faculty Members

About 55 percent of the 140 faculty members surveyed by questionnaire said that they had taught credit courses in the past summers at the College of Charleston; about 65 percent of the faculty members said they would be willing to do so in the future. About 10 percent of the faculty members surveyed by questionnaire said that they had taught a noncredit course or workshop in the past summers at the College of Charleston; about 45 percent said they would be willing to do so in the future. Thus, while virtually all professors interested in teaching credit courses in the summer have been doing so, additional professors would be available to teach noncredit courses or workshops in the summer. (This noncredit potential would be most appropriate for enrolling adults in summer study, inasmuch as most current college students would want to take credit courses.)

When interviewed in small groups, faculty members suggested that the College of Charleston offer more upper-level courses during the summer (this was echoed by some commuting students as well) and advertise them in campus newspapers and other local newspapers. Those two tactics should increase summer school enrollment, according to faculty members.

---

**Question!! Question!!! Question!!!**

Editor's Note: Following are answers to questions submitted regarding the current situation at the College of Charleston. Some answers appeared previously in the student newspaper, The Meteor.

**Question:** Are student fees used to subsidize faculty/staff housing?

**Answer:** Money in the Faculty and Student Housing Account (called the "dorm account"). comes from four separate sources: 1) dorm fees, 2) faculty and staff rents, 3) rent paid for the use of the cafeteria space. Dorm fees are set at an amount calculated to cover the actual costs and maintaining the dorms. Revenues from the remaining three sources of the Faculty and Student Housing Account support the operation and maintenance of faculty/staff housing.

**Question:** Will the College continue to use this account to subsidize faculty/staff housing?
Answer: No. The College will no longer provide housing for faculty/staff after June with the exception of the President's house, which is customary at all state colleges and universities in South Carolina. In the interim, a professional appraisal of all faculty/staff housing is being conducted and plans are being made to charge a fair market rental rate for those properties. People renting those properties would then be given the option of paying the new, increased rent, or of finding alternative housing. Those spaces, after June 30, 1986, will then revert to other uses by the College.

Question: Did the Provost ask to live at 12 Bull Street, or have her house furnished?

Answer: No. The Provost was required by the contract issued her by the President to live at 12 Bull Street, as her two predecessors had, because the College administration and the Board of Trustees believed it was necessary for the chief academic officer of the College to be on or near the campus. Although this requirement was established for the good of the institution and not for the personal gain of the individual holding the position of Provost, some now believe this requirement to be a “perk.” This arrangement has been in effect for the past 13 years and the State College Board of Trustees and the State Auditor have been aware of it. Never was it seen as a luxury or a “perk”.

When Dr. Mattfeld moved into 12 Bull Street, she offered the use of the house for certain public functions, such as the overnight accommodation of College guests and as a meeting place for College committees, seminars, recitals, workshops, etc. She continued to use the house for receptions and other functions as expected of the chief academic officer of the College.

Certain furnishings specified in the Provost’s letter of appointment were provided for the first floor public rooms—the study, the living room, and the dining room. The furnishings purchased were a six-piece sofa set, a four-section dining room/conference table and chairs, and three rugs, one for each room. These public rooms have been heavily used for the purposes for which they were attended.

The Provost does not own the house or the furnishings. When she leaves 12 Bull Street, these will remain the property of the College of Charleston.

Question: Were student fees used to pay for the creation of a $19,000 “garden” in the Provost’s yard?

Answer: No, student fees were used at all for the grounds at 12 Bull Street. Funds to do landscaping at 12 Bull came from State Capital Improvement Bonds which have been used for site development and underground utilities for various buildings on campus. These State Capital Improvement Bonds have been approved by the Commission on Higher Education, the Budget and Control Board, the Legislature and the Governor of South Carolina.

The landscape architectural firm of Edward Pinckney and Associates has done all the design work for the site development and landscaping at the College campus. They have reviewed the file for the design and planting of the outdoor areas at 12 Bull Street and stated that the work was in line with other landscaping projects on the campus, both in terms of cost, quality and character of the work.

