I would like to begin this issue of the Newsletter by discussing an issue from the last faculty meeting.

In the discussion on the approval of the Assessment Committee I noted a distinction between a motion to “table” a motion and one to “postpone definitely.” Since many of you may not know the difference (I never heard of “postponing definitely” until I started reading Robert’s Rules of Order this summer) here is an explanation.

A motion to postpone definitely (also known as “postpone to a certain time,” or simply, to “postpone”) is used to put off action on a pending question until a specified time or until after a given event. A motion to table (or more properly, to “lay on the table”) on the other hand, is used to temporarily set aside consideration of a pending question in order to deal with a matter of immediate urgency. There is no set time for taking up the tabled question again, though a separate motion to take it from the table must be made in the same session (for us, a semester) as the motion to table, or else the question will die.

Robert’s points out that a motion to table is commonly misused instead of one to postpone definitely, and indicates that a motion to table should be ruled out of order if it is clear that the intend of the motion is to kill or avoid dealing with a measure. A motion to table cannot be amended and is not debatable, though the chair can ask the proponent of the motion for stating his or her reason for making it. It requires a majority vote for passage. A motion to postpone definitely is debatable, is amendable and normally only requires a majority vote for acceptance.

At its October meeting, the Board of Trustees voted to establish an Ad Hoc Committee to study the idea of university status for the College of Charleston. Mr. Joe E. Berry, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Trustees, asked the following Board members to serve on the Committee: Joel H. Smith, Chair of the Committee, Fitz-John C. McMaster, Marie Land, John W. Molony, J. Vincent Price, Jr., J. David Watson, and Dewitt Williams.

On November 5, the Committee met to formulate their plans for undertaking the study. According to Mr. Smith, the Committee will seek and encourage input from the faculty and students of the College. In particular, comments and recommendations from department chairs, deans of schools, and chairs of the faculty committees will be welcomed, as well as the opinions of individuals. Late this semester the Committee plans to hold a meeting on campus whose primary purpose will be to give individuals an opportunity to address the Committee directly. In the meantime, those wishing to contact the Committee may do so through Joel Smith at the following address:

Mr. Joel H. Smith, Chairman  
Ad Hoc Committee on University Status  
P.O. Box 11070  
Columbia, SC 29211

In a related matter, at an Academic Affairs meeting held on November 5, Conrad Festa notified the Department Chairs and Deans of School Deans that, CHE has decided to conduct a survey to assess the needs for graduate education in the Charleston area and how best to meet them. Because of its current workload and its desire to have the survey done now, the Commission decided not to do the study itself, but instead to allow the College of Charleston, with the assistance of other state agencies, to conduct the survey.
Congratulations to the Mathematics Department! On November 1 the Commission on Higher Education approved a Master of Science degree in Mathematics for the College of Charleston. The program is scheduled to begin in the Fall, 1991 semester. The program will be a cooperative program with the Citadel and Medical University in that faculty from those institutions will be allowed to participate in the program, but it will not be a joint degree program with either of those institutions.

On October 25, the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President met with President Lightsey. One of the items on the agenda was the President’s “Santa Claus” statement that he made at the recent Board of Trustees meeting. There he expressed a willingness to share some of the increased funding that the College might receive from next year’s (1991-92) formula (because of this year’s growth) with those institutions which may lose funding (either because their enrollments declined, or because they did not grow enough). The President noted that under one plan being considered by the Commission on Higher Education (CHE), the College’s gain would be $300,000 dollars, while Winthrop would lose $1.1 million, USC-Columbia would lose $1.2 million, MUSC would lose $7 million, SC State would gain $700,000, Francis Marion and Lander would each lose about $400,000, and Clemson would gain $3.7 million. The President also acknowledged that offering to give up some of the College’s funds is an easier totake than offering to give up millions as he would be doing if he were in Clemson’s position.

One interesting aspect of this discussion was the President’s explanation of how an institution could experience growth and lose funding under the current formula-based method that the State uses. I obtained from the Floyd Tyler’s office (Floyd is the Sr. Vice President for Business Affairs) a copy of the Commission on Higher Education’s 1991-92 Appropriation Formula for Continuing Operation for Academic Institutions and will attempt to summarize the process here (the actual “formula” is a 14-page document).

