SPEAKER'S REPORT,
PART TWO

1. Around press time for the May edition of FN, Sam Hines, V-P for Departmental Affairs, sent me some newspaper clippings from The State and The Chronicle that seemed to show that our salaries are not at all that bad in comparison with the Southeastern average and with the other state schools in South Carolina. "Although our salaries are very competitive at the Associate Professor Level and the Assistant Professor level," he wrote, "they are much less competitive at the Professor level though that may be because we have many full professors with fewer years in rank. Please know that we are interested in ideas about and strategies for the improvement of faculty salaries..." He invited me to reply, with suggestions about how to improve our salaries. Reprinted here is my reply:

[dated 10 May, 1988] I don't quite know how much detail to go into at this time. But because you asked for my ideas, you have given me a blank check. So, here it goes.

I saw the articles, and one other besides, copies of which you provided. Perhaps naturally, I cannot rely on so simple a set of data. The simple averages of averages of averages may tend to flatten out any real differences that underlie such a comparison as the newspapers presented. I would like to see some multivariate comparisons to include:

1. A comparison between the newspaper data and the AAUP data that are presented annually in Academe.
2. A time series analysis correlating faculty salaries and the consumer price index for this region, contrasting those with similar stats on the other regions.
3. A breakdown by rank and years in rank (the latter may have to be grouped data because the N for categories may be small).
4. A correlation between perks, rank, and region for state-supported institutions.
5. A breakdown of reported unreimbursed professional travel expenses by rank for South Carolina state-supported institutions. The might not be easy to do statewide, but I'm sure it can be done for the C of C. My hypothesis is that unreimbursed expenses is inversely related to faculty rank and in some cases is a substantial figure.
6. Some basic in-state comparisons of average expenses for housing, power, and travel to and from work. My hypothesis is that Charlestonians pay a great deal more for housing than do people who live in Florence, Greenville, and so on. Maybe Joyce Tyler and friends can provide some figures here.

Then and only then can we talk meaningfully about whether comparative salary averages have the same purchasing power in constant dollar terms. Some of these data are going to be difficult to establish, for sure. But by this point I think you catch my drift. Perhaps some enterprising BA/Econ faculty and students working in independent studies can begin collecting these data?

Please accept this memo with the spirit in which it is intended.

2. On 6 June, 1988, I sent the following to Dr. Festa, regarding the Faculty Manual:

To: Dr. Conrad D. Festa, Vice-President for Academic Affairs

You may know that I have been collating a list of "glitches" (for lack of a better term) perceived to appear in the Manual. There may be more items than this, but what follows sums the views of faculty who have contacted me about these matters. The list as of this date consists of two parts. Although Part A below does not require faculty approval, I respectfully suggest that consideration of those items be taken up by the Faculty Welfare Committee and brought to the floor for a vote. Part B below are glitches in the Faculty Bylaws. They require consideration by ad hoc faculty committee(s) and then floor vote. Part B, then, is listed here for your information only.

Part A:

1. Cross-reference the current blue pages to relevant sections of the document. For example, listed among the President's powers is the right to grant tenure. That should be cross-referenced prominently somewhere in the tenure procedures.
2. There should be some clarification as to the difference between a "funded" faculty line and other—or "unfunded"—faculty lines. For example, persons who have faculty lines (and possibly tenure) but who are on leave for the purpose of holding...
administrative positions have "unfunded" lines, as I understood Dr. Lightsey. Perhaps this is not a matter for the Manual at all. But surely a policy clarification could have assisted in the well-deserved explanation as to why and how certain staff possess faculty status without their salaries affecting a relevant [academic] department. A dubious lemma from this item is that such faculty with unfunded lines have a vote in departmental matters. Do you, for instance, have a vote in the English department? Naturally, on tenure matters I would suspect that you would recuse yourself. But what about curriculum matters, for example, intra-departmentally?

3. Procedures for the Hearing Committee--A-51 ff.--are very specific but are not written very well. For example, on p. A-53, letter A: "If the grievant intends to have counsel at the hearing, he/she shall notify the committee and the college representative within ten working days prior to the date of the hearing" (italics supplied). The italics may be an indefinite pronoun reference. Does he/she refer to the grievant or to the counsel?

