This Newsletter is my initial attempt at putting together a document that I hope helps keep you a little better informed about what is going on around the College. More importantly, however, I hope that over the next year it grows to become a worthwhile instrument for exchanging faculty opinions and ideas on the important, and even not-so-important events taking place on campus. In order to accomplish this however I am going to need your input, your willingness to express your opinions about what is going on around campus, and your rebuttals to the opinions expressed by others with which you wish to take issue.

On a later page you will find a letter from a former faculty member, Gerald Gibson, which was published in the first Faculty Newsletter. Perhaps among those of you who are reading this issue of the Newsletter are some who are just as willing to write about the issues that we will face this year (for example, faculty governance, or university status for the College, or reorganization of the College into Schools), as Gerald Gibson and other faculty were ten years ago.

I will be on the lookout for items to send along to you which I think may appeal to a broad constituency of the faculty and which will not be otherwise sent to you though administrative or committee memoranda, published in the Cougar Pause, or be otherwise widely circulated. In addition, I will be in touch with committee chairs, department chairs, deans of schools, program directors, vice presidents, senior vice presidents and others around campus in looking for facts, announcements, reports, etc. which either they or I feel are appropriate for circulation through this Newsletter. At the same time I hope no faculty member will hesitate to contact me with suggestions for things you would like to read about, or better yet, to send me something to share with the rest of the faculty.

One thing which I noticed were printed in the early issues of Newspeak, (as the first Newsletter’s were called) were editorials addressing what the Speaker considered to be major issues. These I am reluctant to write, not because I don’t have any opinions to express, but rather because as Speaker I may have to preside at a faculty meeting where business related to these issues will come up. For this reason I would prefer that my personal opinions on these matters not be known so that I can better maintain the appearance of objectivity that the role of Speaker demands. I will encourage others to submit guest editorials or will seek permission to reprint from other publications articles and editorials which might otherwise be unlikely to come to your attention. If you come across some of the latter, please send them to me. I’ll do the dirty work of contacting the publisher for permission to use them.

Finally, for those who are interested in such things, this issue, and I imagine all future issues, of the Newsletter is being produced using the desktop publishing package, Framemaker, which runs on the NeXT computer that I use in my office. Framemaker is a registered trademark of Frame Technology Corporation, while NeXT is a trademark of NeXT, Incorporated (I have no idea why NeXT is spelled the way it is).
From Dr. Sue Sommer-Kresse, Vice-President for Enrollment Management, comes the following information on Fall enrollments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall, 1990</td>
<td>%Change from 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>6685</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>102.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>7719</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Students

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readmits</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>2156</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>545</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Concurrent students are high school students currently enrolled in college courses; while non-degree students are transient, consortium and national or international exchange students.

Sue also provides the following notes:

1. The large increase in the number of graduate students is due to the increase of contract Education courses offered at off-campus locations for high school teachers.

2. Although a larger number of students applied to the College of Charleston in 1990 (6192 versus 6001 in 1989) and the students were better qualified (as measured by their predicted GPR), fewer students chose to enter the College of Charleston this fall.

3. The 6.7% increase in undergraduate is due to the retention on undergraduate students.

4. The average SAT score for new students declined from 982 to 974.

The following table gives the College's proposed budget for the 1990-91 academic year. As I reported at the September meeting, this budget was approved by the Board of Trustees at their July meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. EDUCATION AND GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Instruction</td>
<td>14,025,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Research</td>
<td>456,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Public Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Academic Support</td>
<td>3,411,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Services</td>
<td>2,168,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Institutional Support</td>
<td>6,979,269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Physical Plant 5,164,905  
8. Employer Contr./Salary Incr. 5,035,470  
9. Student Aid/Waivers 455,000  
**Total Unrestricted Expenditures** 37,697,089  

**B. Restricted**  
1. Instruction 300,000  
2. Research 200,000  
3. Public Service  
4. Academic Support  
5. Student Services  
6. Institutional Support  
7. Physical Plant  
8. Employer Contr./Salary Incr. 25,000  
9. Student Aid/Waivers 1,800,000  
**Total Restricted Expenditures** 2,325,000  