The formula starts with a count of full time equivalent students (FTE’s) in an academic discipline or class of academic disciplines for the Spring and Fall semesters of a calendar year (for 1991-92 funding, the FTE’s from the Spring and Fall of 1990 are used). Among the figures that apply to the College of Charleston, it assumes 30 credit hours for an undergraduate FTE and 24 credit hours for a master’s level FTE student. For each discipline one then calculates the number of FTE faculty positions it (supposedly) requires by dividing the number of FTE students at each level by a student/faculty ratio given by CHE for “formula institution” groups. The group for the College includes Francis Marion, Lander, SC State, the Citadel, Winthrop, and the USC branch campuses at Aiken, Coastal, and Spartanburg. Among some of the student/faculty ratios given for undergraduates for our group are: Biological and Physical Sciences - 19, Business - 24, Computer Science - 20, Fine and Applied Arts - 13, Foreign Languages - 18, General Studies - 18, Letters - 19, Mathematics - 23, Philosophy and Religion - 19, Psychology - 23, Social Sciences - 20, and Teacher Education - 20.

The FTE faculty figure for a discipline is used to determine “total costs for instruction” for the discipline by multiplying the FTE value by a peer group faculty salary average, including (for 1991-92) a 4.5% cost of living adjustment (yielding a cost for teaching faculty salaries) and adding to this costs for instructional support. The latter figure is a percentage of the teaching faculty salary. Among some of the faculty salary averages (given here in thousands - CHE takes it to the dollar) and percentages for instructional support for our group are: Biological Sciences - $37.5 and 64%, Business - $43.8 and 29%, Computer Science - $42.4 and 57%, Fine and Applied Arts - $34.0 and 28%, Foreign Languages - $33.1 and 25%, General Studies - $29.9 and 15%, Letters - $32.4 and 17%, Mathematics - $35.5 and 20%, Philosophy and Religion - $37.9 and 17%, Physical Sciences - $38.0 and 56%, Psychology - $36.9 and 35%, Social Sciences - $36.9 and 22%, Teacher Education - $36.8 and 33%.

It’s worth noting that if the College was in the same group as USC, Clemson, and the Medical University, the salary figures would be: Biological Sciences - $47.5, Business - $54.9, Computer Science - $53.6, Fine and Applied Arts - $37.0, Foreign Languages - $37.6, General Studies - $33, Letters - $37.4, Mathematics - $45.8, Phi-
losophy and Religion - $39.9, Physical Sciences - $50.4, Psychology - $43.4, Social Sciences - $43.7, Teacher Education - $40.1. The percentages for instructional support would be the same.

Other costs included in the formula are those for research (25% of outside-sponsored research from the prior year); public service (25% of outside sponsored public service from the prior year); libraries (10% of total instructional costs); other academic support (12% of total instructional costs, research costs, and public service costs); student services ($150 for each of 1st 4,000 students- headcount, and $125 for the next 4,000, plus $3 per student credit hour), plant operation and maintenance (obtained using a number of formulas given by CHE - among some of the factors considered here are replacement costs of buildings, maintenance costs factors based on whether a building is air-conditioned or not, and whether it is made of wood, masonry, or concrete; the gross square footage of buildings for calculating custodial costs, linear footage of buildings and acreage of maintained areas for calculating grounds maintenance, etc.), and funding for honors students ($1,200 per honor student or $25,000, whichever is greater; an "honor student" is defined as one whose combined SAT is 1200 and who is in the top 10% of his/her class). There are still other factors that go into the formula, but the above should give you a pretty good idea of what CHE looks at.

CHE now takes the total costs for each institution and submits their sum to the State Budget and Control Board, which in turn makes a recommendation to the House Ways and Means Committee, which makes a recommendation to the full House, and so on through the legislative process until the Governor finally signs off on what becomes the total funds for higher education in South Carolina. Whatever percentage of CHE’s initial recommendation actually gets funded is the percentage of “full-formula” funding being supported. Each institution would then receive its share of the actual funds in the proportion of its total costs to the full formula costs.

Unfortunately, what can happen when full formula funding is not achieved (and this is the norm) is that an institution can lose funding not only for lack of growth, but for lack of sufficient growth. As an example, let’s consider the case where no more funding is allocated to higher education than was allocated last year (which was the one from which the President’s comments were derived). Each institution should not expect to receive the same amount of money as it did last year, however, since changes in student FTE’s over the previous year will probably change the institution’s instructional costs, which will change its total cost, which will thus alter the percentage of the total funds for higher education it will receive. Even more noteworthy, an increase in a given institution’s student FTE count will not necessarily translate into more funds for that institution unless this increase is sufficiently large to increase the proportion of funds institution should receive. Take the case of Lander College. Lander experienced a 4.39% increase in student FTE’s over those used in the 1990-91 allocation, and yet would see get a $429,000 decrease in funding for 1991-92 under this scenario. Why? Because across the State there was an overall 5.24% increase in FTE’s, and so while Lander grew, it didn’t grow enough to protect its share of the State’s funds. Another interesting case is that of USC-Union. This school saw a 13% increase in student FTE’s (about the same as the College’s) and yet will lose $27,000 (out of a total budget of only $930 thousand) in funds over what it received the previous year. As I noted earlier, the College would realize a $300,000 increase under this plan.