4. Same reference, on page A-52, letter B: Some faculty suggest that the 20 day period there be increased to 30.

5. It has come to my attention that there may be some disparity between the By-laws and the green sheets for certain procedures. I have instructed faculty who inquired that "when in doubt, follow the By-laws." The By-laws govern the faculty and have been approved appropriately. I have no idea where the green sheets came from in this regard. Dr. Bain's memo of January 8, 1987 does not clarify matters. For example, if the Faculty Research and Development Committee wishes to change its guidelines for grants, as it is the sole agent authorized to do so, those changes should be brought to the floor for a vote of the faculty (see A-63 ff.). Other discrepancies may have been gleamed.

6. The dual employment provisions need to be cleaned up. There seems to be some question concerning these provisions when professors publish copyrighted material for which they receive royalties (white pages, 207-232, passim). Would such a professor be in violation of dual employment? If so, there are some massive disincentives to publish where royalties are involved. What if a professor of Fine Arts sells a work created in his or her office with C of C supplies? Revise and extend this to the use of a C of C computer in the creation and sale of software. Revise and extend this to the publication of copyrighted work where royalties are involved when the work was "created" as a product of lab equipment--this last item is used as an example on those pages, but I wonder about the difference, if any, between lab work and other work. Yet at the same time I wonder whether I, hypothetically, would be violating dual employment in reviewing a text for a fee when I do that work in my C of C office between the hours of 9 and 5. [Would I be expected to share that fee with the College?]

7. There have been many expressions of concern regarding your memo of April 13, 1988 on "Tenure Criteria."

a. What is a "work of scholarship?" Does an art exhibit "count?" Does software? Does an in-house study guide or workbook count as a book? What about a conventionally published study guide or workbook? Must the work have been conducted while at the College? What about work done elsewhere--with or without grant monies--while the professor is affiliated with the College? What about work started elsewhere but finished while affiliated with the College? What about a revised version of a work previously credited toward promotion or tenure at the College?: revised work previously credited elsewhere?

b. In what sense, if any, does the phrase "professional growth and development" differ from the words "research and publication." I can think of examples where a professor may very well have surpassed the minimum criteria for professional growth and development but may not have met the minimum criteria for published research.

In some sense, this can be re-phrased: Is this a publish or perish institution? Does the answer to that--which is apparently "yes"--contradict the basic mission of this College? I recall asking you that question--or one very much like it--when you were here for your job interview. What was your answer then? It looks like your answer now (April 13, 1988) is different. If teaching undergraduates is the College's primary mission, shouldn't "professional growth and development" be the applied criterion rather than "research and publication?"

c. What about those who will be coming up for tenure but who were hired by your predecessor? Are they--unlike undergraduates who must complete requirements only as the requirements existed when the students declared their majors (alternative interpretation: when the students enrolled for the first time as degree-seeking students)--required to comply with your interpretation of the criteria? What if the predecessor's statements, during interviewing, for example, had seemed to suggest a different interpretation of the tenure criteria?

d. What about those who will be coming up for full professor? There is no next highest rank toward which clear progress must be met.

8. Green page A-42: Dr. Lightsey has informed me that the formula for determining salary increments printed there is no longer in effect. He also stated there to be a replacement policy directive. Faculty are unaware of that change.

9. I am not sure whether this is the appropriate forum, but several department chairs [continued on the next page]
**CURRICULUM COMMITTEE**

[Editor's note: this is a leftover report from Spring '88]

The Committee had a full and interesting semester during which it considered, aside from the usual curricular revisions, the establishment of major programs in music and theatre, a matter which occupied much of the Committee's time between January and May. The Committee reviewed policies regarding the establishment of minor programs and concentrations at the College and considered the question of counting certain courses toward two or more requirements (e.g., English 343 for the English major, for an American studies minor, and toward the Humanities requirement). The Committee reviewed the self-study reports of the departments of Physics and English.

This Committee recommends that future Committee actions include (1) monitoring the offerings of special topics courses to insure conformance with faculty action limiting the number of times such courses may be offered, (2) eliminating courses which are not offered for three consecutive years, and (3) discouraging unnecessary proliferation of course offerings.

This Committee further recommends (1) that a representative of the Registrar be included as an ex officio member of the Committee and (2) that the College return forthwith to the annual publication of the Undergraduate Bulletin.

