ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TENURE, PROMOTION, AND THIRD YEAR REVIEW

The T & P Committee met regularly during the months of January and February 1988 to review the cases of sixteen candidates for tenure, five candidates for promotion to associate professor, and seven candidates for promotion to professor. All candidates and their department chairs were interviewed by the Committee. The Committee's recommendations to the President were ratified in public session on February 22, 1988.

During its review of tenure and promotion cases, the T & P Committee confronted numerous problems with respect to evaluation policies, procedures, and practices. We understand that many of these problems are ongoing and that at least two previous Chairs of the T & P Committee have written reports and recommended possible solutions. We are outlining in this report what these problems are, how they may be addressed, and the agent(s) within whose purview they lie.

1. Curriculum Vitae: Many c.v.s included in the tenure and promotion packets were incomplete in one way or another. The T & P Committee therefore recommends that candidates' c.v.s include the following: (a) The title of their dissertation or a clear indication of the nature of their doctoral work or work on their terminal degree; (b) Clear indication of current and/or past status at the College (i.e., "roster" or "special"), years in rank, and dates of appointment and rank at previous institutions; (c) Some distinction between service to the department and service to the College; (d) The names of co-authors; (e) Some separation of publications into "refereed," "editorially reviewed," and "popular." Agents; Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; hereafter VP; T & P Committee.

2. Refereed Publications: To enable the T & P Committee to determine which publications are "refereed" or otherwise "juried," candidates should be encouraged to include with their publications the masthead of the journal, blind reviews of the article (if available), and a letter of acceptance from the editor. Colleague letters would be more helpful if they identified refereed publications and what they considered to be the candidates' best work(s). Agents; VP; T & P Committee.

3. Colleague Letters: A number of departmental colleagues wrote insufficiently informative letters; several letters, in fact, were only one or two sentences. In some instances colleagues who were obligated to write letters apparently refused to participate in the process and submitted no letters at all. Candidates coming up for tenure should also be reminded that they should not write letters for colleagues in their department who are also being evaluated for tenure. Possible Solution: While we would hesitate to remind colleagues about their responsibility to submit substantive colleague letters, we would advise Department Chairs to ensure that colleague letters address the three areas of evaluation: teaching effectiveness, professional development, and service to the community. Agents; VP; Department Chairs.

4. Extra-Departmental Letters: Candidates should be reminded that the "goldenrod" pages clearly stipulate that "no more than five" extra-departmental letters be included in each packet. Persons writing letters should be advised to note the capacity in which they worked with the candidate. Members of the T & P Committee should not write extra-departmental letters. Possible Solution: Academic Affairs in conjunction with the Council of Chairs should develop a standard form that every candidate would be required to complete and submit to her/his chair. The form would have five (and only five) lines for (a) naming the extra-departmental colleagues, (b) specifying the exact nature of the work done with the colleague, and (c) providing precise dates (semester/year) during which this work was accomplished. Chairs would then give the extra-departmental colleagues this information so that no confusion of any sort could occur. Agents; VP; Council of Chairs.

5. Recent Graduates: In far too many instances the number of evaluations by recent graduates was alarmingly low (often under ten, occasionally under five), so low in fact as not to be useful at all, indeed to be statistically unreliable. As the Committee learned during its discussions with the chairs, this problem was sometimes caused by the selective picking of graduates by the candidate and the chair. Such a procedure is in direct violation of the Faculty-Administration Manual, which clearly states on page 114, note 2 (underlining ours): "Recent graduates are all majors whom the evaluatee has taught and who have graduated." Possible Solution: Chairs must be made to adhere to this policy as they work with candidates who are assembling packets. Agents; Chairs.

6. Size of Packets: With all too few exceptions, the packets submitted by candidates were too large and contained too much duplicate material. The FAM states (our underlining) that "samples of tests, exams, essays, or other assignments" (p. 114 and elsewhere) be included. The tough issue here, of course, and one that continued on the next page
may not ever be resolved satisfactorily, is balancing the right of the candidate to present his/her case fully against the limited time (and attention span) the T & P Committee has to evaluate all the packets during January and February. Possible Solution: None, except the good judgment of the candidate. Agents: Department Chairs; Candidates.

7. Closure of the Review Process: The T & P Committee was greatly exercised by the submission and acceptance of materials after specified deadlines. In no instance did these materials (letters, student comments, etc.) add any new information. While the acceptance and inclusion of post-departmental review material does not violate the letter of the law, it does undermine the spirit of the College’s established process, which does have fixed deadlines. Possible Solution: The T & P Committee recommends that only evidence that adds materially to the candidates’ case (e.g. the acceptance of a paper for publication) should be submitted during the Committee’s deliberation period. Agents: VP; Department Chairs.

