Committee Bulletin Board
Reports from Faculty Committees and College Committees

Following are Fall Semester 1985 reports submitted to the Speaker by committees of the faculty:

Committee on Curriculum and Academic Planning
The Committee met approximately biweekly for seven sessions during the Fall Semester. We approved 3 changes in majors; 1 new minor; and 101 course additions, deletions, and description changes that were presented to the faculty for their approval. Details of these proposals can be found in the minutes of faculty meetings. The Committee approved, as did the faculty, the establishment of the Avery Research Center.

Two department five-year self-studies with outside reviewers were conducted (Physical Education/Health and Psychology). The Committee is investigating the creation of a “freshman experience” program to help in retention, etc.
Contact person, Clyde Metz, 2-5587.

Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics
Contact person, Marsha Hass, 2-5627.

Committee on the Library
At the September meeting, David Cohen, Director of the Library, presented the Committee with a revision of the Library’s 1985-86 budget and goals, incorporating a $53,000 cut from the 1984-85 expenditure level. The Library will add no new journal titles this year, but departmental library budgets will remain intact. The approval plan budget is reduced, and 786 microfilm subscriptions were cancelled. In an attempt to minimize the impact of the cuts, the library has also drawn on endowed funds from the Foundation. Deeper cuts may be necessary next year. David Cohen has informed departmental library liaisons that approval plan books should be selected with care; since much of this year’s approval plan budget has been used, some selections may have to be returned.

Plans for the Library automation system are well underway. Selected companies will visit the campus to demonstrate their systems before a final decision is reached. It is expected that computerized search and catalog procedures will be in effect by summer 1986. Since the Library automation system is tied to student fees, it was not affected by the budget cuts.
The Committee also reviewed revisions of the Library’s borrowing policy, which includes the following changes:

- **Students** will be allowed to check out books between semesters.
- **Special Patrons** will be charged a non-refundable $25 fee for borrowing privileges for the year (previously the fee was refunded).
- **Recalls** must be returned within one week after the recall date.
- **Overdue recalls** will be charged $.25 per day with a $25 maximum fee.
- **Faculty members** will be sent a list of items they have checked out at the end of the semester.

The Committee recommended that David Cohen investigate the rates other colleges charge local patrons and that he consider increasing the charge for borrowing privileges.

Extended library hours during the Spring 1985 examination week were found to be successful, particularly on week days early in the exam period; extended hours were planned for the Fall 1985 examination week on a more limited basis.

Contact person, Pam Clements, 2-5557 or 2-5664.

**Graduate Council**
Contact person, Sue Sommer, 2-5620.

**Council of Chairmen**
Contact person, Bill Golightly, 2-5730

**Faculty Advisory Committee to the President**
This Committee did not meet during the fall semester.
Contact person, Michael Finefrock, 2-8029.

**Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs**

Lee Drago, Chair of the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs, asked me to write to you about the Committee’s semester activities. In the October issue of Newspeak, there is a summary of Committee activities through October. Since that time, we have met one more time. Below is a summary of that meeting for your next issue of Newspeak.

The Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs met in December to develop its goals for the Spring semester. It was decided to gather information from each academic department about its policies and procedures governing CLEP exams and to also seek information about its experience with and opinions on “testing out” of courses by such means as exemption exams, course challenges, etc. (notes from Marilyn Lewis, secretary of the Committee)

Contact person, Lee Drago, 2-5711.

**Faculty Welfare Committee**

1. The FWC discussed with various insurance agents, concerned faculty, and College of Charleston administrators the option of picking up a C of C sponsored group disability insurance plan. After a great deal of discussion, the FWC voted not to pursue the issue this year.

2. The FWC requested that the personnel office:
   a. Compile a list of state paid benefits to C of C employees.
   b. Compile a list of optional benefits available to C of C employees; and
   c. To encourage C of C employees to schedule an appointment with personnel to discuss the benefit package.

   The above was accomplished by a direct mailing with the October 15th paycheck.

3. The FWC reviewed in great detail the Hines’ report Evaluation Process for Annual, Third Year, Tenure and Promotion and Evaluation, or the TFED. Copies of motions made by the FWC concerning the TFED were sent to Hines and Jacobson. Frank Petrusak was also sent a copy to be included in a future issue of Newspeak.
4. The FWC was made aware of the inadequate office facilities of the English Department. The Committee sought administrative resolution of the issue. Both President Collins and Lightsey quickly responded with the result being new office spaces allocated for many of the English Department's faculty.

5. At the request of Floyd Tyler, the FWC discussed President Collins' concern about the absence of college insurance coverage for personal items on college property. The Committee sent a memo to both President Collins and Mr. Tyler requesting that the administration explore the possibility of securing an insurance policy, either as a College paid group program or a group program with optional individual participation.

6. Current and future concerns of the FWC:
   a. To review the "white pages" of the new Faculty and Administration Manual.
   b. To address the need for increased compensation to faculty members teaching evening courses and workshops.
   c. To look into providing reduced tuition for children of C of C faculty members attending this school or any S.C. state-supported 4-year institution.