Question: What about 12 1/2 Bull Street, where the Associate Provost rents an apartment from the Provost?

Answer: In Dr. Mattfeld's contract, no restrictions were placed on the use of 12 Bull Street. Having lived in college housing on several other campuses, Dr. Mattfeld was in the habit of renting a room to a student, staff or faculty member. She continued this practice at the College of Charleston, renting the apartment at the rear of the house to the associate provost. The President and Trustees were aware that a staff member was living in that apartment but no one has ever questioned that use or stated that it was inappropriate or illegal.

A preliminary opinion received by the College from the Property Management Division of the State Budget and Control Board supports the College’s right to set the terms of renting its properties, including the right of the tenant to sublease, and the right to determine whether or not the rents collected from such a sublease should remain with the tenant, be given to the College, or applied to any other designated fund.
**Question:** Was the College silent, as some people allege, in the face of the accusations and allegations by State legislators and the media?

**Answer:** An emphatic no. The President, counsel, the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the State College Board of Trustees answered all questions posed about the College within days of the time they were asked. Detailed written answers and massive amounts of material were given to Sen. Glen McConnell, the News and Courier, and the State Auditor. Unfortunately, the media under the pressures of daily deadlines repeated the accusations and gave limited press air time to the College’s replies. After the President of the College became ill and could not be reached for interviews, the Trustees determined that they, not the Provost, would speak for the College in answering charges. The Trustees also decided that it should not be Dr. Mattfeld, but they and the President, who would answer any charges concerning the terms of her employment. The Trustees answered all questions posed to them. Dr. Mattfeld herself wanted to speak with the media and Sen. McConnell. Sen. McConnell declined the offer and members of the Board of Trustees overrode her request to be heard in the media.

It is important to point out that Dr. Mattfeld met on September 4 with student leaders in the Ballroom of the Stern Student Center and answered all their questions. At that time, the Provost agreed to hold a follow-up meeting on September 12 with a larger group of students. The day before this meeting was to be held, it was announced that the President had resigned and would be returning to campus within the week. The Vice Chairman of the Board believed that the entire nature of the meeting had now changed and that it would be appropriate to hold off a few days to allow the President to meet with the students and answer questions.

In addition, the first faculty meeting of the year was opened to all members of the College community and they were invited to ask questions. On other occasions, Dr. Mattfeld met with and answered questions from the Alumni Association and several small groups of students who requested to see her. The Vice Chairman of the Board met with and answered questions from the College of Charleston Foundation. Questions were being answered all the time.

**Question:** Who oversees the Provost’s spending?

**Answer:** There are internal accounting checks both for state and Foundation moneys, and how they are spent. These checks ensure that expenditures made by all employees are scrutinized department by department. And, there are several points at which spending by any state employee can be called into question. Any purchase of supplies, services or equipment is done through a requisition order that goes to purchasing, where it is reviewed to see that it is in accord with the state purchasing code. When the bill goes to Accounting to be paid, it is checked to make sure that it is being charged to the proper account and that someone with the proper authority has made the purchase.

Business Affairs produces computer printouts of every department’s budget once a month. These printouts go to each individual division head or department chairman. If there are budget overruns, the Business Office calls it to the attention of the responsible official. Foundation records are not public; however, expenditures of any of these moneys is rigorously monitored by foundation officers who must sign off on any purchases of expenditures.

All of these rules apply to any state employee, including the Provost.

**Question:** Why do dorm rates continue to rise and the Provost’s rent remain the same, and why does funding of the Provost’s home come from the dorm account and not from commuters and dorm students alike?

**Answer:** As explained earlier, the Provost’s rent is a matter of contractual terms in her letter of employment. There were the same terms of employment as her predecessors. This rate did not go up because the President did not choose to change the terms of her contract. However, this has changed, as also explained earlier, and the College will charge fair market rental rate and utilities to all faculty/staff living on state-owned property until the College sells these properties to pay for the Sears building.

