BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETS, ACTS ON FACULTY PROPOSALS

(Editor's Note: Some Faculty Committee reports on the following pages address actions that were passed by the Board of Trustees during its January 11, 1989, meeting. What follows here is a summary of relevant actions taken by the Board.)

1. Dr. Lightsey reported that his top two priorities are in providing "extra funds for faculty salaries above the levels of state salary increases...until faculty salaries are improved to a more satisfactory level" and in adding "additional positions [funded faculty lines] in 1989-90.

2. He requested the Board to "help in persuading the Legislature to more adequately fund the College" so that the College's plans can be carried out.

3. The Board approved all of the Faculty By-Law changes. A newly revised copy of our By-Laws is forthcoming.

4. The Board held in abeyance two of the Manual changes, pending a review to see if those changes conform with state statute. These concern the T&P Committee's possible review of nonrenewal decisions. (Editor's note: Dr. Lightsey and the Speaker will monitor this carefully so that the Board makes a fully informed decision on these proposed changes.)

5. The College has purchased 88 Wentworth Street for $175,000 (the corner of Wentworth and St. Philip).

6. Fee structures were adjusted--more like an alignment. Dorm fees will go up $40 a term; the 21 meal plan will go up $30; $1 of the library fee will move to health service. Part-time student fees will go up $10 (to $85 from $75) and full-time fees will be charged for 12 hours or more (up from 9 hours). The latter permits Financial Aid, Business Office, and Registrar's Office to use the same criteria for full-time students.

7. The Board gave tentative approval to the History Department's joint M.A. program (with The Citadel), provided that any changes made at approval by the Faculty are not substantive. The Board was pressed to grant this tentative approval so that a March 1, 1989 deadline might be met--if the Faculty so acts--for CHE to consider the program to be installed for the Fall '89 term.

8. The College Coordinator for Assessment was announced: Vice-President Fred Daniels.

9. The new smoking rules proposed by Dr. Lightsey based on the Faculty Resolution were approved.

FALL '88 COMMITTEE REPORTS

(Editor's note: What follows are rather lengthy--in some cases--Faculty Standing Committee Reports submitted at press time. They are reproduced in their entirety.)

Academic Standards: The Committee met, at length, five times during the summer and two to three times/month throughout fall semester. We considered 31 petitions from students; of these, 13 were approved, 12 were denied, and recommendations were made on the remainder. In addition, 6 scholarship/financial aid appeals were considered; 2 were approved, 1 was denied and the remainder were deferred or withdrawn.

The large number of petitions requesting variance from "7 of the last 37 semester hours rule" (Undergraduate Bulletin, page 97) prompted the Committee to evaluate its approval rate and, to facilitate case review, to have the Undergraduate Studies Office develop a more stringent form for seniors requesting to take courses elsewhere. Several requests for retroactive withdrawal from courses by students who failed to withdraw properly (in a couple cases several years ago) were denied; faculty are encouraged to remind students that it is the student's responsibility to follow proper procedure and meet deadlines for withdrawal from a course. The Committee assures the Faculty that no grade will be changed without the approval of the faculty member involved. Another area of concern is in the assignment of a grade of Incomplete for a course; the Academic Standards Committee urges that the faculty member and student both have a clear understanding of what remains to be done and when the work is due so that the grade can be changed by the 60-day deadline. Two cases highlighted the need for better guidance regarding academic regulations for high school students enrolled as concurrent students.

The Committee has also been working on two major academic regulations--retention standards and a course repetition policy--which we hope to bring before the Faculty for consideration this spring.