--Norman Olsen

---

**COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON**

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Here is a list of the membership of the newly-created Board of Trustees for the College of Charleston *(note: those with an * are holdovers from the now-abolished State College Board--other notes are individualized--ed.)*

Mr. Joe E. Berry, Jr. *
Mr. Merl F. Code
Mr. William J. Day
Mr. Timouy N. Dangerfield
Mr. Alton E. Jones *
Mrs. Marie Land
Mr. F. Creighton McMaster *
Dr. Ashriel I. Mose *
Senator Tom Pope, Ill (representing the General Assembly)
Mr. J. Vincent Price, Jr.
Mr. Robert S. Small (C of C Foundation)
Mr. Joel H. Smith
Dr. Gordon Stine *
Mr. J. David Watson
Mr. Thomas W. Weeks *
Ms. Cheryl D. Whipper

---

**KEY DATES FOR THE FALL TERM:**

AUGUST 25: First day of classes
AUGUST 29: Last day for drop/add
OCTOBER 5: Last day to withdraw from classes with "W"
OCTOBER 24: Pre-registration for Spring and Maymester '89
NOVEMBER 4: Pre-registration ends
DECEMBER 2: Last day of classes

---

Continued from page two

have complained to me about overlapping reviews/reports that are redundant (not only that, they are duplicative). Some reports are for an academic year; others are for a calendar year. The same holds for yearly vitae updates. I am sure there is a reason. Is it rational? Can the rationale be clarified to the chairs? If there are these duties of chairs specified in the Manual, and if a more rational scheme of yearly reports is adopted, changes in the Manual must be made.

Part B:

1. This item consists of several parts; all the concerns of which were expressed by faculty. Because these questions relate to the By-laws (or glitches therein), any proposals for change must be directed to special ad hoc committees for report and vote on the floor:
   a. What is the calendar of service for faculty committees?
      --April to April? (logic: that is when the elections are held; records are to be transferred to the newly elected committee/chair within ten days of the April faculty meeting)
      --August to May? (logic: that corresponds to contract periods and to the academic calendar for faculty business)
   b. If April to April, what if there is continuing or unfinished business?
   c. If August to May, what happens during the summer months?
   d. Under either option, what about some committees for which the nine-month contract doesn't seem to carry, such as the Academic Standards Committee, which meets during the summer? Should any committee for which duties might include conducting summer business (others may include the Hearing Committee and the Grievance Committee) have a charge so written into the committee description? (rationale: some faculty may not wish to serve on any committee if summer business is possible)

---

The Speaker's Report is continued on page six, column one
STATE LEGISLATION--Wrap Up

[Editor's note: Daniel Dukes IV, Vice-President for Special Projects, was invited to discuss and summarize the General Assembly's activity for this edition of FN. It was his suggestion that the discussion be conducted in an interview format, which occurred on June 23rd.]

Ed.: At the close of the legislative session, you summarized the status of five pieces of legislation which were relevant to the College. These were: the Separate Board of Trustees bill, the State Appropriation, the "Cutting Edge", the termination of the Charleston Higher Education Consortium, and the Capital Improvement Bond. Maybe we should talk about them one-at-a-time. But before that, I guess I should ask whether there were any vetoes?

DD: None that affect us.

Ed.: How well did we do with Appropriations this year?

DD: All colleges and universities were funded at 93.28% of the total formula funding, which is 100% of the Southeastern average for colleges. Last year our funding was based on 88.7% of the formula. This translates into an increase from about $16.5 million for 1987-8 to $17.7 million for '88-'89.

Ed.: The Appropriations Bill distinguishes between recurring and non-recurring funding. What do those terms mean?

DD: Recurring funds carry over--become the base--to the next fiscal year. Non-recurring money is one-time money that is not put into next year's budget base. Recurring funds are at 90.3% of the formula allocation for fiscal '88-'89, which will be the carry-over base for '89-'90. Higher education will start next year's appropriation process at the 90.3%. Of course the colleges will fight for more than that for '89-'90.

Ed.: I can tell that you are thinking in terms of the next budget cycle. What do you think?

DD: Of course much of what we get is based on the state's economy. However, higher education is promoting itself better and we can get to a level whereby we are consistently being funded in the 95% to 98% range. That is attainable.

Ed.: I've already been asked what the raises will be.

DD: Faculty are unclassified, and the legislation specifies a range and average by department. Faculty will receive a 4% average within an individual range of 0-8%. These will be effective August 15th. [Editor's note: "sources close to the administration" indicate that an extra 1.5% will be allocated to each department above the average 4% to address inequities and special merit. Dr. Lightsey is scheduled to meet with department chairs on July 6th to outline how this will work.]

For classified employees, the cost of living adjustment is 4% across the board, plus a one-time $365 bonus paid on December 1, 1988. That $365 does not go into the individual's salary base.