Dorm rates continue to rise because the state requires the dormitories to be self-supporting. Rates rise with the increase in costs of maintenance, utilities, security, etc. Please note that the “dorm fee”
charged to students is calculated at exactly what it costs to operate and maintain student housing. This figure is unaffected by any other charges against the “dorm” account. Other fees in that account are used for faculty/staff housing. As the College goes to fair market rent, the provost, for the first time, will have the option not to live on campus, if she chooses.

**Question:** Why are the fraternity houses being sold?

**Answer:** The fraternity houses will be sold, eventually, as will other College properties, to repay the loan taken out to buy the Sears property. The Board of Trustees believes that the Sears property is critical to the present and future facility needs of the College. It was also part of an agreement with the City of Charleston that the College, in taking the Sears property off the city tax roll, would return roughly an equal amount of property back to the tax roll, so the city would not be adversely affected by the land sale. Please keep in mind that there will be a lease-back agreement so that no one will be displaced overnight. There will be plenty of time for fraternities and others to seek new accommodations to rent, as they have been doing from the College.

**Question:** Is the audit standard procedure?

**Answer:** The state audit is standard procedure. The College is audited every other year or so, as standard procedure, and at this time ALL operations at the College are examined for compliance with state law. The state Auditor has routinely examined the President’s and the Provost’s expenditures, housing, salaries, etc. for the past several years and has never brought attention to anything as inappropriate or criminal.

The legislative audit is indeed not a standard procedure, but a special audit that can be called only by state legislators. However, College officials are especially grateful for this audit because it insures a complete, comprehensive, and fair review of the College, and students and the general public can see for themselves in what ways the College is being well-run and where it can improve. That is why the audit is critical to the well-being of the school and why administrators mean it when they say, “We welcome the audit!”

**Question:** Has there been a high administrative and faculty turnover here?

**Answer:** Because other institutions of higher education in the state of South Carolina do not keep such records, or are unwilling to release them, it has not been possible for us to provide turnover rates in the other four-year colleges to which we could compare the College of Charleston’s. However, a comparison of the College’s turnover rates in recent years with those its records show for the past eight years, shows there has been, almost without exception, a decrease in the turnover rate at the College in the past three years.

**Question:** Why did the College not print an annual report for fiscal 1984?

**Answer:** The deadline for the 1984 annual report was extended at the request of the Director of Institutional Research when three contributors were unable to complete multiple assignments and responsibilities and meet the original deadline as well. As soon as it’s printed it will be made available to the public. Both the 1983-84 and 1984-85 annual reports are expected to be distributed early in the new year.

**Question:** Why has the Provost redecorated her office and her administrators’ offices twice in three years?

**Answer:** When the Provost arrived, the office she was assigned had not been painted in several years. She was given the opportunity to select a paint color and drapes. In the spring of 1983-84, as the Undergraduate Dean’s staff increased and additional rooms were required for the office, the President decided to turn over the entire suite to the Undergraduate Dean and to Faculty Services. The Provost and her staff were reassigned to the area they now occupy. That area also had not been painted in several
years. The Provost took the drapes from the one window in her previous office and had sets made to match for the additional two windows in the new location. The remainder of the offices in the suite used drapes that were already there. The Provost and two Associate Provosts were allowed to choose the color of the paint for the offices in their suite.

Question: Is there a committee at the College known as the "Audit Committee or some similar title? If such a committee exists, what are its functions? Do faculty members serve on this Committee? If so, why, in view of the nature of the audit? Who are the non-faculty members? How were the faculty members chosen?

Answer: (Editor's note. the following answers were supplied by President Edward Collins, who created the "Audit Committee").