**TOTAL EDUCATION AND GENERAL** 40,022,089  

**II. AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES (SALES & SERVICES)**  
1. College Stores 2,450,000  
2. Vending 53,500  
3. Housing  
   a. Student Dormitories 2,610,000  
   b. Administrative 28,000  
4. Health Services 285,000  
5. Food Service 2,650,000  
6. Parking 310,000  
7. Athletics 1,200,000  
8. King Street Rentals 35,000  
**TOTAL AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES** 9,621,500  
**TOTAL ALL EXPENDITURES** 49,643,589  

Here restricted funds are funds such as matching contributions for grants, etc. which can only be used for a specific purpose.

The College’s stationery will be taking on a new look soon. The President has given approval to the Department of College Relations to design a new standard format for College of Charleston letterhead, envelopes, business cards, and mailing labels.

According to Susan Sanders, Director of College Relations, after the changes go into effect, existing stationery can still be used until current supplies are depleted. Any exceptions or modifications to the standard format being adopted must be reviewed by the Director of College Relations and the President. Shown on the next page, reduced by one-third, are personalized (for yours truly) examples of the letterhead and envelopes.
New Standard Form for C of C Letterhead

For those of you who have PostScript printers and who have been printing your own letterheads using a program I developed a couple of years ago - fear not. College Relations plans to make available similar programs for the new letterhead, and even for the envelopes, if your printer can print on envelopes. These programs can be customized within the adopted standards.

Last Sunday's edition of the News and Courier contained an article about the College’s Early Childhood Development Center (ECDC). Marge Humphries, Director of ECDC asked me to inform the faculty that there is an opening in the five-year old class. ECDC has classes for two, three, four, and five year old children and serves as a laboratory for the Early Childhood Education programs at the College. Though enrollment in each class is limited, Marge notes that children of College faculty, staff, and students have first priority in filling each class.

The State Budget and Control Board made some changes in travel reimbursement, effective last July 1. While your department should have a copy of the memo from the Controller describing all the changes, here are the changes which are probably most used by faculty:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meals</th>
<th>In-State</th>
<th>Out-of-State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Rate</td>
<td>New Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mileage:
1. Reimbursement is 24.5 cents per mile for personal auto where a state vehicle is reasonably available.
2. Reimbursement is 25.5 cents per mile for personal auto when no state vehicle is reasonably available.
These are rogues that pretend to be of a religion now!
Well, all I say is, honest atheism for my money.
(Thomas Otway, The Atheist, Act III, 1.31)

Someone at the College has applied to for the presidency at USC!! Herb Silverman has sent in an application in order to challenge a section of the South Carolina Code of Laws (specifically, Section 59-117-100) which states: “The board of trustees shall take care that the president of the University shall not be an atheist or an infidel.” Herb rates his chances of being selected President of USC as better than those of being elected governor, though in light of the ad which USC placed in the Chronicle of Higher Education this summer, one must wonder whether he should de-emphasize his academic qualifications and instead stress his political experience. In case you missed the ad, it included the statement: “While understanding of the academic environment is important, the Search Committee is sincerely interested in nominations and applications of persons with demonstrated leadership ability, regardless of academic background or degree.”

This was the most unkindest cut of all.

Last year the Commission on Higher Education (CHE) ranked four of the College’s new proposals in the top ten for funding under the Cutting Edge program. Included in these proposals was the top-ranked proposal and three of the top four; the College also had one program up for renewal. So what happened? Citing a lack of funds, the CHE has decided not to fund any new proposals this year, nor will it fund any renewals, opting instead to use the available funds of $0.5 million for 1990-91 (down from $5 million in 1989-90) to continue the Palmetto Fellows program and other activities such as the planning and assessment programs that are under way. The Commission goes on to state while it will work diligently to restore funding for the Cutting Edge in 1991-92, any proposals that were not funded this year and which are re-submitted for possible funding next year will not necessarily enjoy any privileged status in the review process.

Conrad Festa has informed me that President Lightsey has agreed to provide partial support from the College’s funds for the College’s proposals that could not be funded by Cutting Edge.