8. Role of Department Chairs: Many of the problems the T & P Committee encountered can be prevented or minimized if chairs exercise certain prerogatives and explain the evaluation process clearly to candidates, their respective departments, and all members of the department panel. The Committee also felt that chairs had too many opportunities (they write annual evaluations and colleague letters, craft the letter that accompanies the departmental panel vote, and appear before the Committee) to assert their personal views, and to downplay any minority view expressed during departmental deliberations. Possible Solution: The majority of the Committee felt that chairs should write any letters of evaluation during the review process except for the letter that accompanies the departmental panel vote. The latter should address itself to all issues raised during the deliberations and should give a sense of both the majority and minority opinion on the departmental panel. Agents: VP; Department Chairs.

9. Role of the Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs: The Committee felt that many of the problems concerning evaluation procedures and policies could be prevented by having the VP meet in early September with all chairs involved with any kind of review in their department. This occasion would provide an opportunity to clarify policies and procedures before candidates begin assembling packets and chairs solicit colleague letters and convene departmental panels. Agent: VP.

10. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion: The criteria for tenure and promotion are spelled out quantitatively in the FAM. Since the manual is given to all faculty members and is their standard as they move towards tenure and promotion, the Committee feels that current interpretation of this criteria must be made explicit. Do the standards for Tenure and Promotion in the FAM refer only to minimum standards, and are candidates expected to exceed these standards? What does “progress towards the next higher rank” mean? Does it mean the person has to meet the minimum criteria for the next higher rank or simply show evidence of “progress?” Unfortunately, the VP’s interpretation of the criteria for “Professional Growth and Development” (in his memo to the faculty, dated April 13, 1988), is not an interpretation that is shared by most faculty. Possible Solution: Current interpretation of criteria for tenure and promotion should be clearly specified by way of an addendum or insertion to the FAM. This should be put before the faculty for a vote. Agents: President; VP; T & P Committee.

11. Equity: In its deliberations the Committee was constantly faced with issues of equity. While issues arising out of personnel decisions are not within the purview of the Committee, a majority of the Committee felt that these issues would not have come up in the first place if the Administration had consistently applied the policies and procedures laid down in the FAM. Possible Solutions: (a) We need some consistent rules on ABD’s. Do they come to the college at the rank of instructor, is service at this rank counted towards tenure and promotion (to Associate), and how much time towards completing the dissertation is considered reasonable? A majority of the Committee felt that service while a person was ABD should not count towards promotion to Associate Professor. (b) We also need a clear statement on the evaluation policy for persons on leave without pay (LWOP). Previous Administration policy and State Personnel rules clearly state that no person will be evaluated when on LWOP and that any and all evaluations will be held in abeyance until the person returns to “active pay status.” In the past this policy has been applied inconsistently. (c) The FAM states that “normally up to two years will be counted from other institutions toward fulfilling the five year probationary period at the College” (p. 107). In several places in the FAM this two year credit is referred to as the maximum, yet contract letters issued by the Administration have routinely provided between one to three years prior credit, oftentimes without appropriate consideration of the number of years of “full-time service in previous institutions of higher education” (p. 106). In addition, some Committee members questioned whether it was appropriate to give teaching credit for activities totally unreleated to teaching (a violation of FAM rules). A majority of the Committee felt that the FAM rules must be applied with respect to all probationary appointments and that it might be useful to have the Vice Chair of the T & P Committee and the Speaker of the Faculty review continued on the next page
all new contracts to ensure compliance with the rules. (d) Access to the President is perceived as being easy for some persons and difficult for others. If three or four very similar candidates are denied tenure or promotion and one of them successfully petitions the President, then this raises the question of equity. The Committee therefore recommends that each candidate receive, either as part of his notification letter from the President, or separately, a written reminder that an appeal is available to him/her. It might be noted in the reminder that the main reasons for reconsideration are as follows: (i) publication of material that had not come out during the evaluation process; (ii) discrimination, defined as differential treatment based upon race, religion, sex, national origin, color, age, or handicap; (iii) violation of academic freedom, as it relates to freedom of expression; and (iv) violation of due process, as provided in the College’s rules, regulations, policies and procedures” (FAM, AI-18). Appeals should normally be made to the Faculty Hearing Committee, and faculty members denied tenure or promotion should be reminded that this is their first line of appeal. (e) No person should be permitted to come up for tenure twice. The FAM makes no provision for this, “precatory” language in contract letters notwithstanding. The T & P Committee was unanimous in its belief, that the President, by allowing three persons (one in 1986-7 and two in 1987-8) to come up for tenure a second time, after he had officially denied them tenure in their March 15 letters, was setting a dangerous precedent and opening up the College to potential law suits from faculty members previously denied tenure, and who were not afforded the same opportunity. The FAM allows the President to overturn decisions, but it does not allow for one year extensions to remove “deficiencies.” (f) The FAM clearly lists those positions at the College which carry faculty rank. Faculty status cannot be conferred on persons not so listed without the consent of the faculty and the department in question. Agents: President, VP, T & P Committee, Speaker of the Faculty