--Dr. Susan J. Morrison (Biology), Chairman

Advisory Committee to the President: The Committee accomplished its goal of meeting regularly with the President, and we spent about two hours on each of Sept. 12, Oct. 17, and Dec. 1. At each meeting the committee raised all issues that had been communicated to it by the faculty. We discussed allocation of additional funds received through FTE's or higher formula funding. What became particularly clear is that the President plans to continue to make supplemental increases in faculty salary his highest priority, followed by new faculty lines, and only then an account for grant matching funds. We raised issues concerning continued next page
parking decals, the faculty dining area, early snack bar closing hour, a Fall break, possible change of graduation from Mother’s Day to some other time, faculty-staff day care, the tenure more than one issue, concerns over registration procedures, recognition of honors on student transcripts, campus-wide heating and cooling problems, paper recycling, reciprocity with MUSC’s fitness center, capital improvements, computers on campus, a step plan for promotion within the rank of Professor, a post-Labor Day start for classes, Trident Tech’s attempt to change its name to College and its potential effects, new student probation standards, the faculty-passed “no smoking” resolution and its implementation, new fee schedule, bond money for parking, keeping faculty parking lots available for faculty for events such as Commencement, the criteria for promotion, and many more.

All of the meetings were informative, and issues that warranted the President’s action were addressed by the President. A brief list of accomplishments contains: reimplementation of Fall Break, honors now indicated on all transcripts, activity on establishing promotion steps for Professors, snack bar staying open longer, faculty access to its dining room via a back door route, parking lots policed on Commencement, etc.

At our last meeting we were provided with an important clarification of the President’s position with regard to the widely known administration position that one must exceed the minimum criteria for promotion in order to get promoted. He wishes the Faculty to understand that one may exceed the criteria in any one of three areas of evaluation (Teaching, Research and Development, Service). That is, one could get promoted if he/she had a minimal research output and service component, but could demonstrate outstanding teaching that exceeded that criterion. The President plans to address the Faculty on this matter.

--Dr. J.L. Carew (Geology), Chairman

Advisory Committee on Tenure. . . . The Committee met on Sept. 8, Oct. 5, and Oct. 17. The Oct. 5 meeting was held with President Lightsey to clarify faculty concerns regarding current interpretation of the tenure and promotion process and to address broader issues of equity involved in the “reconsideration” process which had the potential to undermine the integrity of the tenure and review process. A written report of this meeting was circulated to all faculty and the Vice-Chair entertained questions regarding this report at the November 14 faculty meeting. Nagging faculty questions arising out of the report concern (1) closure of the review process, (2) the “reconsideration” process, and (3) the administration’s new interpretation regarding the publication requirements for tenure and promotion (for tenure one must meet the minimum standards for the next higher rank, for promotion one must exceed the standards).

The Committee proposed several changes to the Faculty By-Laws. These changes approved by the Faculty in the November and December 1988 faculty meetings will have the following results (if approved by the President and the Board of Trustees):

(a) The Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion will now be chaired by a faculty member. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs will continue to sit on the Committee as an ex-officio non-voting member.

(b) In the case of a non-renewal decision a faculty member on a probationary appointment may appeal directly to the Committee if he/she feels that the non-renewal decision was not based on adequate consideration in terms of the relevant standards of the institution (Section IV, G. 6 of the PAM). In other words, if the faculty member has performed adequately and has met all the relevant institutional standards in the area of teaching, professional growth and development, and service, he/she should be afforded the opportunity for an impartial review. While the recommendations of the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion are not binding, they should weigh heavily in any “reconsideration” of the non-renewal decision.

--Dr. Klaus de Albuquerque (Sociology), Vice-Chair

Graduate Education, Continuing Education. . . . The Committee gave a favorable recommendation to the Graduate Council that the Master of Arts proposal of the history department be approved. Deliberations were held with representatives of the history department, including a minority report from the department concerning the program proposal. Editorial changes to the proposal were suggested. The objections of the minority report were duly noted and referred to the Graduate Council. Our major concern dealt with financial projections which were deemed to be too conservative. This was sent back to the history department for further review.

The committee was especially concerned with the effect the M.A. program would have on the undergraduate history program. The history department representative fully assuaged fears about dilution of their undergraduate program and asserted that the undergraduate program would actually be strengthened by the addition of the M.A. program. The concern with future financial aspects of the program were of the drain that it might place on the history department and the College. The committee did not want the possibility to arise that a couple of years down the road that the history department would come requesting additional faculty lines to support their program due to drained resources. It was our understanding that any additional faculty lines would only come when the program grew enough to itself support those lines (“supply-side economies”).