**College Planning Council**

The primary activities of the College Planning Council throughout the fall semester have been related to the development of a revised institutional statement of purpose and a revised statement of institutional goals. The results of the Institutional Goals Inventory survey, conducted last spring, were reported to the faculty and administration. The results of this survey, input from members of the college community, and the currently approved statements were used to develop revised statements which were approved by the faculty in January and have been forwarded to the President for his approval.

The CPC also began the development of proposed measures of effectiveness of the College in meeting its institutional goals.

Contact person, Hugh Haynsworth, 2-5730.

**President's Planning and Budget Team**

The President's Planning and Budget Team approved the planning and budgeting calendar for the year, proposed and approved charges for the College Planning Council and for itself. The group met once with the College Planning Council to discuss the year's work.

The majority of the fall semester's work has been the reduction of the 1985-86 budget. Division heads have brought reductions to the Committee from their department heads; these recommendations were considered by the President as he arrived at final budgetary decisions.

(Editor's Note: the Planning and Budget Team is currently sitting with the President as he reviews the plans of the administrative divisions and departments, and the academic departments, of the College.)

Contact person, Alice Jacobson, 2-7031.

**Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions and Financial Assistance**

The 1985-86 Academic Standards Committee began its work in the summer of 1985. The Committee met six times during the months of May, June, and July to consider student petitions to review the draft copy of the Learning Disability section of the Faculty/Administration Manual, and to discuss student circumvention of the College policy on summer school fee payments.

During the fall semester, the Committee met twice a month. General issues considered were:

1) Consortium grade transfers; 2) the four-week drop date; 3) the clarity of statements on academic requirements in the new undergraduate bulletin; 4) the policy of the Undergraduate Dean on excused/unexcused absences; and 5) the summer option policy.

The following petitions were also handled by the Committee in the period from September to December 1985:

1) Reviewed 27 late grade changes: 18 were approved; 2, denied; 7 returned for clarification

2) Reviewed 6 financial aid petitions, 5 were approved: 1, denied.

3) Voted to waive the laboratory requirement for a legally-blind student.
4) Allowed a student to receive a second degree from the College of Charleston to meet the humanities requirement of the 1979-80 College Bulletin.

5) Allowed 2 students to take more than their last 7 hours outside the College of Charleston.

6) Deleted one course from a student's transcript because of illness.

7) Deleted F's for two courses from a student's transcript since there was no indication the student ever attended or paid fees for the course.

8) Approved a student's request to accept transfer credit earned while dropped for academic deficiency.

One issue which has concerned the Committee all semester is the violation of the College policy on incomplete grades. Faculty are reminded that "The grade 'I' indicates that only a small part of the semester's work remains to be done, that the student is otherwise doing satisfactory work in the course, and that an extension of time is warranted to complete the course. The student is allowed sixty days from the end of the semester in which this grade is received to complete the work in the course. If the student does not complete the work within sixty days, the 'I' is automatically changed to an 'F'". (College of Charleston Undergraduate Bulletin, p. 320).

Contact person, Amy McCandless, 2-5711.

Honors Program Committee
Dr. Rew A. Godow, Jr., the Director of the Honors Program, has been at the University of Hartford on sabbatical leave during the fall semester. He will return to the College at the end of the 1986 spring semester. In Dr. Godow's absence, Dr. Rose Hamm has done an excellent job as Acting Director of the Honors Program, and members of the Honors Program Committee are very appreciative of her effort.

The current members of the Honors Program are: Dr. Rose Hamm, Dr. Craig Rimmerman, Political Science (who also is secretary of the Committee); Dr. Reid Wiseman, Biology; Dr. Faye Steuer, Psychology; Dr. John Olbrych, Fine Arts; Miss Lynn Bryson, Honors Program Student; Miss Tracey Couch, Honors Program student; and John Rashford, Sociology and Anthropology (and who is chairman of the Committee).

In fall of 1986, 29 students were accepted into the Honors Program. Average verbal and mathematical scores were 606 and 619, respectively. The Honors Program Committee is very pleased with the number and quality of proposals received for fall 1986 courses. As the selection of courses for the fall 1986 semester is still under discussion, I will refrain from listing them here.

On behalf of the Committee, however, I would like to thank all members of the faculty who submitted proposals, and I hope others will take advantage of the opportunity in the future.

(This report was submitted by Prof. John Rashford.)

Contact person, John Rashford, 2-8188.

Faculty Research and Development Committee
The Faculty Research and Development Committee has completed its review of proposals for the first round of College Grants and has made the following awards for Spring Semester 1986:

1) Cynthia Bouton, History: "The Flour War: Rural France Confronts the Subsistence Crisis of 1775"

2) James Deavor, Chemistry: "Matrix Modification in a Pyrolytically Coated Graphite Furnace"

3) Phil Dustan, Biology: "Biological Oceanography of Charleston Harbor"

4) Doug Friedman, Political Science: "State Development and Economic Underdevelopment in Spanish America: Peru and Argentina in the Early Twentieth Century"

5) Magnhild Lien, Mathematics: "Groups of Knotted 2-Spheres that Cannot be Realized as Groups of Deform Spun Knots"

6) Jeff Porter, English: "The Significance of the Ethymeme in Aristotle's Rhetoric"

Contact person, Larry Carlson, 2-5664.
**Fact File**

*** Facts ***

**Highlights of the Institutional Goal Inventory (Part II)**

*By Hugh Haynsworth*

III. Of the 110 goal statements, a total of 27 statements received a mean response of at least 4.00 to the question "How important should this goal be at this institution?" from the total survey sample. The number of goal statements receiving a 'should be' rating of 4.00+ from each constituency is as follows:
- Faculty: 26, including 22 of the 'total' list.
- Students: 29, including 23 of the 'total' list.
- Administrators: 38, including 26 of the 'total' list.
- Trustees: 37, including 22 of the 'total' list.