12. Confidentiality: A majority of the Committee was again this year concerned with problems of confidentiality. While the Committee has no way of ensuring absolute confidentiality, it does feel that certain steps can be taken to better safeguard confidential materials. Possible Solution: Colleague letters should be preferably hand delivered to the Departmental Panel Chair. Candidates’ packets should also be hand delivered. The T & P Committee needs a secure office on campus where packets can be kept. There is too much traffic through the Academic Affairs Office complex. Agents: VP; Department Chairs; T & P Committee.

13. Mutual Respect: A majority of the Committee felt that the spirit of collegiality continued on the next column

and mutual respect would be enhanced if the Committee were privy to the independent decisions made by the VP and the President. Possible Solution: The VP and the President should inform the Committee of their decisions on third-year reappointment, tenure and promotion. Copies of letters from the President to all candidates should be sent to the Chair of the T & P Committee. Agents: President; VP.

14. Usefulness of the T & P Committee: A majority of the Committee had mixed sentiments over the usefulness of their exhaustive deliberations and of their inordinate concern for due process and equity, especially in light of the eventual outcome of their efforts. Most distressing of all, was the awarding of tenure by the President to an individual who did not go through the College wide evaluation process. One Alternate member argued that Committee members could not judge the scholarly merits of work that was outside their area of competence, and on this score, the usefulness of the Committee was in question. This, however, was a view not shared by the regular members of the Committee. Possible Solution: Policies and procedures in the FAM must apply to all parties and there must be vigilance on all sides to ensure compliance and equity. Agents: VP; T & P Committee; Faculty.

ACADEMIC STANDARDS, ADMISSIONS, AND FINANCIAL AID

The Committee focused its attention on academic policies and procedures, including the learning disabilities policy, provisional student policy, financial aid guidelines, and numerous smaller matters referred to the Committee. It began consideration of retention standards and expects to bring recommendations to the faculty in the fall.

One of the biggest dilemmas has been determining the process to follow once the Committee has approved a policy or procedure. Hours have been spent researching old faculty and committee minutes and other records to determine the most appropriate steps in the approval process. In many cases, there is no precedent recorded and we have made decisions on whether something should be brought for faculty vote, should be presented as information, or was a matter that could stop with the Committee.

A subcommittee worked steadily for months, considering scholarship policies, allocation of funds and selection of recipients. If, in the future, this year’s guidelines or similar ones are followed, the Committee could reasonably continue this responsibility. If, however, revamping of the guidelines occurs again or if the faculty becomes involved in the actual selection of recipients continued on the next page
HONORS PROGRAM COMMITTEE

The Committee met six times each semester, including one special meeting in December with the Search Committee for a new Director of the Honors Program.

The purpose of the special meeting was to provide the Search Committee with our suggestions concerning the qualities needed in a new director (in light of the current needs of the program), and the terms of appointment for that position. Our regular committee meetings were devoted partly to implementation of the policy and curriculum changes recommended by last year's Committee, and partly to the two standing duties of the Committee: solicitation and evaluation of course proposals for the 88-89 academic year; and evaluation of applications to the Honors Program.

Concerning the Committee's regular duties, the honors course schedule for next year has been published in a previous edition of the faculty newsletter. Thanks to the recruiting efforts of Rose Hamm, Julie Kresch, and the staff of the Honors Program, the applicant pool for the program has been much larger and more diverse this year than it has been in the recent past. We had 137 complete applications, from among whom we accepted 69 students, whose SAT scores averaged 1210. Of these 69, we know of 25 who plan to attend other colleges, leaving us with a tentative entering class size of 44. All of these figures are up significantly from last year, and we look forward to a very promising crop of freshman honor students.

