In the November Newsletter I announced that a committee had been organized by Academic Affairs to assess the information resources needs of the College, to identify its priorities, and to make recommendations to the Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs by December 15. The following is an excerpt from the committee’s report, giving its recommendations:

The committee recommends that the College purchase a high-speed, large storage capacity machine for academic users linked to the campus network. Further, the committee recommends that the staff the Academic Computing Department manage the new machine. Several areas feel that their existing programs will be seriously jeopardized without a major upgrade in computing hardware. The library MicroVax, purchased nearly five years ago, does not have the capacity to operate in the emerging campus computing environment. As more people access the system through the campus network, it will not have the main memory or processing power to accommodate them. The Computer Sciences Department and the Mathematics Department need a new machine to handle algorithmic implementation requirements which they cannot now run. The new machine would replace existing machines in the library and the Computer Sciences Department. At the same time, the academic machine reserved for all academic departments will address some of the other new and existing needs. BITNET access, high volume data manipulation, and the statistical analysis applications requested by many departments could run on this machine.

The committee recommends that additional microcomputer labs, both Macintosh and IBM, be created. Almost all the departments expressed the urgent need for more student microcomputer labs to be used by their faculty teaching classes, and by students outside of classes to complete assignments. The faculty believe, and the committee concurs, that proximity is an important issue. Simply put, faculty work more effectively with students if the labs are located near their offices. Perhaps the new configuration of the College into schools should become the basis for initial allocation and location decisions. The committee further recommends that localized decision-making about hardware and software accompany any decisions about new labs. Finally, the committee recommends that additional classrooms be equipped with single computers and overhead projection units.

The committee recommends that departments and related academic support units have regular, budgeted funding to support existing computer activities as well as appropriate funding for new initiatives in support of teaching and research which require additional computing resources. Over time, this funding should be increased to support minimal microcomputing for all faculty in a networked environment. The committee defines “minimal microcomputing” as network access and word processing capability in one’s own office. As new initiatives are approved, these initiatives would also be regularly funded. Note, regular funding requires:

- initial funding for hardware and software
- funding for maintenance through Academic Computing
- funding for integration into the campus network if appropriate
- replacement or upgrades for hardware and software as that hardware/software becomes obsolete in order to maintain the original functionality.

The committee recommends that more attention be given to planning for academic computing. The administration may want to take advantage of such existing requirements as the annual preparation of Information Technology Plans to develop plans which integrate the computing activities of individual departments, Academic
Computing, Administrative Computing, the Learning Resources Center and the Library. Further, the committee recommends that the Academic Computer Committee be (re)formed. The committee could be chaired by the Director of Academic Computing, and include the Director of Libraries, a representative from the Administrative Computing Advisory Committee, and a representative from each of the new schools. This advisory committee should report to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. The primary responsibility of the committee will be planning. The committee will recommend priorities for new initiatives which require additional computing resources. The committee may also develop an allocation scheme whereby older computers are redirected to appropriate users on campus.

The committee recommends that the College add a BITNET connection and make the soon-to-be implemented Internet connection available to all faculty over the campus network.

The committee recommends that the College join EDUCOM --- the leading professional support organization for computers in higher education.

The committee is concerned that faculty and students be fully aware of the many legal and ethical issues surrounding the use of computer software. The committee recommends that the Academic Computing Department provide specific information on what users can and cannot do with the software they acquire. The committee recommends that the Student Affairs Division develop a code of behavior similar to an honor code which speaks to illegal copying of software, invasion of privacy of data files, plagiarism, and unauthorized access for students at the College.

---

The following is a summary of the administration’s allocation of discretionary equipment funds for 1990-91:

- **Library**
  - $200,000 for books and $12,000 for equipment

- **School of the Arts**
  - $31,000 for piano lab equipment and dehumidifiers for the piano rooms; slides for art history, easels for the drawing studio, a video projector, and a computer and printer.