Based on the above results, all constituencies are able to agree on a number of goals that should be of high importance. In a sense, the administrators represent a 'middle-of-the road' position with regard to the ranking of goal statements, as the total group and the administrators agree on 26 of their first 27 highest ranked items. However, the administrators generally gave higher ratings than either students or faculty.

The discrepancy between the 'should be' mean and the 'is' mean ('should be' mean minus 'is' mean) is a simple measure of the perceived need for change indicated by each constituency. The number of goal statements with a positive discrepancy of 1.0 or higher was 28 for the total sample; 26 for the faculty; 24 for the students; 57 for the administrators, and 2 for the trustees. Both the trustees and the administrators feel a larger number of goals are of higher importance than the students and faculty. However, the trustees indicate the least need for change, while the administrators indicate the greatest need for change. This suggests that the trustees feel we are generally achieving the most important goals while the administrators feel we are not. Faculty and students fall somewhere between the positions of the administrators and trustees.

Based on a review of comparative data from ETS, it is typical for the 'should be' mean to exceed the 'is' mean, when rating the importance of the goal statements, i.e., a positive discrepancy. Only four goal statements received a negative discrepancy. The number of statements with a negative discrepancy from the four constituencies was: 10 for the faculty; 5 for the students; 1 for the administrators; and 6 for the trustees.

Of the 17 highest rated goals (i.e., those with a mean overall 'should be' rating of 4.0+), 19 are included in one of the twenty goal areas defined by ETS. Seventeen of these are included in one of the seven highest rated goal areas (see Section II published in the previous issue of Newspeak): one goal falls under the goal area of Accountability/Efficiency, the eighth ranked goal area; and one goal falls under the area of Meeting Local Needs, the tenth ranked area. Several of the remaining eight goal statements were taken directly from the current statement of institutional goals. The 27 goals receiving the highest overall 'should be' ratings are listed below in descending order.

Listings of the highest rated goals, by constituency, are available in the faculty lounge, Room 202 Maybank Hall.

**Highest Ranked Goal Statements in Descending Order**

1. To ensure that students who graduate have achieved some level of reading, writing, and mathematics competence.
2. To 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.
3. To recruit and maintain a staff that is well trained, sensitive to the needs of those they serve, and committed to supporting the academic mission of the College.
4. To maintain a climate of mutual trust and respect among students, faculty, and administrators.
5. To create an institution known widely as an intellectually exciting and stimulating place.
6. To maintain or work to achieve a reputable standing for the institution within the academic world (or in relation to similar colleges).
7. To teach students methods of scholarly inquiry, scientific research, and/or problem definition and solution.
8. To help students acquire depth of knowledge in at least one academic discipline.
9. To identify, recruit, and retain students who indicate a good likelihood of success in a college that emphasizes academic excellence.
10. To provide an atmosphere in the classroom which is based on mutual respect between the faculty member and the student.
11. To help students identify their own personal goals and develop means of achieving them.
12. To assure individuals the opportunity to participate or be represented in making any decisions that affect them.
13. To hold students throughout the institution to high standards of intellectual performance.
14. To maintain a climate in which communication throughout the organizational structure is open and candid.
15. To ensure that students acquire a basic knowledge in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences.
16. To provide sound, attractive, secure, and appropriate physical facilities through a planned program of acquisition and preventative and corrective maintenance, which creates an environment conducive to pleasant living and learning.
17. To provide assistance to faculty which supports or improves their ability to be effective classroom teachers.
18. To create a system of campus governance that is genuinely responsive to the concerns of all people at the institution.
19. To maintain a climate in which faculty commitment to the goals and well-being of the institution is as strong as commitment to professional careers.
20. To maintain a campus climate in which differences of opinion can be aired openly and amicably.
21. To be concerned about the efficiency with which college operations are conducted.
22. To develop students' ability to synthesize knowledge from a variety of sources.
23. To instill in students a life-long commitment to learning.
24. To protect the right of faculty members to present unpopular or controversial ideas in the classroom.
25. To increase the desire and ability of students to undertake self-directed learning.
26. To help students develop a sense of self-worth, self-confidence, and a capacity to have an impact on events.
27. To provide opportunities for continuing education for adults in the local area, e.g., on a part-time basis.

Vita for Harry McKinley Lightsey, Jr.

Born December 27, 1931 in Columbia South Carolina; Married--four children.
Attended Columbia public schools.
Graduate: Clemson University, 1952, Cum laude, B. S. degree.
University of Georgia, 1956, Cum Laude, D. V. M.
University of South Carolina Law School, 1962, Summa cum laude, LL.B.