In evaluating applicants to the program, the Committee adopted the following procedure: applications were divided up into alphabetic subgroups, with two members of the Committee reviewing each application, and Rose Hamm reviewing all of them. Applicants were ranked into four groups using this procedure: accept; leaning to accept; leaning to reject; and reject. Any student who received no 'accept' or 'leaning to accept' votes was rejected without further review. Any student with three 'accept' votes was accepted without further review. The remaining students were then reviewed by the entire committee, and accepted or rejected by consensus. Criteria used in evaluation included, roughly in order of descending importance: high school performance, SAT scores, Student Essays, and reference letters. Occasionally, an applicant would have some less tangible added dimension to offer, which might outweigh something like weak SAT scores.

With respect to implementation of policy changes, the Committee began the year working on anticipating possible objections to Honors Program curriculum changes which had been submitted to the general faculty last spring, but tabled until this fall. The recommended changes were however approved without comment at the second general faculty meeting. In order to comply with the Political Science Department for 1544 auditron sticks, 35 spirit masters, 148 laser printer copies, and an untabulated number of mimeo sheets of paper this year.
continued from page four

another of last year's Committee recommendations, the Committee also scheduled an Honors Program faculty meeting in October, and a new honors faculty orientation meeting in April. The point of meetings like these ones is to afford faculty a forum to discuss any special problems associated with teaching in the program, and to provide them with a sense of partnership in the Honors Program community.

New business focused on the need for more effective student recruiting techniques and some concern about the possible effects which the new departmental administrative and budgetary autonomy may have on the Honors Program's ability to attract faculty to teach Honors courses. President Lightsey's Retreat (September) served as an occasion to reflect upon these issues, both at the Committee's meeting prior to the retreat, and at the retreat itself, attended by Rose Hamm (Honors Program Director) and Richard Nunan. Some of the more important suggestions emerging from these meetings were:

(1) The Honors Program is in very serious need of scholarship money tied directly to the Program; otherwise it cannot effectively compete for students recruited by well-endowed honors programs at other institutions (e.g., USC). The administration appears to be committed to addressing this problem in the near future.

(2) A common dormitory facility for Honors Program students (at least for incoming freshmen) would help to promote a sense of community among students in the program, and would also serve as an attractive recruiting device.

(3) An end-of-semester mailing to non-Honors students already enrolled at C of C and maintaining a 3.5 g.p.a., encouraging them to apply to the program. (This has already been done by Rose Hamm for the fall '87 semester, with very encouraging results).

(4) A reminder to the general faculty that they can be the most effective recruiters for the Honors Program among their more promising students—especially freshmen, sophomores, and continuing education students who plan to pursue a degree. For the Honors Program is open to students already enrolled at the College. (You are hereby reminded.)

(5) A commitment from the Administration to some concrete institutional policies designed to encourage faculty staffing of Honors courses. Under current conditions, the Program has to rely on the good will of individual faculty members and their departments. Although there has been no evidence of a diminished commitment from the faculty, the administrative decentralization of departmental budgets and scheduling makes this a precarious situation. Over the long run, departmental autonomy is bound to encourage departments to act more as self-interested units, in which case interdisciplinary programs like Honors may suffer. The Committee foresees the need to formulate institutional policies designed to counteract this tendency. No work in this direction has really been done yet.

--Richard Nunan

LIBRARY COMMITTEE

The Library Committee met three times during the Spring Semester of 1988. The major items of business were as follows: (1) The Committee reviewed the Library's three-year plan (1988/9 - 1990/1); (2) After initial testing and refinement by the members of the Committee the Library Survey was administered to faculty and students and preliminary data were reviewed; it was agreed that the next Committee may wish to evaluate the final data more thoroughly; (3) The Committee studied the process by which annual allocations for academic departments are formulated, and the specific allocations for 1988-9 were reviewed and approved. The rising costs of journals continued to be a matter of particular concern.

--Lawrence J. Simms

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

During the academic year 1987-88 the Faculty Research and Development Committee reviewed 44 proposals for research or development, requesting a total dollar value of $89,767. Unfortunately, since the Committee had a budget of only $35,500, many of these proposals were funded only partially, or rejected completely. In all, 26 awards were made representing a dollar value of $38,348 (spread out over two fiscal years), which represents just 43% of the dollar amount requested.