Needless to say, the way higher education is funded under the “full formula” method can lead to some interesting situations. I’ll keep you informed about what’s going on.

In order to take stock of how the College is doing in assuring sufficient information resources for now and the next few years, the administration (specifically, Conrad Festa) has organized an ad hoc committee to assess the needs of the College and identify its priorities. Among the areas the committee will look at are: quality of applications software and hardware, support services, availability of resources, and network access. The committee was also asked to report on the policies, procedures, and incentives in place to encourage faculty and students to make appropriate uses of information technology to improve academic programs. The committee is comprised of David
Most of you have been hearing about the College’s new computing system for some time now and have witnessed walkways on campus and various streets in its vicinity being torn up so that cable can be laid for a campus-wide network. I thought I’d try to give you an idea about what’s going on here and what it might mean for individual faculty.

First the administrative computing system. In October, 1989 the College acquired two computers from Digital Equipment Corporation (DEC - pronounced “deck”) in their VAX 6000 family. Their role is two-fold:

1. to allow the College to do all of its administrative computing tasks (such as maintaining and accessing student, payroll, and accounting records) on campus instead of using the main administrative computer at USC.

2. to replace the centralized Wang word processing system, and its accompanying word processing terminals, PC’s and printers, with stand-alone personal computers (generally IBM PS/2’s). One immediate advantage here is that office word processing will not come to a halt all over campus because of “the system being down.”

A comprehensive package of software purchased from the company Information Associates will, when fully implemented, handle all manner of tasks related to course schedules, student records, payroll and personnel records, accounting records, etc. The scheduling and accounting systems are currently operating. Tentatively the purchasing system and electronic mail system are to go online sometime in January, 1991 and; the payroll and personnel systems and phone registration should be operating by January, 1992.

As for the Wang system, after January, 1991, it will no longer be running, and the “Wangnet” network of cables and software which was used to connect the word-processing terminals, PC’s, and printers to the central Wang computer will be replaced by another system of cables configured into what is known as an “ethernet” local area network (as opposed to wide area networks which connect computers which may be dispersed regionally, nationally, or even globally). The term ethernet describes just one way of setting up a local area network; AppleTalk and Arcnet are some other types you may have heard of. What all of these have in common is that they provide a means for assembling a group of computers, printers, and other equipment and getting them to interact in order to transfer information back and forth among themselves.

The basic ethernet model uses one primary cable - the “ether” - as a spine to which other systems can be attached. A simple arrangement like this is shown below:

```
      system A           system C
         ether
        / \            / \
     system B       system D
```

Now if one system, say system A, wants to communicate with another system, say system D, for purposes of retrieving a document from it, or for “logging on” to it, then A puts an appropriate “message” into a unit known as a package and deposits the package on the ether. Besides the message, the package will include information identifying the recipient through an “address” the recipient has been assigned, and will include a return address for the sender. Like a pack of weary travellers hovering around the baggage carousel at an airport waiting for their luggage to appear, each system on the ethernet monitors the packets on the ether for one being sent to it, and detecting one, will capture the package, read the accompanying message, and send an acknowledgment to the sender.
One technical problem with ethernet's way of sending messages is that only one message at a time may appear on the ether. Consequently, any system that wants to transmit a packet must first make sure no other packets are currently being sent. If there are a lot of systems connected to the ether and they generate a lot of traffic among themselves then things will move every slowly as these many systems jockey for times when they can transmit their packets.

One way around this problem is to break at least parts of the ethernet system into smaller ethernet systems that are able to both isolate their own traffic from that of the others and yet allow, messages to pass between systems on different ethernet networks via a device known as a bridge.

Here's what's being done at the College. The campus has been divided into four zones, each of which will be organized into a small ethernet network. These small networks (or segments) are known as the SCIENCE, ARTS, RANDOLPH, and EDUCATION networks and will be connected to one another via bridges and a main ether (known as the network's "backbone") as shown below.

Check your local administrative computing representative for the name of the segment coming to you.