College Activities and Honors:
- Phi Beta Kappa
- Blue Key Fraternity
- President of Student Body at Clemson University
- Editor of S.C. Law Quarterly, Southeastern Veterinarians, The Agrarian
- Captain and member of University of South Carolina National Moot Court Team
- Chief Justice of the Wig and Robe Society
- Winner, Sapp Memorial Award

- Joint Committee on Voting Rights, 1966.
Assistant Professor of Law, University of South Carolina Law School, Trusts and Property, 1963-1965.
Counsel for State Senate on Reapportionment, on appeal to the U. S. Supreme Court.
Counsel for S. C. Electric and Gas Co., on appeal to U. S. Supreme Court.
Counsel for State Legislative Committee studying CATV.
Commissioner, National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, 1973 to present.
Appointed by S. C. Supreme Court as Acting Judge, November 1975 term of Court of Common Pleas.
Chairman, Subcommittee on Automatic Adjustment Clauses, Related Rate Design, and Proposed Legislation, Committee on Agency Rate Making Organization, American Bar Association Administrative Law Section.
Professor of Law, University of South Carolina School of Law, 1972-1976.
- (Administrative Law, Regulated Industries, Constitutional Law, Code Pleading, Civil and Political Rights)
- Chairman, Academic Standing Committee.
- Chairman, Faculty Selection Committee
- Member, Curriculum Committee
- Member, Minority Affairs Committee.
- Winner, Outstanding Professor Award, 1973.
Dean, University of South Carolina School of Law, 1980-Present.
Research and draftsman of South Carolina Public Service Commission Uniform Procedure Act and the Human Affairs Statute.
Member, Board of Governors, South Carolina Bar.
Member, Association of American Law Schools Committee on Admissions to the Bar.
Chairman, South Carolina Appellate Defense Commission.
Chairman, Governor's Ad Hoc Committee on Intermediate Court of Appeals.
Chairman, University of South Carolina's Presidential Commission on Undergraduate Education, which is assessing the current status of undergraduate education throughout the nine-campus system, 1984-1985.

Admitted to practice before:
Letters to the Editor

Time of Troubles; Other Woes; India Fest

To The Editor:

After the recent controversy on our campus, I would like to urge our faculty to unite and form a common front. It seems to me that our differences are not nearly as wide as it has been made to appear in the press. In fact, I believe that our differences are not as many as our similarities. I know that I personally have a better understanding of many of my colleagues today than I did three or four years ago. That may be due to the mere passage of time, but I don't think so. Trouble does have a way of bringing families together and we are a family of sorts.

Let's try to keep an open mind as we face this next semester and try to do that which will benefit the College. Our future may well depend on it. We have many talented people on our faculty. We have a new administration. Let's work together and form a team. There is no problem that we cannot solve together.

Marsha E. Hass
Business Administration/Economics

To the Editor:

This letter was prompted by your "Reflections on Our Time of Troubles" in the recent edition of Newspeak.

I, too, am upset with some of the implication of the involvement of politicians into the internal affairs of the College of Charleston. Likewise, I am genuinely sorry over the personal abuse you have been subject to. However, it seems self-defeating for you to ask members of the faculty to "stop such destructive behavior and words", while branding "a small minority of faculty and staff" as "disgruntled" or McCarthyite. What a truly perilous situation we are in when someone as dedicated, fair-minded, and decent as you resorts to such labels! Most people on all sides of the various issues have acted of what they perceived as a real love of this College. Let's build on this common bond towards a new unity. Let's cease this senseless and destructive name-calling.

Edmund L. Drago
History

(The Editor stands behind the analysis and prognostications made in the article. "Reflections on Our Time of Troubles". Some of the prognostications appear to be coming to pass. In reply to Dr. Drago, I would note that "disgruntled" faculty are rarely McCarthyites. But a faculty member--or anyone in the community--who is McCarthyite in word or action can do much to destroy for long periods the "common bond" that is required for any "unity".----Editor)

To the Editor:

Some of my recent experiences might be of interest to the faculty, particularly those who find themselves in similar circumstances.

1. Faculty considering taking leave without pay should be aware that if this leave extends beyond a year, the State of South Carolina, for all intents and purposes, will consider them "new hires" upon their return to the College. This means they will forfeit such things
as accumulated sick leave and will have to undergo a waiting period if there has been any interruption in medical insurance coverage. In fact, if they initially opt not to continue their medical insurance, but subsequently find that they are inadequately covered elsewhere, they cannot request resumption of coverage until they return to “active pay” status. The State Division of Human Resource Management (what a wonderful euphemism!) considers faculty on leave without pay not to be in the employ of the College. This interesting interpretation has also been used for faculty who go through the evaluation process in Fall semester but are on leave following Spring semester. Fortunately, these interpretations/rules are not uniformly applied (on my first leave without pay I did not lose my accumulated sick leave and I was able to resume my medical coverage long before my return to “active pay” status).

2. Faculty should also be apprised that personal typewriters, slide projectors, computers, etc. used exclusively in their respective offices to aid the “instructional effort” are not covered by the College’s insurance policy. Should they disappear from one’s office, there is no recourse whatsoever.