"In response to your letter to Frank Petrusak, there is a committee to assist with the audit. I appointed the Committee to help the College respond promptly and accurately to requests made by both of the audit teams, and to provide the audit teams with contact persons who can assist them in areas such as finances, management, and governance. As you know, members of both audit teams are well-trained professionals who have access to all the records and files of offices of the College. The Audit Committee can assist the audit teams, or not, if the teams so desire, in locating the appropriate offices or documents necessary to complete their work. Dr. Mattfield heads the committee and is the principal contact person with the audit teams. The other members of the Committee are:

- Floyd Tyier, Vice President for Business Affairs, Physical Plant, and Public Safety
- Joseph Bolchoz, Jr., Controller
- Frank Petrusak, Speaker of the Faculty
- William Golightly, Chairman of the Council of Chairmen
- Luther F. Carter, Director, Institute for Public Affairs and Policy Studies"

---

**Letters to the Editor >>>>

ACE Fellowship; Honors Program Courses

To The Editor:

Several people have asked me about the American Council on Education Fellowship for which I was selected last year, and it seemed to me that Newspeak was a good place to use to let those who might be interested in arranging a similar experience know more about my own observations. I would certainly be happy to provide more information to anyone who might be interested. Perhaps you can find some place in an issue of the newsletter for this report.

The ACE Fellowship program provides a mixture of practical experience and theoretical knowledge about academic administration to a group of about thirty people in higher education in each year. My fellowship year, 1964-65, was the twentieth of the program's operation. About twenty percent of those who have been fellows have gone on to become presidents or vice presidents of colleges and universities; still more have become deans. A substantial number also decide at the end of their fellowship year that they prefer not to continue a career in administration. The College of Charleston has successfully nominated two other fellows. One, John Dempsey, is President of Belmont Abbey College in North Carolina, and the other, Jill McGovern, is Assistant to the President at the Johns Hopkins University.

The core of the fellowship program is a series of three week-long workshops during which all of the fellows of a given year come together to discuss issues in higher education, listen to speakers, participate in a number of exercises (budgeting, collective bargaining, etc.), and get to know one another. This last function is perhaps one of the more important of the fellowship. ACE Fellows "network" with a vengeance. They are eager to share information with their peers. One of the advantages of the fellowship year has been that I am tied into a network which extends across the country and includes over eight hundred alumni of the program.
My fellowship class also organized a number of regional meetings designed to give us an opportunity to visit many different colleges, speak with a wide range of presidents, senior administrators and faculty, and learn more about programs of special interest. For example, we visited the Six Colleges Consortium in Western Massachusetts, a group of universities and colleges in the Philadelphia area ranging from the University of Pennsylvania to Montgomery County Community College; the Research Triangle Park, National Humanities Center, and University of North Carolina System; Colorado College, the Auraria Campus in Denver, and the Air Force Academy in Colorado; and several institutions in the Boston area. Most of the regional visits were focused around a theme such as "cooperation among colleges," "community relations," "the care and feeding of trustees," and "research relationships." I also made a number of site visits on my own to schools such as Brown University, the University of Kansas, and New Mexico State University.

The bulk of my time as a fellow was spent working as an assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of Rhode Island. Bill Ferrante, who served as my "mentor" in the program, involved me in a wide range of activities across the university. He also spent a considerable amount of time talking with me about the philosophy and practice of administration as he understood it. An engineer by training, he has been Vice President for Academic Affairs at U. R. I. for nearly two decades and has an enormous store of information and insights. The thing that I like best about working with him was that he would never assign me a task unless I could identify something that I expected to learn from it. This freedom from "busy work" was a real luxury for me, and it set my experience apart from that of many of the other fellows. I became a sort of sounding board and troubleshooter for him in the Academic Affairs Office.

Among the projects I completed were position papers for the Board of Governors (Trustees) on financing for the University Libraries, Professional Travel for Faculty, and Capital Equipment Acquisition. I also wrote reports for the Vice President's Office on faculty development, the Honors Program, and Computing Equipment and Facilities at the University. I was assigned several program reviews to conduct. These tended to emphasize the university's concern for publication and securing external grants, although teaching was not ignored. One of the more interesting assignments I received was to serve as a member of the search committee for a Director of Academic Computing at the University. In some instances I was able to see positive results come out of this work while I was still in Kingston, and these assignments certainly acquainted me with a wide range of issues and concerns beyond my experiences in the history department and summer sessions at the College of Charleston.