Note, departments that already have their own local area networks already in place can incorporate these into this scheme by employing another bridge, if the departmental network is ethernet; or by using another piece of hardware known as a "gateway" if the network is not ethernet. Basically, all a gateway does is convert the way one system packages and sends its messages (the network's "protocol") into that of another. As an example, inside the J.C. Long building, which houses the School of Business and Economics, the Computer Science Department, and the Departments of Academic Computing and Administrative Computing, is an ethernet network to which are connected most of the Computer Science faculty's computers, the second floor teaching lab (whose IBM PC's are networked together with Arcnet, which is different from ethernet and hence connected to ethernet via a gateway) and the Accounting lab (also IBM PC's connected as another Arcnet network). This system will shortly be bridged into the EDUCATION segment.
Two questions remain. So what? and what will I need to get my computer hooked in (assuming you like my answer to the first question)?

We begin answering the first question by noting that each departmental office has an IBM PS/2 that is connected to its designated segment, the VAX's are connected to their segment, and the library's microVax II (from which it runs the on-line catalog) will be eventually be connected to a segment. This gives each office the potential to log into the VAX and among other things, to send electronic mail to another office via the VAX's e-mail system. When the library computer is connected one could log onto it to access the catalog; additionally, one could connect to another office's computer and send a document to it or get one from it. Although the facilities of the VAX probably will have only marginal interest at best to most faculty, individuals connected to the network, either directly or through some sort of departmental network, will enjoy the same degree of connectedness as the office computers, and will be able to interact with other faculty connected to the network as well. Finally, when the College eventually attaches to a wide area network, say BITNET or INTERNET, access to this network will be facilitated through the network.

As for what it will take (and cost) to get hooked up - it's not going to be cheap. If you are not already part of departmental a network and want an individual connection to your segment, you will need to have something called an ethernet interface card (or just ethernet card) which you insert into your computer, and a phone line to connect your card to a special outlet in the phone jack in your office. The ethernet card takes care of all the line monitoring and transferring of packets to the ether as I described it earlier. You will also need some software to allow you to enter your communications requests from your keyboard and to have these requests transformed into the appropriate messages and packets needed by ethernet. Finally you will be assessed a "connection fee" by administrative computing to help defray some of the additional costs it will incur for adding systems beyond those in the original plan (consider it a type of "impact fee"). Figure on about $1,000 total per system for the, wethernet card, software and connection fee.

On the other hand, if you are already part of a departmental network, as some of you are, then your department will have to purchase either a bridge ($3000, though I saw one advertised recently for $1,600) or a gateway ($3000, but some may be available for less), depending on whether your network is ethernet or not, and you will have to pay the connection fee (just one fee will cover your whole network).

In late September the Commission on Higher Education submitted a group of Task Force report summaries to the President's of South Carolina's colleges and universities which were intended to serve as part of a "statewide planning document" for the Commission for addressing strategic issues in higher education in South Carolina in accordance with its mandate from the State Legislature as specified in the "Cutting Edge" legislation of 1988.

The document given out by CHE to the President's gave summaries of four reports:

* Report of the Task Force on Enrollment Distribution
* Report of the Task Force on Quality Incentives
* Report of the Task Force on Space Use and Space Needs
* Report of the Task Force on the Conversion from Regional to National Peer Groups in the Formula

Reaction to the report by the Presidents and chief Academic Officers of the State's colleges and universities was swift in condemning the reports for signifying a shift in the Commission's view of itself from that of a coordinating body for the State's institutions of higher learning to that of a governing body (though CHE's commissioners deny that this was their intent). Among some of the more objectionable elements of the Task Forces' recommendations are:
• placing enrollment ceilings (the Commission called them "goals") on undergraduate FTE's for each of the State's institutions (the College's would be 6,000 which is where it is now; see the earlier article on formula funding however to see what its implications could be, at least in the short run). Part of the Commission's purpose in so doing is to channel more students into the State's two-year colleges whose enrollments are below national averages.

• that four-year College reexamine their goals and aspirations, avoid inappropriate competition with nearby public and private institutions, and determine their appropriate "niches" as liberal arts, comprehensive, or specialized colleges.

• the suggestion that the spending patterns of institutions be held more accountable to the line item expenditures included in the Commission's appropriations formula and the suggestion that the formula be "adjusted" for those institutions that charge fees which the Commission feels are "far in excess" of what is suggested by the formula.

One aspect of the Task Force reports that was well-received was the recommendation that the Commission move from using regional peer groups to national peer groups for calculating the faculty salary figures used in its appropriations formula.