A special interdisciplinary campus-wide workshop on Writing Across the Curriculum was held August 14th, 1990 in the ballroom of the Stern Student Center. One of the nation’s leading experts on Writing Across the Curriculum, Dr. Art Young from Clemson University, conducted this workshop, which was sponsored by Academic Affairs, the Schools of Education and Business, and the Departments of Biology, English, Philosophy, Political Science, Sociology, as well as the College Skills Lab (the Writing Lab). During the full-day workshop, which was attended by 44 faculty and administrators representing fifteen departments, participants explored the assigning and evaluating of student writing in classes ranging from large lectures to science laboratories. Workshop participants developed a list of problems they frequently see in student writing, and they speculated on the reasons for these problems. Then, Dr. Young, who holds the prestigious Campbell Chair in Technical Communication, explained how writing promotes learning and communication in all subject areas. He also described how to spend less time grading with better results, why and when to assign non-graded writing, and finally, how to integrate writing into the everyday life of the classroom.

Late last semester the College learned that it was one of five colleges and universities in the country selected to participate in the second phase of NASA’s JOVE (JOint VEnture in Space Science) initiative, bringing the total
number of JOVE participants to ten. The program is designed to include colleges, public and private universities of modest size, and major public and private universities throughout the United States in a joint program with NASA to enhance educational and research opportunities between NASA scientists and science educators at academic institutions. The participating institutions will receive satellite data through an electronic link with NASA and a workstation in exchange for providing faculty and student time to carry out research and for establishing an outreach program to primary and secondary school teachers and students. NASA will also provide partial support to the professors involved for a research orientation the first summer and partial summer salary in subsequent summers (the program is for three years and is renewable).

Professors Phil Dustan (Biology) and Mitchell Colgan (Geology) will serve as the College’s primary participants. Both spent time this past summer at the Goddard Space Flight Center. Among the projects which Phil and Mitch propose to carry out using data available through NASA are to measure the effects of the flow of nutrients and sediments from the land in the South Carolina Low Country on the growth and productivity of phytoplankton populations into the nearshore sea, and to develop remote sensing techniques for analyzing the decline of the world’s coral reef systems. In addition, Professor Robert Nussbaum of the Geology Department will also use satellite images available through JOVE to study geologically active sites in the Galapagos Islands and eastern Honduras.

Phil notes that while he and Mitch are the College’s primary participants in the grant, all College of Charleston faculty are able to use the data and satellite images available from NASA.

At the September faculty meeting, Cathy Reinecke of the Alumni Affairs office announced that her office is interested in enlisting faculty as guest lecturers during their 1991-93 alumni travel series. They plan six to ten programs within the next three years, with their next scheduled trip including Professor Emeritus Dr. Harry Freeman, who will travel with the alumni to the Galapagos Islands in June of 1991. Interested faculty are asked to contact Alumni Services in Randolph Hall. Among the information they would like to know are

1. What are the areas of expertise in which you would be willing to lecture?
2. On what types of trips can you envision giving lectures?
3. What destinations best suit your particular areas of expertise?
4. What travel plans have you already made for 1991-1993?
5. When would you be available to travel and for what length of time?

The Philosophy program has been selected by the Office of Undergraduate Studies as the “Major of the Month” for October. Sponsored jointly by Undergraduate Studies and the Office of Career Development, the “Major of the Month Special” (MOMS) as it is called, is held four times a year for the purpose of familiarizing students in a designated major with career opportunities that are available to them that are not normally associated with that major. The department of the MOMS invites its majors to meet with some of its recent graduates so these graduates can describe the career path they have taken and the type of preparation the major provided for that path, with an emphasis on the “liberal arts” aspect of that preparation. The meeting for Philosophy majors will be held on October 9 from 3:00-4:15 in Room 210 of the Education Center.

The other Major of the Month Specials for the coming year are: Physics, on November 30; Sociology, on February 13, 1991, and English, on March 5, 1991. These meetings will likewise be held from 3:00-4:15 in Room 210 of the Education Center.
Sissy James, Director of Academic Computing informed me that her department has set up small computer labs of between 4 and 8 machines (all IBM compatibles) in six dormitory locations. The Buist, Craig, and Wentworth Street dorms, as well as the College Lodge, have one lab each, and the St. Philip Street dorm has two sites.