- **School of Business and Economics**
  - $19,000 for a network file server for classroom use; for a computer, printer, and statistical packages for research; and a computer, CD ROM reader, and two-year subscription to Disclosure (which gives financial information over the last five years on over 12,000 companies)

- **Biology**
  - $75,000 for laboratory equipment, including a gamma counter, a liquid scintillation analyzer, rotors for high-speed centrifuges, a polymerase chain reactor, a recording current meter, a CTD, a fluorometer, and a spectrophotometer

- **Chemistry**
  - $55,000 towards the cost for a video graphics projection system and computer for classroom instruction, and laboratory equipment, including Cypress electroanalytical system, a Galactic data station, a Perkin-Elmer LS-50 spectrometer, a gas chromatograph-mass spectrometer auto sampler, and a polarimeter

- **Computer Science**
  - $40,000 towards the cost of a 12-station Macintosh II laboratory.

- **School of Education**
  - $3,500 for software and video disks for computer education classes and a TV to hook up to computers in the lab
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Allocation Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>$2,500 for books and equipment for the writing laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>$23,000 for laboratory equipment, including a power auger, computer for their x-ray diffraction system, surveying equipment, and an image analysis system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>$3,000 for maps, books and videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>$4500 for maps, books, and videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>$30,000 towards the cost of a computer laboratory for graduate students. When completed the lab will have 6 SUN3/50 and one SUN3/60 workstations based around a SPARC Station II file server.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>$2,500 for implementing a connection to the VAX and for bulletin boards and posters for classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>$12,500 to upgrade the file server the for department’s network and for two computers and software for the psychology lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/Health</td>
<td>$12,500 towards the cost of a video analyzer recorder system and a clinical chemistry analyzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>$49,500 to upgrade their instructional computer lab with 14 Macintosh LC’s and two CD ROM readers, and for laboratory equipment including a Lynx CCD Photometric System, a video disk player, driven from a Macintosh, for use in classroom instruction, and a holographic set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>$1,500 for computer upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology/Anthropology</td>
<td>$9,700 for videotapes, two Field ZEOS laptop computers, two printers, and a Macintosh for the archeology laboratory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total allocation came to $586,700.

The following is a summary of the administration’s allocation of additional faculty lines for 1991-92:

- **School of the Arts**: 1 line for a tenure-track faculty member
- **School of Business and Economics**: 1 line for a tenure-track faculty ember
- **Biology**: 1 line for a department chair and 1 line for a laboratory director/instructor (the latter is a conversion of an adjunct position)
- **School of Education**: 2 lines for tenure-track faculty members
- **English**: 1 line for a tenure-track faculty member
- **Geology**: 1 line for a physical geography tenure-track faculty member
- **History**: 2 lines for converting full-time adjuncts to instructors or assistant professors
- **Languages**: 2 lines for converting full-time adjuncts to instructors or assistant professors
- **Mathematics**: 1 line for a tenure-track faculty member as called for in the proposals
Psychology
Sociology/Anthropology

In addition to these lines, President Lightsey will be providing lines for the Deans of the two newly formed schools.

Citing a hiatus in the College’s assessment program because we have not had a committee to replace the previous ad hoc committee, (recall that at the October meeting the faculty voted that the assessment committee become a standing committee until the beginning of the 1991-92 academic year) Conrad Festa, Sr. Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty, has asked 14 members of the faculty, staff, and administration to serve on a replacement committee for the previous ad hoc committee until the standing faculty committee becomes active. According to Conrad, in order to comply with the South Carolina Assessment Program, the College must adopt plans and submit assessment results to the Commission on Higher Education beginning this June 15. The following people will serve on the administrative ad-hoc assessment committee (2nd edition): John Newell (History), Tom Livingston (Business Administration and Economics), Carol Toris (Psychology), Andrew Lewis (Physical Education), Hope Florence (Mathematics), Bonnie Devet (English), Hugh Wilder (Philosophy), George Dickinson (Sociology/Anthropology), Henry Donato (Chemistry), Mike Pincus (Languages), Cheryl Bolchoz (Institutional Research), Sam Hines (Academic Affairs), Sue Sommer-Kresse (Academic Affairs), Bob Fowler (Education and Director of Assessment), who will continue to chair the committee.

The committee, and the chairs of departments and deans of schools met with Conrad on January 7 for a short review of where we are and where we need to go with assessment this year. This was followed by a meeting of just the committee, at which time it formed two subcommittees - one on assessment of majors and another on assessment of general degree requirements.