--Dr. Jim Deavor (Chemistry), Chairman

Hearing Committee: This is to notify you that one grievance was filed with the Faculty Hearing Committee. After considering the issue of compliance with procedure, the committee decided not to hear the grievance.

--Dr. Robert M. Norton (Mathematics), Chairman

Library Committee: The Library Committee met twice during Fall Semester of 1988. The Director of the Library, David Cohen, provided the members of the continued next page
committee with an introduction to the duties of the committee and a report of the current status and needs of the library. The two main points discussed by committee members this semester were (1) the means of conducting assessment of how well the library satisfies the needs of students and faculty and (2) how to solve the problem of the few faculty members who hold large numbers of overdue books and who fail to return them when they are requested by other patrons. Discussion of both matters is ongoing.

--Dr. John Newell (History), Chair

Research and Development Committee: As previously announced, the Committee has funding this year in excess of last year, about $37,500.

The Committee rewrote its "Guidelines" in September, 1988, in an effort to address criticism raised by a number of faculty members concerning past inequities in the distribution of awards with respect to departments not directly represented on the Committee. New policies include: (1) Concerning eligibility, a two-year ceiling on individual awards in any two year period of $2500; (2) Concerning the process of evaluation and award, the elimination of the practice of assigning committee members as "department liaisons"; the prohibition of members from participating in discussion and voting on proposals from their respective departments; and the requirement that voting be achieved by secret ballot.

The Committee funded three proposals for about $6,000 for the spring semester. A new call for proposals for award in the summer of '89 was mailed to faculty in early December. The deadline for applications is January 27, 1989.

--Dr. Wayne Jordan (History), Chair

Student Affairs and Athletics: The major activities of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics during the Fall 1988 semester involved several areas. A considerable amount of time was spent discussing a student grievance concerning procedural selection of persons to student organizations. As a result of this grievance several recommendations were made in hopes of improving the process. In addition, a large amount of time was used to review the criteria for students nominated to Who's Who Among Students in American Universities and Colleges and the selection of those students to represent the College. Thirty-two students were nominated from the 99 applications that were received, and of those selected 53% were Non-Traditional students with 10 Juniors and 22 Seniors. Following the public announcement of the recipients of this honor a reception will be held during the spring semester for these students.

The Committee also served as a clearing house for information concerning questions involving membership in the Cougar Club and Faculty benefits during Athletic events.

Discussions were held early in the semester on problems associated with the start-up of classes including the drop/add procedure, scheduled fix-up of classes and housing. Also, the Committee unanimously supported a proposed no smoking rule.

--Dr. Andrew H. Lewis (P.E./Health), Chair

(Editor's Note: At press time, no other Committee Reports escaped to this desktop.)

Administrative Reports

(Editor's Note: The following two letters were received and warrant attention.)

Letter from Dr. Festa to Ms. Phyllis Mayes, Director of Human Resource Management in Columbia:

The College of Charleston would like to institute the following changes to the faculty evaluation process during the 1989-90 academic year. The College will continue to use the same forms that it has used in the past but we want to modify the process.

1. All untenured faculty will be evaluated annually in the same manner (as prescribed in the Faculty-Administration Manual) using existing forms.

2. Tenured faculty will be given a full (i.e., following existing procedures) evaluation every third year. Chairs will have the option of staggering the evaluation over a three year period, conducting one-third of the evaluations each year or they may evaluate all the faculty every third year. An exception to this procedure will be as follows: In the year prior to a faculty member's being considered for promotion, a full evaluation will be conducted so that the evaluation will be included in the promotion packet.

3. The rating given to the tenured faculty member as a result of a full evaluation will be automatically used for the second year if the chair observs no change in performance. If either the faculty member or the chair wishes to conduct a full evaluation, then a full evaluation will be conducted. No ratings can be changed without a full evaluation.

Please present these changes to the appropriate committees and agencies to initiate the approval process. We will be happy to provide any additional information or assistance you may need. Thank you for your assistance.