Klaus de Albuquerque
Sociology/Anthropology

To the Editor:
Some of you may already have heard about the “India Festival” planned for next semester at the College. If not this memo is intended to provide you with background to the festival and to inform you of the various events that have been scheduled.

In 1982, during a state visit to the United States, the late Prime Minister of India, Indira Gandhi, agreed with President Reagan to step up cultural exchange between our two nations. One result of that decision is the “Festival of India, 1985-86”, a year-long celebration in the United States of 5,000 years of Indian cultural tradition and heritage. The Festival was opened by the President at the Kennedy Center in Washington on January 13, 1985, and has since been followed by a multi-faceted program—conferences, major art exhibitions, craft demonstrations, music and dance performances—throughout the country.

It was my hope that the College of Charleston could become part of this larger celebration by sponsoring a mini-festival of our own during the 1986 spring semester. To this end, using the Art History Lecture Series as the coordinating body, I have enlisted the cooperation and financial aid of many departments (including Business, English, History, Languages, and Political Science), programs (Honors, Studia Humanitatis, International Studies) and individuals to create a modest, but interesting, series of events.

As of this date, the following activities have been scheduled:

- Thurs. February 6, 1986  Screening of Satyajit Ray’s “Pathar Panchali”
- Thurs. February 13, 1986  Screening of Satyajit Ray’s “Aparajita”
- Thurs. February 20, 1986  Lecture by Prof. Robert Burton, English Department, “Satyajit Ray and Indian Cinema”
- Thurs. February 22, 1986  Screening of Satyajit Ray’s “World of Apu”

The last event, the finale, is a multimedia presentation and should appeal to all disciplines. We are still in the process of arranging some additional activities, including an “India Day” of food, music, and costume and a humanities-social science symposium (sponsored by Studia Humanitatis).

Clearly, the greater the participation we receive, the better the possibility of realizing the project’s success. I would ask for your cooperation, support, and suggestions for additional sources of funding and/or ideas for other appropriate low-budget events. I hope you will all attend the events and share in their success.

David Kowal
Fine Arts
To the Editor:

I would like to pass along some information that should prove helpful in clearing any ambiguity related to the purchase of the new campus telephone system. The College of Charleston's telephone system, along with other State agencies, is part of a State TeleCommunications network. Decisions regarding the replacement of systems and purchase of services are mandated by the State Division of Resources Management. Mr. Ted Lightle, Director of IRM, was interviewed by a reporter with the News and Courier on August 2, 1985, and his comments make clear the fact that the decision to purchase a new telephone system was not decided by the College but instead by the State.

Quoting from the above mentioned newspaper article, Mr. Lightle said that "...the State Plan on Technology mandated (that his) division develop a plan for its information technology... South Carolina will install a $50 million state owned telecommunications system that will link the Citadel, the College of Charleston, the Medical University of South Carolina, and other state agencies... The network will include S. C. Educational Television and a microwave voice and data system." Lightle continued by stating that the overall plan would "include the AT&T System 85 phone system, which will use fiber optics technology to tie the three local colleges to the state capital complex in Columbia."

The reason for the purchase of the new phone system, instead of "paying leasing charges," Lightle explained, is "the state is trying to stabilize its costs when it can." Further, Lightle estimated that "the new phone system would save the state $5 million to $7 million over the next seven years."

In response to the State's decision to purchase a new telephone system, I would like to comment by saying that its is estimated that the College will not pay back to the State what it normally paid for the leasing of cable facilities and telephone equipment. In this way, the College's service will be updated with touch-tone and other features, and at the end of seven years, the voice/data system (equipment and cable facilities) should be paid for.

If additional information is desired, please call me at 2-5524. Or, if you would like to consult with Mr. Lightle, his number in Columbia is 758-2771.

(From Lib Bullock, Director of Administrative Services (Copying, Duplicating, and Telephones)

To the Editor:

Some data that you might find interesting is generated each year by the Admissions Office. It is shared with the faculty Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid on a regular basis. Since 1982, which was a peak year for enrollment of new students, the number of freshmen enrolled has fallen an average of 59 enrollees per year, with the largest drop occurring in 1983. During that same period the number of transfer students has increased an average of 28 enrollees per year. I think you can see this has produced a slight decline in newly enrolled students. Results from Institutional Research attributes the major decline this year to non-returning students, a retention problem.

In 1984 the College conducted a survey of 149 freshmen and 69 new transfer students using an instrument produced by the Cooperative Institutional Research Program and developed by the American Council on Education and UCLA. One very surprising result was that when asked if the "chances are very good that you will transfer to another college," 21.9% of the freshmen said "yes", and 25.8% of the transfers said "yes". In four year selective public colleges, this answer is given only by 6.4% of the recipients.

Several solutions to the problem of non-returning upperclassmen have been suggested. The one which this office is most interested is attracting more highly qualified transfer students from two-year institutions. We will continue to clarify articulation agreements with those institutions so that transfer to the College is considered a viable and easy transition for qualified AA graduates...

W. A. Lindstrom
Director of Admissions
On Increasing Organization Contracts

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?

***

Should the College of Charleston contract with organizations to supply education and training?