The overriding consideration used by the Committee in determining what proposals received awards was the quality of the proposal, as stipulated by the Committee Guidelines. Some proposals were clearly outstanding, and these were funded fully if possible. Many other proposals were of good quality, and should have received full support, but the Committee budget could not be stretched nearly so far as we would have liked. This intense competition for awards, and denial of full (or any) funding to reasonably good proposals, was frustrating to Committee members and faculty proposers alike. It is particularly disagreeable that, as higher standards for professional growth and development are being enforced in tenure and promotion decisions, the faculty research and development budget continues to remain inadequate.

Speaking of the Guidelines, many of you apparently don't realize that this document changes continued on the next page
STUDENT AFFAIRS AND ATHLETICS COMMITTEE

The Faculty Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics cosponsored with President Lightsey and the office of Student Affairs a reception on March 28 for the nominees to Who's Who Among American Universities and Colleges for this academic year.

Faculty Awards for Academic Achievement were presented to the following athletes for having attained the highest cumulative GPR on each team:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Student-Athlete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball-Men</td>
<td>Ronald Cudd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball-Women</td>
<td>DeAudre Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>Scott James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>Christopher Moe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>Luiz Vieira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming-Men</td>
<td>Patrick Querubin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming-Women</td>
<td>Ines Castro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis-Men</td>
<td>Lars Lund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis-Women</td>
<td>Karen Garfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>Catherine Gaillard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Men's Tennis Team was the recipient of the Faculty Award for Academic Achievement for being the team with the highest cumulative GPR.

Correspondence was received from President Lightsey announcing the appointment of Professor Andy Abrams to the position of Executive Athletic Director.

WELFARE COMMITTEE

During the Spring Semester of 1988, the Faculty Welfare Committee considered the questions of campus security, parking, faculty access to the Johnson Center, and tuition exchange on remission for faculty dependents. Continuing issues include disability insurance and interdepartmental salary inequities. Over the summer, the outgoing chair will prepare salary data for distribution to the faculty in the fall.

As a result of the Committee's work, I feel that I should remind the faculty that security is everyone's business and is aided by our cooperation with Public Safety. Also, while parking spaces are distributed in an equitable manner, the enforcement of parking regulations and some College policies regarding parking may not be. Finally, remember that there will be an open enrollment period for disability insurance in the fall, if there is sufficient enrollment by May 20th for the program to be in place, for those who missed the opportunities to enroll this spring.

--Alexander W. Ritchie

OK, enough complaining. The good news is that, in spite of severe budgetary constraints, the Faculty Research and Development Committee was able to award $38,348 to further research and development at the College of Charleston this year. I can assure you that research, quality research, is being accomplished on campus, by hook or by crook, and I'm very glad that our Committee could support a small part of it.

--Sara A. Heller
REPORT OF THE SPEAKER, PART I

(1) First of all, with the exception of one subordinate clause in one committee report, what you have read is what was submitted. As of May 9, 1988 (4:00 pm), no reports were received from the following committees: Nominations, Curriculum, Graduate and Continuing Education, and all non-standing committees (Judicial Board, College Planning and Program Evaluation, Computer Advisory, and Campus Planning).

(2) As of this date, there are no known Board of Trustees-approved Faculty-Administration Manual revisions since the last revisions were circulated in late January.

(3) Heartiest congratulations to Betsy Martin (Chemistry) and Klaus De Albuquerque (Sociology/Anthropology) for their most-deserved awards—Betsy was a double winner (for Teaching and for Service), Klaus for Research.

(4) There are some observations about Commencement/Institutional History. I will phrase these in question form to stimulate, hopefully, some attention on the part of anyone interested in following through:

(a) Regarding the Phi Kappa Phi medals worn by some during Commencement exercises: Can we see to it that such recognition is provided in the program to those students?

(b) Does anyone have a historical list of the winners of the Bishop Robert Smith Award? Wouldn’t it be nice to have a permanent and displayed record of these students’ names?

(c) Does anyone have a historical list, for that matter, of all student award winners for all awards? Wouldn’t it be nice to have a permanent and displayed record of these?

(d) Wouldn’t it be nice if the faculty awards—there are only three and it wouldn’t add but a couple of minutes to the duration of Commencement—were announced instead of on awards day? It used to be done then, for all to see and appreciate. The same goes for the Bishop Robert Smith Award recipients.

In short, there seems to be a gap in our institutional memory that ought to be corrected somehow. I will be happy to coordinate an effort in this regard beginning now. George Haborak has volunteered to assist in compiling the Bishop Robert Smith list.

(5) There appear to be some glitches in the FAM. I am pooling a list of these items. Anyone with a meaningful contribution should call, drop by, or send me a note.