From Sissy James, Director of Academic Computing, come the following items:

1. The Department of Academic Computing has published a Software Catalog which describes over 1,000 software titles available through Academic Computing. Anyone interested in obtaining a copy of this catalog should contact Sissy.

2. Over the past few years the Medical University of South Carolina developed a two day Macintosh training seminar, held at Camp St. Christopher on Seabrook Island. The purpose of this seminar was to introduce administrators and faculty to the Macintosh and various software application packages. The program was so successful that Apple Computer, Inc. has agreed to fund it and is offering it to various institutions. Consequently, March 5 and 6, there will be a session of Camp Macintosh. There are 24 openings, eight each for the College, MUSC, and the Citadel.

Among the items on the agenda for the two-day session are: an introduction to the Macintosh SE computer, an introduction to word processing (using MacWrite); an introduction to statistical packages (using StatWorks); an introduction to graphing scientific data (using Cricket Graph); an introduction to electronic mail (using Quick Mail) and file servers (using AppleShare); presentation management (using PowerPoint); demonstrations of conversions of IBM files to Macintosh files and other Macintosh programs, and teaching with multimedia; and an introduction to HyperCard. This training is offered at no cost to the participants.
Please let Sissy know if you or anyone in your division would like to attend Camp Macintosh. The Camp is intended for faculty and administrators with little or no computer experience and is offered at no cost to the participants.

As a final note about Academic Computing at the College, I would like to reprint some items from the “Policies and Procedures” section of the Software Catalog that some of you might find informative:

- All College of Charleston faculty, students, and staff may use the two main computing centers (in the basement of the Library and in Room 404 of the J.C. Long Building) by simply walking into a center and logging in as guest. Many software titles are provided via the network and access is through a menu selection. You must provide your own disk to save your files.

- Any faculty or staff wishing to check out software may do so by contacting Academic Computing or by going to the software desk in room 404 of the J.C. Long Building. The software may be checked out for extended periods, but must be renewed every two weeks.

- Academic Computing is the licensed owner of all software in the Software Catalog except those titles created by faculty. Duplication of the software is prohibited.

---

**Fall Reports of Standing Faculty Committees**

**Faculty Welfare Committee:** [This is the report presented by Michael Finefrock at the December meeting of the faculty.] This semester the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) met monthly. It has discussed with the President the College No Smoking policy and recommended placement of additional benches outside campus buildings, especially the Education Center, for those who wish to smoke. It is evaluating the descriptions of benefits, now in place for College Faculty, that are provided by the Office of Personnel.

In the first week of the semester the President presented to Faculty committees a document, that he indicated had been written by Dr. Hines, in which he asked certain Faculty committees to consider aspects of school structure that are germane to their committee responsibilities, and called for “as broad a consultation process as possible.” To the FWC in particular was addressed the question of “What general principles should govern the organizational membership of schools - number of schools, disciplinary groups, numbers of Faculty in each school.” At its meeting on September 10 the Faculty voted to direct all responses to the President’s request through the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President (FACP). The FWC met on September 14 to discuss the matter, and had prepared and submitted its recommendations before the FACP’s memorandum of October 1 was received. That report reads as follows:

The members of the FWC, having discussed the substance of Dr. Lightsey’s memorandum of August 28 on the subject of an “Academic Organization Change”, forward to your committee for communication to the President the following position statement:

- a. The members of the FWC prefer that no further “schools” be created within the College of Charleston, and urge that there be no further division of the Arts and Sciences into separate schools. Should a School of Arts and Sciences be created nonetheless, then the members of the committee recommend that each department within such a school continue to be administered by a Chair. Special and/or inter-departmental programs should not be placed under a separate jurisdiction.

- b. The FWC recommends that all departments, whether presently affiliated with a school or not, be accorded the option to “join” whatever school their members select by majority vote.”

As the basis for their discussion, the members of the FWC had only the prima facie statements provided in the
call by the Administration for a discussion of the creation of additional schools. In view of the fact that the President's Myrtle Beach Retreat was still a month away and a Faculty opinion poll had been recommended, committee discussion proceeded on the assumption that we were only at the first step in a process, and the committee members sought to begin that process by taking the position favored by a large number of departments and Faculty not yet included within the school structure.