One area on which I spent a good deal of time was the complex of activities concerned with recruitment and retention of students. I worked for a time in the Admissions Office in order to become familiar with procedures, interviewed in some detail the new Dean whose responsibility this area was to be, and surveyed retention efforts at the College of Arts and Science, Freshman year, and University levels. Rhode Island was an especially interesting place to look at these processes, for the demographic curve of declining birth rate is steeper there than in any other state in the nation. Indeed part of my reason for choosing Rhode Island as a site for my internship was in order to have the opportunity to work in an environment where the institution was faced with serious problems yet one in which enough resources were available to do something about them.

An important aspect of the Fellowship was the opportunity to observe. I monitored the tenure and promotion process, transfer of the Graduate School of Library and Information Service to the College of Arts and Sciences, and a number of other important changes. Two issues that I was able to follow but had not expected to have the opportunity to spend much time with were legal issues--a major sex discrimination case was in process--and labor relations--the union contracts for employees were in an early stage of negotiation. I attended lots of meetings--that is the fate of every administrator--including the Council of Deans, President's Staff, Faculty Senate, and Curricular Affairs Committee. The first of these was the most interesting, and it was clear that much of the real governance of the university was carried on by the deans.

Rhode Island proved to be a good choice of an institution to observe. It was large enough to provide a variety of experiences yet small enough for me to comprehend the whole. I was treated well, afforded entry into every office I wanted to observe, and granted full access to information, sometimes more than I wanted. I was involved in the active process of administration to the degree that I desired. I could see that the University had some serious problems, perhaps most clearly in the political relationships which
Two strong impressions that I developed during my fellowship were that few problems in academic institutions exist in isolation and that the College of Charleston is, compared with many other colleges, a good place to work. There are many institutions in the country where administration is less humane and where faculty are less well treated, less well qualified, or less concerned for the quality of their work. I also gained the fresh insights of a broader perspective on the problems which we do have.

At the end of the year, I have returned to Charleston with. I think, an enhanced understanding of the variety of higher education institutions in the country, knowledge of their problems, and with a willingness, under certain circumstances, to pursue a career in academic administration. For me, the fellowship worked beautifully. On the other hand, I did find that I missed the classroom, and I really look forward to teaching this year. It is clear to me that administrators often have to find their satisfaction from their jobs in unusual ways, for it seems that their accomplishments may be overlooked or misunderstood. the rewards of teaching are often much more immediate and tangible.

Clarence Davis
Chair, Department of History

To the Editor:

Attached, please find a letter requesting Honors Program course proposal that I would very much appreciate you including in the next issue of Newspeak.

CALLING ALL FACULTY

Would you like smaller classes with brighter students? Do you long for students who enjoy participating in class? Are you excited about being paid to develop a course in your favorite topic? Does being part of an interdisciplinary teaching team interest you?

If the answer to any of the above is "yes", then propose a 1986-87 course for the Honors Program. Although we are especially interested in having proposals for interdisciplinary, team-taught Honors Colloquia, we invite proposals for any Honors Program Course, including special topics courses.

Recently, all faculty should have received a complete proposal form and listing of Honors Program courses. If you need additional proposal forms or did not receive a form, please call the Honors Center at 792-7154. You might also like to see a description of courses offered for 1985-86.

The Honors Program will award a number of summer stipends for those planning Honors Program courses. This year $8,000 is available for allocation to faculty for course development. The stipends will be awarded according to need and the number of proposals submitted. Generally, the Honors Program will compensate your department for your release to the Honors Program.

The deadline for submitting proposals is Monday, December 3, 1985. We will make final decisions by early January so that when departments are asked to fill out their fall schedules, they will know who will be teaching Honors courses, the percentage of time for those faculty who will be released to the Honors Program, compensation the department can expect from the Honors Program, etc.