Printed below are two Committee reports from last year which did not get published in last May’s Faculty Newsletter.

**Faculty Hearing Committee (Bill Bischoff, chairman):** During the academic year 1989-90, two grievances were brought to the Faculty Hearing Committee. In the case of one grievance, a formal hearing was held and the findings of the committee were presented to the President. (A tape-recording of this hearing is on file in the President’s office). In the case of the other grievance, the committee decided that it would not be necessary to conduct a hearing, and, after carefully reviewing the materials presented, the committee made its recommendation to the President.

**Committee on Curriculum and Academic Planning (George Pothering, chairman):** The Committee on Curriculum and Academic Planning met eight times during the Spring, 1990 semester. The committee continued to review proposals submitted by departments or representatives of academic programs. Most of these were submitted for consideration by the faculty, though the deliberations of some of this business occurred over several meetings as the committee sought clarifications from those who submitted the proposals, or suggested modifications to them. Several items of business could not be completed during the spring semester and were left for consideration by the 1990-91 committee. The officers for the 1990-91 committee are Frank Morris (languages), chairman, and Mack Tennyson (Business Administration), secretary.

Frank Morris, Chairman of the Committee on Curriculum and Planning reported that the Committee already has a long agenda of business for the Fall semester, hence any departments who wish to have business acted upon by the December faculty meeting should get it to the Committee by the middle of October.

Brett Lott, chair of the Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics, notified me that applications for Who's Who Among Students in American Colleges and Universities will soon be sent out to students. He would like for faculty to encourage their students who receive the applications to fill them out and send them in.

Marty Perlmutter has asked me to announce that faculty members who would still like to subscribe to the New York Times for the remainder of this semester may do so by contacting the Philosophy Department in the next week or so. Campus mail will deliver your copy to you in the morning mail.

Michael Finefrock sends along the announcement that faculty can order copies of WordPerfect, 5.1, directly from WordPerfect Corp. for $99 for a Macintosh version and $135 for an IBM PC version. An order form has been posted on the bulletin board in the Faculty Lounge which you can copy for placing your order. Michael also said that faculty can obtain significant discounts on Hewlett-Packard hardware (printers, scanners, etc.). A copy of the H-P catalog describing these discounts is also posted on the bulletin board.
As I noted in my opening comments, this year marks the tenth year since the establishment of a faculty newsletter by then Speaker, now Gubernatorial candidate and applicant for the presidency of USC, Herb Silverman. In poking over issues of the newsletter from that first year, I was struck by how many of today’s hot topics were alive and then. With the issue of faculty governance coming up in November, I thought the following letter, reprinted from the first Newspeak, dated September 22, 1980, might be of interest. The author was Gerald Gibson, who was then a faculty member in the Chemistry Department and who is now Academic Dean at Roanoke College. Please note, that I am not attempting to influence the issue one way or the other, I am merely reproducing Gerald’s letter hinging that some of you may find it interesting.

Dear Herb,

You and I have chatted briefly once or twice about how things might be changed in the interest of getting faculty business done more expeditiously -- and responsibly. If I may, I’d like to say a little in writing on that subject.

Few of us are ready to point to our faculty meetings as a paradigm of rational discourse and decision-making. Typically we faculty members criticize various administrative failures to deal with small and large challenges, while being at least as guilty as they of fumbling opportunities and facing responsibilities. As with the administration, our failures come less often from a lack of good intentions than from a lack of good translation of those intentions into effective action. I see no reason why we should feel at a loss to improve our effectiveness as a faculty. In particular, I would suggest that an initial step in that might be taken by changing the procedures for conducting faculty business.