The Commission solicited response from the public in a series of public hearings it conducted around the state shortly after it released its reports. In a meeting held at the College on October 4, several individuals from the College addressed the Commission on their concerns over the recommendation. These individuals were Mr. John Clark, from the Board of Trustees, President Lightsey, Conrad Festa, Pam Tisdale, Bill Golightly, and the Speaker of the Faculty. Representatives from the College were at the Commission's other five public hearing.

According to Conrad Festa, rather than submit its plan to the Legislature this December as originally planned, CHE has agreed to wait for six months.

On October 12 and 13 the College held its faculty/staff retreat for 1990 in Myrtle Beach. Participating in the retreat were upper-level administrators, program directors, department chairs, deans of schools, and chairs of faculty committees. The focus of the retreat was on the implications of potential university status on the College of Charleston, with separate discussions being held on

• Institutional Organization and Governance Structure

• Undergraduate Programs

• Graduate Programs

• Facilities and other auxiliary enterprises

• Student issues

From Sue Sommer-Kresse, Vice-President for Enrollment Management, comes the following summary of financial aid awards for the last fiscal year (July 1, 1989 to June 30, 1990).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award Per Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grant</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>$1,523,375</td>
<td>1743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEOG</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>104,013</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERKINS (formerly NDSL)</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>400,805</td>
<td>1072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Work Study</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>296,642</td>
<td>1186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-Work Study 580 883,220 1523
Job Locator & Develop. 208 396,656 1907
GSL/PLUS/SLS 1829 5,026,704 2748
C of C Scholarships 340 345,532 1016
Athletic Grants 136 251,064 1846
Abatements:
   Academic 26 33,600 1292
   Athletic 72 82,163 1141
   2% Waiver 66 14,500 906
Non-Institutional Aid 166 223,035 1343
Graduate Assistants 38 128,468 3380
Baruch Loans 85 18,680 220
TOTAL  $9,713,957

From March 4-8, 1991 the Office of Undergraduate Studies and the Career Development Office will sponsor a series of workshops and activities known as “Bridging the Gap.” It is intended to assist College of Charleston seniors in making the transition from life in college to life after college. Among some of the major areas that will focussed on during the week are: The Career Search; The Art and Science of Job Hunting; Developing a New Lifestyle; and Senior Survival Skills. The series will conclude with a Student Employment Salute Day.

Also included in the program will be a career Fair, with visiting employers on campus, an interview day for seniors to interview with these visiting employers, and a summer job fair for students looking for summer employment.

And, to end on a lighter note we have...

NEW ELEMENT DISCOVERED AT NRC RESEARCH CENTRE
(Reprinted from CRESS Bulletin, York University, Jan 24.1990)

The heaviest element known to science was recently discovered by physicists at the NRC Research Centre. The element, tentatively named Administratium, has no protons, 126 assistant neutrons, 75 vice neutrons and 111 assistant vice neutrons. This gives it an atomic mass of 312. These 312 particles are held together in a nucleus by a force that involves the continuous exchange of a meson like particles called morons.

Since it has no electrons, Administratium is inert. However, it can be detected chemically as it impedes every reaction it comes in contact with. According to the discoverers, a minute amount of Administratium caused one reaction to take over four days to complete, when it would normally occur in less than one second.

Administratium has a normal half life of approximately 3 years, at which time it does not actually decay, but instead, undergoes a reorganization in which assistant neutrons, vice neutrons and assistant vice neutrons exchange places. Some studies have shown that the atomic weight actually increases after each reorganization.

Research at other laboratories indicates that Administratium occurs naturally in the atmosphere. It tends to concentrate at certain points such as government agencies, large corporations, universities, and NRC and can actually be found in the newest, best maintained buildings.
Scientists point out that Administratium is known to be toxic at any level of concentration and can easily destroy any productive reactions where it is allowed to accumulate. Attempts are being made to determine how Administratium can be controlled to prevent irreversible damage, but results to date are not promising.

Besides those whose names appear in the various notes, I would like to thank Priscilla Burbage, Sue Dowd, Tom Hamby, President Lightsey, Marcia Moore, Rise’ Porter-Wolf, Sandy Powers, Joel Smith, Mike Smith, and Floyd Tyler, for providing information for this newsletter or verifying some of the details. Thanks also to the person who surreptitiously sent me the “Administratium” item.

Anyone who would likes to supply information, or write an item or letter for the next newsletter, please try to have it to me by November 30.