I hope you will give serious consideration to proposing an Honors Course for next year. If you have any questions or if you would like help in working out a proposal, please contact me or one of the other members of the Honors Program Committee: John Olbrych, John Rashford, Craig Rimmerman, Faye Steuer, or Reid Wiseman.

Rose Hamm
Acting Director
The Honors Program

To the Editor:

Let’s have something in Newspeak each week on how we as individuals might help retain students. For example, I would like to know what success people have had in using peer tutors. There may
be other little things we can do. We might develop a system to contact promising Continuing Education students who may be missing classes. Sometimes a phone call might encourage such persons to remain in school.

Lee Drago
Associate Professor
Department of History

(Editor's Note: I ask that all faculty consider Professor Drago's suggestion and submit any ideas to this column for publication in future issues.)

To the Editor:

In the process of cleaning up my files this summer, I came across these two quotes from old graduate work. I enjoyed reading them once again and thought I'd share them with you.

"There are thousands of men and women teaching in the American universities who care more about the quality of their work than about their standard of living. They are neither geniuses nor saints, their contributions to scholarship may prove to be modest, and many of them publish little or nothing. But they care about intellect, they nurture the minds of their students, and some of them are passionately caught up with the state of the world. On certain campuses they tend to be overshadowed by the small minority of academic entrepreneurs; somehow, they don't sufficiently establish themselves as a force for standards in most universities; but they are serious men, much to be respected, who can transform the life and values of their students."

Bibliography Lost, source unknown

"The higher education depends upon the higher learning, but the higher learning includes two elements which must be distinguished: empirical research and rationalizing scholarship. At present the higher learning and the higher education conflict with one another because we have not differentiated between research and scholarship and because graduate schools erroneously insist that all their students should be trained as research workers to the neglect of interpretive scholarship and also to the neglect of training in the arts of communication. The conflict will end when we learn that only scholar teachers can build and maintain the bridges that will keep the higher learning and the higher education joined in enriching cooperation."

From "Toward Harmonizing Conflicting Points of View in the Preparation of Teachers", a paper by W. H. Crowley, Stanford University

Roy Hills
Associate Professor
Physical Education and Health

^^^Newsnotes for October 1985^^^

Protest Petition

The following petition was signed by 124 members of the College of Charleston faculty and was sent to members of the legislative delegation in Charleston, Berkeley, and Dorchester Counties and to members of the State College Board of Trustees:

We, the undersigned, wish to protest the manner in which the College of Charleston and members of its administration have been attacked by a small number of local public servants. Members of the
administration have been accused, tried, convicted, and sentenced before a complete and comprehensive review of the records of the College of Charleston has been undertaken. Public pronouncements demanding resignations of college officials represent a threat to the integrity of the academic institution. This integrity lies at the heart of the educational process. We welcome the audit of the records of the College inasmuch as it will provide a complete and comprehensive public record of the institution’s operation. From this investigation can come rational decision-making based on weighed evidence. Only then should personnel decisions be considered. The body which has the authority to make such decisions, if necessary, is the State College Board of Trustees. To allow outside political involvement and pressure to influence internal personnel decisions at the College of Charleston constitutes a threat to the cherished principle of academic freedom upon which higher education rests.

**Board Response Concerning Presidential Search Committee**

The composition of the Screening Committee for the Selection of the President has been set by the Board of Trustees and any changes must be approved by the Planning and Development Committee for the College and by the full board, according to Joe E. Berry, Jr., Chairman, State College Board of Trustees, in a recent letter to the faculty speaker.

Mr. Berry was responding to the faculty’s request, resulting from a motion at the October faculty meeting, that the faculty contingent on the Search Committee be expanded from three (the Speaker and two faculty elected at large) to five (the Speaker and four faculty, one elected from each of the distribution categories.)

The Board of Trustees will not meet again until November 13, two days after the November faculty meeting, when the faculty is scheduled to elect members for the Search Committee.

The faculty must determine at its November meeting how it will proceed in this matter.

---
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