(6) As of this date, the College of Charleston Board of Trustees will be elected in the General Assembly some time next month. Later this month I will be meeting with the Charleston legislative delegation—at the invitation of Dr. Lightsey. So if there are any ideas you would like me to forward about the Board or anything else, let me know.

(7) As of this date, there is one bond item earmarked for the College that remains in the budget bill (an upgrade for the Physical Plant’s energy system). In earlier drafts, the next two permanent improvement items in our five year “wish list” appeared.

I would like to take this time to say THANK YOU to all those who propped me up when I was down, polished me when I looked tarnished, and assisted me when I needed help—which was often. Subsequent "parts" to this report will appear periodically, as needed, in a Midsummer Night’s Faculty Newsletter. Until then, as the song goes, “see you in September.” Wait a minute. A committee report just came in.

ASSESSMENT PLANNING COMMITTEE

CHE has stepped up its timetable for assessment. It has ruled that all seniors take comprehensive exams in their majors for course credit. The time limit for these exams, with one exception, is two hours.

Biology: Go to the lab. Create life. Write an essay estimating the differences in subsequent human culture if this form of life had developed 500 million years earlier, with special attention to the probable effect on the ozone layer. (If your concentration is pre-med or allied health, you may substitute the following: Using the razor blade, gauze, and bottle of scotch provided, remove your own appendix. Do not request sutures until your work is inspected.)

Business Administration/Economics: Assume that IBM merges with the US Government. Discuss the implications for management, marketing, personnel, advertising, accounting, finance, the Sherman Act, and military procurement.

Chemistry: Using your recombinant DNA kit located on your desk, create a better mouse. The prototype mice are in the lab. In an essay, discuss why your new mouse is better.

Computer Science: Write a dialog between two artificial intelligence systems where one defeats the other at hopscotch. Use Fortran IV.

Education: Teach your children. This is a take-home test. Your degree and college will be deferred for fifteen years, at which time your children will be tested using whatever standardized test dominates the market at that time. Your grade will depend on theirs.

English: Restricting yourself to simple sentences, rewrite any chapter of James Joyce’s Dubliners. Compare your work with Hemingway’s Garden of...
continued from page seven


**Fine Arts:** Write a piano concerto. You will find a piano under your desk. Orchestrate your work for flute and drum. (If your major concentration is visual art, you may substitute the following: Discuss in essay form the difference between mixed media art presentations in the nouveau art tradition and Ronald Reagan's movie roles.)

**Geology:** Derive blood from a stone. Materials are in the lab.

**History:** Describe the history of the papacy from its origin to the present day, concentrating especially, but not exclusively, on its social, political, economic, religious, and philosophical impact on Europe, Asia, America, and Africa. Be brief, but be specific.

**Languages:** 2500 riot-crazed Australian aborigines are storming the classroom. Calm them. Use any language you choose. Your grade will correlate with your survival.

**Mathematics:** Prove that Arrow's paradox of social choice based on individual values is wrong.

**Philosophy:** Take a position for or against truth. Prove the validity of your position using symbolic logic.

**Physical Education and Health:** Ponder the likelihood of a cure for herpes based on a program for physical fitness and safe sex which you outline. Tape record this exam while running a marathon.

**Physics:** Explain the nature of matter. Include in your answer an evaluation of the impact of the development of the mathematics of science. You must make that inclusion, because any Physics major is automatically a Math minor. [If your concentration is Engineering, you may substitute the following: The disassembled parts of a high-powered rifle have been placed on your desk. There are no instructions. In ten minutes a hungry Bengal tiger will be admitted into the room. Good luck.]

**Political Science:** There is a red telephone on your desk. Pick up the receiver. Report on the socio-economic effects of what happens.

**Psychology:** Sketch the development of human thought. Estimate its significance. Compare it with the development of any other kind of thought.

**Sociology:** Estimate the sociological problems which might accompany the end of the world. Construct an experiment to test your theory. Report on the findings of your experiment.

There will also be a general knowledge essay. Each student will write a question, trade with the person sitting behind him/her, and answer it.

*continued on the next column*

CHE further stipulates that merit raises will be based on the following: (1) Department faculty will rotate grading these exams: Sociology faculty will grade the Biology exams, Biology faculty will grade the BA/Econ exams, BA/Econ faculty will grade the Chemistry exams, and so forth. Dr. Lightsey will grade the general knowledge exams. (2) Merit raises will be based on a combination of student performance and faculty competence in grading. DSS personnel will score #2 and report to CHE, which will make the final merit determinations.

*finis*