Letter to David Mann, Speaker, from Dr. Sommer-Kresse, Regarding Admissions and Recruitment:

Some clarification is in order regarding the purchase of The College Board's list of students. This is a very popular method of identifying students who perform well on the SAT test and have indicated an interest in attending an institution with a profile similar to your college. The College of Charleston has purchased such lists for the past two years. Within our budget limitations, we requested names of students in target market areas (South Carolina, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina) who indicated a desire to attend a public, four-year liberal arts school similar to the College. Approximately 5000 names were purchased each year. Mailings were sent to students who will be entering in the Fall of 1989. The fact that we were not able to purchase a list this year, because of budget constraints, may have an effect on the students entering in Fall, 1990. [Editor's note: please refer to the [continued next page]}

Keep in mind that students in the target areas who indicated on the SAT that they were interested in private schools or out-of-state schools (if local students) would not be on that list. An excellent local student could be eliminated from the list because of these variables.

We will continue to purchase the list of minority students in the region to encourage them to apply to the College of Charleston.

Admissions Staff members visit all local schools and participate in the College Fair nights throughout the state. All students who participate in the Science Fair, Math Meet, Governor's School or any other event which indicates a strong academic background will be sent literature from the College of Charleston if mailing lists can be obtained. Individual inquiries and referrals are the main source of prospective student names. It is estimated that the College receives approximately 20,000 requests for information each year. The assistance of all faculty and staff in identifying academically strong prospective students is greatly needed and appreciated.

To identify and recruit highly qualified students will become increasingly more difficult because of the competitive nature of college admissions practices. The Dean of Admissions, Don Burkard, has developed a plan in conjunction with other Enrollment Management Offices to identify, to recruit and, through personal contact, hopefully to bring a larger percentage of the most qualified students to the College.

Please contact me if you have other questions or want more information regarding any of the Enrollment Management functions.

Calendar of Selected Events

January (all month): Maymester Pre-registration--all students should go to the Registrar's Office to do so.
January 23: Faculty Meeting
January 25: Conference: Aids and the College Student
February 9-11: Superweekend
February 13: Faculty Meeting
February 22: Last Day for Undergraduates to Obtain "W"
March 2-4: Science Fair, Math Meet, iETS Competition
March 13-17: Spring Break
March 20: Faculty Meeting
April 10: Faculty Meeting
April 11-12: Board of Trustees Meetings
May 8: Faculty Meeting

There was no room left in this issue for the promised discussion of parking. Next issue will address parking and "what does the sick leave number mean?"--editor

Other Letters Received

(Editor's note: Other letters arrived recently that are worthy of your attention. These are excerpted in the interest of saving space and time.)

To David Mann from Earle E. Morris, Comptroller General of South Carolina: Thank you for your letter expressing concern for the level of faculty salaries. . . . One of the major components in the state's higher education formula besides enrollment is faculty salaries. The states does use the Southeastern average for salaries of peer institutions. . . Unfortunately, the budget limitations of the past few years have prevented us from achieving 100% formula funding. . . .

We are striving toward that goal. . . . The current Appropriations Act allows the colleges and universities greater flexibility than other state agencies in allocating funds for salary increases. Colleges and universities with unclassified employees (all faculty are unclassified positions) are allowed to compensate their faculty without uniformity. . . . Thus, hopefully, the financial rewards are going to those individuals who are making the greatest contributions. Several colleges and universities have even announced setting aside additional funds to enhance faculty salaries as their operating budgets will allow. . . .

To David Mann from Senator Glenn F. McCon nell: I want to thank you so much for sharing your letter to Governor Campbell with me. I enjoyed reading it, and I will be on guard this year to make sure that money is not diverted out of basic formula funding to go into the Cutting Edge. It is important to begin the Cutting Edge, but it is also important to keep up with formula funding for our colleges and prevent an increase in the cost to the parents of the students.

(Editor's note: reference the "Special Issue" Speaker's Report for the text of the letter sent to Governor Campbell.)