The members of the FWC believe that the "broad consultation process" sought by the President is not yet complete since, regrettfully, the primary arguments of the Administration in favor of the creation of additional schools were communicated to the Faculty by the FACP only within the last week.

Research and Development Committee: This brief is a summary of committee activity for the Fall Semester of 1990-91. We evaluated nine (9) first-round proposals and recommended that eight of them be funded either fully or partially in the total amount of $11,780. The breakdown of the awards is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Michel</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
<td>Exhibition of Human Figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniell Bellack</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>$780.30</td>
<td>Investigation of Human Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dexter Buell</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
<td>Spoleto Bridge Sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Tidwell</td>
<td>BA/Economics</td>
<td>$1520.00</td>
<td>Judicila Examination of PTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Bowers</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>$2000.00</td>
<td>Memory and Food-motivated Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Logan</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>$1480.00</td>
<td>Stability and Uniqueness of Mathematical Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert McCarthy</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>$2000.00</td>
<td>Embryonic Gene Study System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Shanks</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>$2000.00</td>
<td>Anoxic Microzones in Marine Snow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please inform the Faculty that the deadline for round-two proposals is January 25, 1991. We have money to award, and it is available in the form of College Grants and Summer Grants. Chairs and Deans have the necessary information to facilitate an application.

Committee on Curriculum and Academic Planning: The committee met several times during the Fall semester to consider proposals from various schools and departments. The memoranda circulated to the faculty for the October, November, and December faculty meetings summarize the outcomes of these meetings.

On November 19, Dr. Tony Boccanfuso of the National Science Foundation was on campus to discuss grant opportunities with NSF. One of the faculty attending this meeting was Chris Starr of the Computer Science Department who sent a memo to the rest of the department summarizing what went on at the meeting. With Chris' permission I am passing along portions of his memo for the benefit of those who could not attend the meeting:

A representative from the NSF visited our campus to enlighten the faculty on the various mechanisms through which a small college can be more successful in securing grant awards from the NSF. The meeting was attended by a small group of eight faculty members.

The NSF is an independent agency of the federal government. Although having to compete with even social service agencies in the budget process, the NSF has been funded near their requested level.

The NSF over the past year had been partial (and still is) to infrastructure building and rebuilding. The updating and formation of academic research laboratories at large institutions has taken the largest fraction of the NSF budget. Any researcher here may apply for the remaining NSF budget along with applicants from larger institutions. However, there are a few special programs designed to increase the competitiveness of grant applications from undergraduate institutions. Below are brief descriptions of a few of these NSF programs.

RIA - Research Instrumentation Award The RIA is designed to provide money for the purchase of research
equipment. The award requires matching funds from the institution. Our administration would have to commit at least in writing to support the grant.

REI - Research Experiences for undergraduates (I don’t remember the meaning of the “I”.) The REI is designed to fund up to eight students at $4000 each (+25% indirect costs) to provide research opportunities and experience for undergraduate students.

ROA - Research Opportunity Award The ROA is designed to allow one or more faculty members from an undergraduate institution to participate in research at a major institution to bring back experience and increased competitiveness for subsequent grant awards. The ROA is a supplementary award to an existing grant and the application must be submitted by a principle investigator (PI) from the major institution.

There are other awards that were discussed. One of the awards was for funding minority high school students as research assistants.

Of perhaps more interest to you are the rules of thumb for NSF grant application. First, you should title all grants as RUI (research in undergraduate institutions) designated grants. The designation will make the grant application stand out. The reviewers’ checklist is still headed by (1) solid science and (2) preparation of students for graduate training, but the RUI designation will give your application the edge over a similar application from a larger (graduate) institution.

Grant applications at the NSF are reviewed either by an in-house panel or by an ad hoc review group appointed by the NSF and headed by an NSF chair. We were encouraged to include a list of reviewers in the cover letter to the grant application who are competent to review the grant for the NSF. These peers must:

- have no conflict of interest;
- have no concurrent proposal to the NSF;
- have no declinations in the past two years;
- not be used too often.

Thanks to everyone who sent me information for the Newsletter or who confirmed information, including Conrad Festa, Sam Hines, Sissy James, David Cohen, Richard Godsen, Frank Morris, Michael Finefrock, Chris Starr, and all department chairs and Deans of schools.