Ed.: Tell me about the "Cutting Edge."

DD: CHE asked for $31 million for a variety of projects, most of which were to be primarily for universities and colleges for research. CHE and the three universities (Clemson, USC, and MUSC) pushed hard for the bill. The legislature appropriated $5 million. About 85%--which is the talked-about estimate--of the $5 million will go to the three major universities. We are in the remaining pool of 15% of $5 million.

Ed.: Did the College support the legislation?

DD: Yes, we supported it. However, we are concerned that the universities, due to the fact that they get the majority share of the Cutting Edge funding, might turn their efforts to lobbying harder for the Cutting Edge funds instead of formula funding.

Ed.: We would rather increase the formula?

DD: We, along with the other four year colleges, wish the formula to be funded as close to 100% as possible first, and then for any extra funds to go toward the Cutting Edge. The four year colleges in future years must make sure that the Cutting Edge does not start taking precedent over formula funding. Formula funding is divided among all the colleges and universities for general operating funds and can be used for research funds. We got an amendment, important to all the four year colleges, which prohibited matching funds to the Cutting Edge funds being taken out of formula funding. Any Cutting Edge money cannot go back into the formula on a match.

Ed.: Without that amendment...

DD: Any Cutting Edge research money would have been a part of the recurring budget or general operating budget of the College. Senator McConnell pushed hard for that amendment--in fact, he threatened to filibuster the Cutting Edge unless that amendment was adopted. He and Senator Fielding work very hard for the College.

Ed.: There is no longer a Charleston Higher Education Consortium?

DD: The Consortium is dissolved. There was a concern among many of our local legislators that the other Consortium members had too much involvement with CHE recommendations regarding new academic programs and degrees. The bill was sponsored by Rep. Limehouse (R-Summerville) to eliminate all statutory authority of the Consortium. The College supported the bill.

Ed.: Will that affect the crossover registration agreement?

DD: Dr. Lightsey has suggested that the President form a local council of presidents type of organization that will serve to maintain existing agreements but will have no statutory authority. [continued on the next page]
legislative wrap-up continued from page four
Ed.: As I understand it, the Bond Bill provides money that is separate from our operating or recurring budget and provides money necessary for physical plant permanent improvements such as new construction, renovation projects, and the like?
DD.: By law the state has a capital improvement bond bill every even-numbered year. The state Treasurer issues bonds to cover the cost of these projects. The money is given to institutions on a competitive basis but the money is “free” to the institution. By that I mean it is not part of the recurring or operating budget. We have to give a project description on how we are going to spend the money. Bond funds are basically just an additional appropriation that the state gives. Our items this year include Central Energy Facility Expansion ($1,500,000), Sottille Theatre Renovation ($1,000,000), and Central Computer Equipment ($1,500,000).
Ed.: Who sets the priorities for the permanent improvement list?
DD.: The projects we request from the legislature are established by the president with approval from the Board of Trustees. We were fortunate this year in that we got funding for every project we requested.
Ed.: We haven’t talked about the Board of Trustees legislation.
DD.: Our top priority was the passage of that bill. The bill eliminates the State College Board of Trustees—which had governed Francis Marion, Lander, and C of C—and establishes a separate board for each of the three schools. Senator McConnell had authored a bill last year that would have created a separate Board for the College. That didn’t pass. This year, President Lightsey publicly supported Senator McConnell’s bill (co-sponsored by Senators Fielding, Applegate and Martschink, Representatives Day, Bradley, Limehouse, Winstead, Holt, Brown, and Foxworth). The time had come for the College to have its own Board of Trustees paying separate attention to the College of Charleston. The College should benefit in areas such as fundraising, student recruitment, legislative relations, public relations, and the like. The new Board should be a real asset.
Ed.: Was dissolving the State College Board of Trustees very controversial?
DD.: To several members of the legislature it was. We had strong opposition to the bill but were able to win the battle due to the unanimous support by the lowcountry delegation. The new board will meet here, by the way, on July 5th.
Ed.: It sounds like we had a very good year in Columbia.
DD.: We are fortunate to have solid support from our local legislators. They are responsible for the good year we had.

REMINDERS and POTPOURRI

1. Did you fill out a parking sticker request for the fall term? If you can’t find your form, Auxiliary Services (if you can’t find it is now in the Business Office. Pay on or before August 22d.