YES

An organization can be thought of as a student. That is, there are things that businesses and industries, government agencies, and voluntary associations need their employees or their clients or their members to learn in order for the organization itself to prosper. Individuals within the organization will do the studying, of course, but they will do it on behalf of the organization as well as on behalf of themselves.

Like individuals, organizations live in a changing environment and must themselves change if they are to survive and perhaps expand. Companies must deal with changing technology, shifting competition from other companies, movements in market demand, altered government regulations, and so on. Government agencies themselves must respond to changes made by other government agencies as well as to changes in the environments where they perform services or regulate activities. Voluntary associations have to deal with rising and falling populations within their service areas, changing tastes on the part of their members, and—depending upon the nature of the association—shifting patterns within the businesses or industries or government agencies or home environments within which the members conduct their lives.

The environment around some organizations is more volatile than the environment around others. Organizations in fields involving high technology, intense domestic or international competition, rapidly changing government regulations, or expanding markets need to learn more often and more intensively than other organizations.

The question is whether the College of Charleston should make contract training arrangements with organizations in the Tri-County area—businesses and industries, government agencies, or voluntary associations. The term "contract training" is used here to distinguish the situation in which the organization itself contracts with a college to provide education or training for its employees, clients, or members from the quite different situation in which the organization provides tuition reimbursement for individuals who study something of value to the organization, pay for it, and are then reimbursed. In the first instance, the organization decides to learn; in the second, the individual decides to learn. The distinction is important because the methods a college must use to market its services to organizations differ from those it must use to market its services to individuals. The topic here is contract training with organizations, not tuition-reimbursable courses for individuals.

In examining this topic, the College must recognize that organizations are unusual—and sometimes unruly—students. They are more like adult students than like traditional students. Organizations tend to be mature, aggressive, volunteer students who want to shape what is taught, when it is taught, where it is taught, how it is taught, and perhaps even who does the teaching.

Whether the College of Charleston should contract with organizations to supply education and training can be answered partly by considering the mission of the College. As a public institution, it presumably has public service obligations. And presumably those obligations extend to organizations as well as to individuals. The presumption is that it is in the public interest for businesses and industries in the Tri-County area to prosper and
preferably to expand, for government agencies to be efficient as well as effective as they work in the public arena, and for voluntary associations of all kinds—labor unions, trade associations, professional associations, youth-serving groups, and even organizations whose members are engaged in recreation and leisure—to be successful.

Assuming that the College of Charleston has the obligation, do the organizations want its services? To get the answer to that question, the College Board staff and College of Charleston representatives interviewed officials in 12 organizations in the tri-country area. The organizations were quite diverse. They included companies, government agencies, and voluntary associations. The fields included manufacturing, medicine, real estate, publishing, the military, and so on.

A detailed profile was prepared at the end of each interview. The 12 profiles describe the actual or potential interest of each organization in contracting with the College of Charleston for education or training and sketch out the topic, schedule, location, and cost of each specific course discussed during each interview. The 12 profiles appear in the Technical Report.

Generalizations about contract training are not worth much for these reasons:
- They are difficult to make. Two organizations which appear to the unaided eye to be quite similar—two banks, for example—may respond quite differently. One may have no interest whatsoever in contract training; the other may want several courses immediately and look forward to a long relationship with the College.
- Even within a single organization, circumstances change. The opening of a new plant, the expansion of the work force, a rash of new promotions, or simply a staff change in the office of the personnel director can change an organization's mind about entering into a contract with the College.
- Generalizations do not provide a good basis for specific actions in dealing with organizations as individual entities, which is how they must be viewed and treated.
- Each large organization is large enough, important enough, and promising enough as a prospective student to be dealt with as an individual entity—no matter what conclusions might be reached about organizations in general.

Nonetheless, here are a few simple generalizations which come to mind while studying the 12 profiles in the Technical Reports:
- There are a considerable number of contract training opportunities in the Tri-County area. Many of these are latent, in the sense that the organizations may not use the initiative to formulate their training needs and seek out colleges to meet them. But a college willing to use the initiative and the effort necessary to develop these opportunities can convert them into specific contracts.
- Trident Technical College has done an excellent job of investigating contract training opportunities in the Tri-County area, especially with industrial organizations, and has established contract training relationships with a number of them. There are segments of the industrial market which are appropriate for Trident, but are not appropriate for the College of Charleston. On the other hand, there are segments of the industrial market which are appropriate for both colleges.
- No college besides Trident has investigated contract training opportunities thoroughly. Certainly the College of Charleston has not done so.
- There are solid opportunities for the College of Charleston, a substantial number of which are described in rather specific terms in the 12 profiles in the Technical Report. The officials interviewed were generally receptive and expressed high regard for the College, especially as a liberal arts institution. Some officials expressed reservations about the College as a supplier of industrial or highly practical business training. Nonetheless, they were in most cases, able to talk about specific courses which they either definitely wanted or might want. They were able to articulate their degree of interest in many of the courses discussed, and they made it clear that their interest differed sharply from course to course.