How might we reasonably and profitably change how we do business is, I think, suggested by a scrutiny of the problems that have arisen from how we have done business in the past. For example, it is inexcusable that faculty meetings should have to be cancelled for lack of a quorum; it is truly absurd to enact legislation as a faculty that a patchwork put together by a committee of the whole -- many of whom have done no homework on the problem -- when a standing committee of the faculty has studied the problem for months beforehand and discussed it thoroughly. In the former case the business of the faculty is actually hated because so many of our number are apathetic about it; in the latter it generally is determined at least as much by emotion and rhetoric as by rational consideration, and nearly always the “camel-as-horse-by-committee” qualities to be expected when a motion becomes no more than a hastily sewn together collection of amendments.

The quorum problem could be dealt with by either of two approaches (probably more, but these occur to me): (1) establish a faculty senate; or (2) redefine our quorum as 35-40% of the faculty. Option (1) has previously been considered and voted down by our faculty, but we may now be ready to consider it anew. Option (2) would certainly not penalize anyone who wanted to participate in deliberation and decision-making, but would allow both to go on in the absence of a technical majority; quorum does not mean majority unless we choose to make it that.

The problem of patched-together faculty legislation may be less simple to deal with. Again, may I suggest two options: (1) Amend the by-laws to (a) outlaw any amendment to a prime motion that has the effect of creating a substitute motion, and (b) require all prime motions to be published in writing with a rationale at least a week before formal consideration -- which is supposed to be the case now -- and all amendments to be published in writing with a rationale at least three days before formal consideration; or (2) amend the by-laws to require that (a) any commendation coming from a standing committee of the faculty have the support of at least two-thirds of that committee and, (b) in the absence of a two-thirds vote against the recommendation by the general faculty, it becomes faculty legislation. (Though proposed as options, it would, of course, be possible to do both (1) and (2).)

Option (10 should at least discourage the inadvertent creation of “camels” by providing more time prior to formal faculty discussion for consideration of the full impact of amending a particular motion in a particular way, and would decrease the confusion as to what, in fact, is to be voted on --the published motion or its inverse. Option (2) should assure that what is enacted has the broad support of the faculty both within the committee and on the floor of the faculty, should give encouragement to good committee workers that what they have tried to have crafted carefully will not be mutilated capriciously once brought to the faculty, and indeed, should encourage the fac-
ulty to elect the very best people to serve on faculty committees. Both options should have the practical result of having more motions voted either up or down rather than playing parliamentary games with them.

Now I recognize that there are faculty members who would disagree with all the options above, feeling quite seriously and sincerely that the principle of "democracy" would be impinged upon somehow by the enactment of any of them. In response I would submit that democracy suffers only if we mean by that word that and every legislative act must be by a greater-than-50% direct vote of all members of the group, and if one ignores the fact that much of our legislation results now from a 50+% favorable response by whatever 50% of the total faculty happens to be at a given faculty meeting. Further, I suggest that how we try to do business has become a great enough embarrassment that even if so laudable a principle as pure democracy must be nibbled at a bit, it is high time to consider how serious the swap-off is that we would be making.

Two more suggestions I will lump together as brief statements in this one paragraph: (1) We should reduce substantially the number of standing committees of the faculty; too many have no real business to tend to. (2) The Speaker should publish the semester reports from each standing committee as one package at the end of each semester; this would provide a neat summary for each faculty member in a form less likely to be lost.

May I add as an aside that I think your "Speaker's Newsletter" is a good idea. An informed democracy is certainly better than an uninformed democracy, and the newsletter should help those who want to be informed to keep up with what is going on.

Thank for taking the time to read this. If you see any merit in any of it, I'd be happy to discuss further with you how it might be effected.

Sincerely,
Gerald W. Gibson
Professor of Chemistry

+ +

Thanks to everyone who either provided news or background information for this newsletter or who helped verify some of the details. Besides those whose names appear in the various notes, I wish to express my appreciation to Bonnie Devet, Sam Hines, Mike Katuna, Bill Lindstrom, Bob Lyon, and Floyd Tyler.

+ +

I will normally try to publish the Faculty Newsletter each month, two weeks after the general faculty meeting. In October, however, I will be out of town at a conference in the days just prior to the normal publication date, and hence will produce it a week later. Anyone who wishes to contribute to the October 29, Newsletter should send your items to me by October 24.