2. The Admissions Office indicates that enrollment projections are up from the final Fall ’87 figures.

3. A faculty group is now drafting a proposal for a minor in women’s studies. In order for us to set up an information network and to plan for the future of women’s studies at the College, faculty with teaching/research interests in women’s studies are encouraged to contact Cheshire Cathoun (2-5958 or 889-2878).

4. There will be an Alumni Fall Fest the weekend of October 14th, which will tentatively include an event for the parents of freshmen and transfer students. Super Weekend is scheduled for the weekend of February 9th.

5. The Assessment Planning Committee hasn’t met since April. Wendy Baughman is coordinating a massive mail questionnaire project, part of which is targeted as an assessment tool. All known alumni since the early 1970s have been sent a questionnaire. The response rate to the survey is approximately 23%.

6. Do you have any news? The deadline for copy for the next edition of this newsletter is August 10th.

7. There are several articles from a variety of sources which are posted for your perusal in the Faculty Lounge.

8. Anyone interested in serving on an ad hoc committee the task of which would be to assess and consider the abolition of committees should contact the Speaker. Seriously, if you served on a committee that should have met but didn’t, or that met without needing to meet, or that met too often, or that had too much business toward which to do justice, contact the Speaker, David Mann: 792-5703/792-5724.
Speaker's Report, continued from page three

3. On May 9, 1988, Bill Golightly (Chair, Math) requested to Dr. Festa that the Math department office space be expanded, to include moving a wall into what is now part of the Faculty Lounge. I wrote an unsolicited memo in support of the request because Math faculty lines (of the funded variety—see above #2, A-2) require staff who need office space. The planned encroachment (which was less than the actuality, for some reason) into the safe haven for faculty was not supposed to be severely cramping. (Speaker's Notes: (1) This type of item should have been dealt with by the Campus Space Allocation Committee, created a year or so ago, but which met only once last year. Can we please either use the committees or abolish them? (2) I have written to Dr. Festa and to Ms. Scott a request to consider a consolidation of office space in the Street Education Center for the purpose of establishing a Faculty Lounge in that location. In that request I include the comment that the Space Allocation Committee should meet as soon as possible to consider that request so that the new lounge would be available for the fall term.)

4. I have corresponded with each member of the new College of Charleston Board of Trustees, congratulating them on their election. Most faculty probably do not know that during the course of the 1987-8 academic year, the now-abolished Board members with specific College of Charleston responsibilities were contacted almost monthly. They received copies of Faculty Newsletter on a regular basis. The newly elected members of the C of C Board will have received a copy of the May, 1988 edition of FN (the one with committee reports in it) by the time you read this. Plans are to continue this practice, so that Board members will know what is going on with regard to faculty business.

---

THE FIRST MEETING OF THE FACULTY FOR THE 1988-89 ACADEMIC YEAR WILL BE SCHEDULED FOR:
MONDAY
SEPTEMBER 12th
5:00 pm
SIMONS FINE ARTS RECITAL HALL

---

LIST OF BISHOP ROBERT SMITH AWARD RECIPIENTS*

1973: Kathy Wyly
1974: Dennis J. Encarnation
1975: Greischen Kessler
      Gregory L. Phelps
      William T. Stone
1976: Margaret M. Badger
      Russell C. Sullivan
1977: Laura S. Jenkins
1978: Linda S. Crabbe
      David P. Schwacke
1979: Stephen P. Groves
      Albert E. Parish, Jr.
      Ginger E. Wishik
1980: Cathryn Ann Hill
1981: Nancy Hitt
1982: John F. Martin
      Laura Eaddy
      Gary D. Hines
1983: Susan S. Olson
      David W. Newton
1984: W. Kurt Taylor
1985: Howard Hall
      Shawn Baldy
1986: Anthony T. Crowe
      Jeffrey R. Drummond
      Shannon Lachicoute
1987: Debra Gammons
      Darren Rhinehart
1988: Audrey R. Barkan
      Sarah M. Elkins
      Marianne T. Lohman

*As you know, the Bishop Robert Smith Award, established by Dr. Stern in 1973, is considered to be the most prestigious student award. It is presented at the May Commencement. Circumstances only recently permitted research to find and list these students and is published here in its entirety for the first time. Thanks to Dr. George Haborak, Ms. Eileen Baran, Mr. Oliver Smalls, Ms. Cathy Reinecke, and Mrs. Teresa Pregnall for their assistance in compiling this list.

---

in addition to the above-mentioned individuals, the following contributed to this newsletter: bc, cc, dd, smh, ecm, no; special thanks to twp and mb for their assistance