Finally, three-quarters of the College of Charleston administrators surveyed by questionnaire and two-thirds of the faculty members surveyed by questionnaire indicated that they believed the College should contract with organizations to supply both credit and noncredit programs. Only a handful of administrators and faculty members opposed contracting with organizations to supply education and training. Therefore, the favorable
opinions and support of College administrators and faculty members should be a valuable asset to the College if it decides to pursue the solid contract training opportunities which exist for it in Charleston.

President’s Report

Some First Reflections on the C of C

By Harry M. Lightsey, Jr.

I would like to thank all of you on the faculty for the kind and courtesy with which you have welcomed me to the College of Charleston. Both Kathleen and I have enjoyed getting to meet many of you, and we look forward to the chance of seeing more of each of you in the future. I have been tremendously impressed by the quality of the ability of our faculty, and I am reassured that your great strengths will enable the school to continue to develop as a unique and significant part of higher education in this state.

Because many of you have been concerned, I want you to know that we have found some ways to absorb the 2% state budget reductions without requiring further cuts in the budgets of the academic departments. To do this, we have had to use savings from consolidations and attrition in several administrative areas. We have also made adjustments in some of the college operational areas, and I hope that you will not be inconvenienced or find any significant change in support services as a result. I have come to know many of the staff throughout the College and have found them to be fine and dedicated people. I am asking them each to work a little harder to make sure that you receive the support you need, and so far they have been extraordinary in their willingness and commitment to seeing that services are not diminished.

I deeply regret the loss of our Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs, whom I have already found to be a knowledgeable and supportive friend within the administration. I share many of her views about higher education and had hoped to have her as a part of our team. I understand and accept her feelings about the new position she has taken, but know that we will all miss the many contributions that she would have continued to make here.

I will look forward to our next faculty meeting and the chance to address more specific issues there. In the meantime, I would like to restate my strong, previously expressed, and now reinforced belief in the bright prospects for the College of Charleston. As already noted, we have a fine faculty and a dedicated staff. The students are wonderful--bright and energetic and what really makes this job worthwhile. This is, finally, a truly beautiful campus, almost surreal in being what most would dream of as an ideal. I know that we can bring all of these qualities together so that we can enjoy a realization of our possibilities.

Question!! Question!!! Question!!!

Editor’s Note: In response to the faculty’s questions about the letter from Gordon Wescoat and other students in the Meteor responding to the “Time of Troubles” article in Newspeak and references to Mrs. Andre Parrott, a copy of a letter (dated November 24, 1985) to Mr. Wescoat is reprinted below. This letter was submitted to the Meteor for publication. No response yet has been received concerning the offer to open an investigation into the concerns expressed by the students in their letter.

I take this opportunity to let you know how much I appreciate your recent letter to the editor in the Meteor concerning the "time of troubles" and particularly Mrs. Parrott. I admire your candor and your obvious dedication and concern for your teacher.
On behalf of the faculty, I propose that the issues you raise in your letter be resolved so that justice can clearly be obtained for Mrs. Parrott regarding the allegations that surrounded her departure from the College.

Please send to me (or have Mrs. Parrott send to me) by January 6, 1986 xerox copies of valid diplomas (or valid college transcripts with notations) that would validate the awarding of the following degrees which Mrs. Parrott has indicated in her resume that she currently holds:

For the Universite d’Alger—
1. Baccalaureat—Philosophie, Licencce—es-Lettres
2. Diplome d’Etudes Superieures—es-Lettres
3. Maitrise with Four Certificats d’Etudes Superieures
From the Ecole Libre des Sciences Politiques et Administratives, Paris—
1. Diplome

Since you (or one of the other authors of the letter) have seen the diplomas, I know that they are readily available.

After receiving and confirming this preliminary evidence, I will immediately convene with the assent of the faculty, a Select Faculty Investigating Committee composed of faculty members acceptable to the students, faculty, and administration. The Committee will determine the validity of Mrs. Parrott’s professional status and will also investigate the principal allegations that were brought against her. I would ask that this Committee report to the faculty as soon as possible.

If the evidence develops as you suggest, result could be a public apology to Mrs. Parrott for any insult to her professional status and work, and an opportunity to rejoin the College faculty if she so desired.

I assure you that I and the rest of the faculty are as interested in seeing justice done in this matter as you.

---

^^^Newsnotes for Winter 1986^^^

AAUP Meeting
At its latest, November 26, 1985 meeting, the College of Charleston Chapter of the American Association of University Professors elected the following as officers: Jim Hagy, President; Katina Strauch, Vice-President; Lee Drago, Secretary-Treasurer; and Beatrice Stiglitz and Norman Chamberlain, Executive Council.

The group determined that a membership campaign would begin in January. President Hagy will make contact with the AAUP Chapter at the Citadel. Although the National AAUP is reviewing the Faculty and Administration Manual, it was decided that the membership of the Chapter will do the same, passing suggestions to the officers and executive council. The officers and council will then meet to discuss these suggestions, formulating recommendations for the membership as a whole. Once the membership has acted upon them, they will be forwarded to the Faculty Welfare Committee for action by the entire faculty. The new AAUP president will meet with the outgoing President and the incoming President of the College (Notes taken from the minutes of Secretary-Treasurer Lee Drago).

Recommended Changes in Evaluation
Following are recommended changes in the Draft of Recommended Procedures for Annual Evaluation. Third Year Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion made by the Faculty Welfare Committee:

1. Insert the word "not" under the heading Third Year Evaluation on p. A-8 so that the sentence will read "They should not include specific recommendations..." Do the same under the heading "Tenure" on p. A-13 and "Promotion" on p. A-18.
2. Remove words "secret balloting" or words to that effect wherever they appear in the document. e.g. P. A-3, P. A-14, and P. A-19.

3. Evaluate(s) must provide written recommendations with justifications to faculty member being evaluated and to subsequent levels in the evaluation process. Specific references would occur on P. A-9 under "Third Year Evaluation" for the Departmental Evaluation Panel chair and the Director of the Libraries. On P. A-9, it would be used in connection with the Faculty Advisory Committee (note: a change in the Faculty By-Laws would be required to implement this recommendation). Similar language would be included in connection with the "Provost's Review" (P. A-9) and the "President's Review" (P. A-10). Also, under "Tenure" (P. A-14) for the Reporting Procedures of the Departmental Evaluation Panel and Library Director, Faculty Advisory Committee Action, and Provost's Recommendation (minus the sentence dealing with cases of third year reappointment), and President's Decision on P. A-15. Also, under promotion (P. A-19) for the reporting Procedures of the Departmental Evaluation Panel and Library Director and Faculty Advisory Committee Action and Provost's Recommendation and President's Decision on P. A-20.

4. FWC would like to have more than the annual evaluations given to the Departmental Evaluation Panel. Also, the "a" should be removed from this section as there is no "b" in Section No. 6 of all three areas.

P. A-9, Third Year Evaluations, Procedures of the Departmental Evaluation Panel, (v) and P. A-14, Tenure, Procedures of the Departmental Evaluation Panel: "All annual evaluation narratives and rating letters as well as any letters that the evaluatee has written in response to the annual evaluations."

P. A-19, Promotion, Procedures of the Departmental Evaluation Panel, same as above plus add at end of sentence: "... since appointment to the current faculty rank (i.e. instructor, assistant professor, associate professor) of the evaluatee."

5. Recommendation to allow President to obtain added information regarding evaluatee when needed, especially in cases where Provost votes no but Departmental Evaluation Panel and Faculty Advisory Committee votes yes.

P. A-3, Operation of the Faculty Advisory Committee, last sentence: "In the course of his/her consideration, the President shall have access to all materials used in the evaluation process, have the opportunity to consult with whomever he/she chooses, and appoint a committee if he/she desires."

6. Recommendation that the comments/recommendations made by the department chair for annual evaluations be positive ones instead of negative ones.

P. A-5, Annual Evaluation Process, b. "Constructive comments for areas in which the evaluatee has performed below acceptable levels."

7. Recommendation that the forms and format used for annual evaluations not be changed every year but instead be subject to review by FWC before implementation.

P. A-4, Bottom of page, third paragraph: "The Associate Provost for Planning and Evaluation will provide the calendar of evaluation to the faculty at least 60 days prior to the beginning of the evaluation process. Any changes in evaluation forms must be sent to the Faculty Welfare Committee for review/recommendations one full year before implementation."

8. FWC would like the basis for appeals to be broadened to include any kind of violation of academic freedom and violation of due process. Also remove word "only". PP A-3, A-10, A-15, A-20, i.e. a. 'The denial of...may be appealed to the Faculty Hearing Committee when the faculty member alleges that the denial was based upon any of the following. a. Discrimination...; or, b. Violation of academic freedom; or, c. Violation of due process.'

9. The FWC is concerned that there is no appeal procedure for faculty members who have been denied reappointment, tenure, or promotion on grounds other than discrimination, violation of academic freedom, and violation of due process (if FWC's motion #8 is approved). Even with the appeal procedure as already written, the appeal results in review of the President's decision by the appropriate faculty committee and then referral back to the President for a final decision, a case of double jeopardy.

10. The FWC would like to eliminate the percentages used for overall performance rating on annual evaluations.
paragraph to read as follows: "At least one week prior to the interview, the faculty member will receive the chair’s assessment of strengths and weaknesses; the completed evaluation form containing ratings of performance in teaching/professional competence, professional growth and development, and service; and an overall performance rating with an explanation of the method used to derive this rating."

JUSTIFICATION With assigning percentages, there is a tendency to standardize the faculty which leaves little room for diversity. The numbers can be applied against a faculty member and is not really a safeguard against an arbitrary evaluation by a department chair. Also with rigid guidelines being applied, a chair may be prevented from giving a higher percentage than he/she would like to give. The percentages do not reflect the relative emphasis of the three areas to be judged.

11. In the event that the above motion is not implemented by the administration, the FWC would like to eliminate the segregation of library faculty from instructional faculty and recognize the equivalence of professional competency of library faculty with teaching of instructional faculty. If percentages are to be used in performance rating, all faculty should be evaluated using the same percentages.

12. Change words "professional librarian" to "library faculty" wherever they appear in the document.

Correction on Faculty Committee List
Debbie Miller, Physical Education, should be added to the listing of the members of the Student Affairs and Athletics Committee.
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