STATEMENTS BY THE NOMINEES FOR SPEAKER OF THE FACULTY

Statement of Klaus DeAlbuquerque

I accepted the nomination for Speaker because I saw this as an opportunity to raise important concerns that are widely articulated by the Faculty, but somehow never get addressed or debated fully. Perhaps it is because I still retain an idealized view of what a college/university ought to be and am fundamentally committed to the notion that the faculty are the institution and ultimately have a higher authority in its governance. Indeed, there are legal opinions in several states that affirm this. After all, ours is the central role in the transmission of knowledge and this is what this enterprise is all about. As Speaker my main concern will be with finding ways to reassert our authority over the governance of this institution, and not just over the academic structure and programs, but in all those areas that directly affect the academic mission of this institution.

My wish list, then, of things I would like to attempt to do as Speaker, or the areas I would like to initiate discussion and/or change is as follows:

1. A careful review of all lines of authority and in particular those areas of the SC Code that circumscribe the authority of faculty at public institutions in the state. It goes without saying that the professoriate at our public institutions have enormous latent political clout and, if the California Faculty Association is any guide, can organize to significantly affect higher education issues in this state. As someone who has worked in a Legislature, I am very aware that the process of law making and revision is usually responsive to organized and vocal constituencies. I therefore see linkages with all other public institutions and political organization as a necessary first step, and certainly the revival of strong AAUP chapters is a positive development in this direction.

2. A second and related task would be to facilitate direct faculty contact with the Board of Trustees. Clearly it is in the interest of the faculty that we know something about the governing board of this institution, and that they know something about us, individually and collectively. From my very limited contact with Board members, I have the distinct impression that they are not being given the whole picture and have no idea about faculty and student opinions on the various issues they are being asked to decide. To this end, I would invite Board members to meet with faculty biannually and to express their views either publicly or in writing. As elected/appointed representatives they have a mandate to all citizens of the state to listen to, and ask questions of, all constituencies, especially those most directly affected, and not to merely rubber stamp whatever is presented to them by the administration. As a corollary, I would undertake a review of the powers of the Board with a view to lobbying to change those powers that encroach or infringe upon academic freedom.

3. A faculty task force needs to be assembled to rewrite sections of the Faculty-Administration Manual to reflect the changing structure of the institution as well as to redress all those areas of the Manual that are inconsistent with AAUP’s Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Since the College subscribes to AAUP principles, it has always been troubling, for example, that the President and Board of Trustees can reject faculty recommendations without providing “compelling reasons”. In the absence of such a proviso in the Manual, any recommendations for restructuring Faculty Committees or the formation of a new faculty governing body, are secondary. If our recommendations can be ignored or rejected without “compelling reasons” then we do not have shared governance, and we might as well just meet our classes, hold our office hours, and go home. Furthermore, we must make sure that the Manual is followed scrupulously by all parties and that it is not simply
used against faculty members when convenient. The most cursory review of administrative decisions and practices over the last 10 years will show that the administration routinely penalizes faculty members for the very same things administrators seem to be able to do with impunity. Even simple matters like deadlines seem only to apply to the faculty (e.g. faculty are two months late this year in receiving notices of approval of sabbaticals).

4. We need to reassert our primary responsibility for all academic matters, which means that any changes that directly affect the academic mission of this institution, must have faculty input and approval. I have been very troubled, as have many other faculty, that we have been routinely bypassed on some very important matters. The change in “Mission Statement” which originated in the Office of Academic Affairs and was passed by the Board of Trustees is a case in point. Another more egregious example was the move to new team sports and membership in the NCAA. This was not discussed with the relevant faculty standing committees, even though this mandate is very clear and the point was made very forcefully to the administration at the time. The administration’s response was to arrange for an ad hoc committee that would do its bidding. There is now an administrative move afoot to consolidate power into an “Academic Council”, where many matters which are clearly within the purview of the faculty, including class size and curriculum, will be decided. As a faculty we must wake up and exercise our primary responsibility in such areas as tenure and promotion, recruitment (if the new Deans are to be given faculty appointments, who has the ultimate say in their selection?), academic planning, academic standards, curriculum, academic structure, and so on. This is why I expressed concern that the move to additional Schools occurred without much faculty input or debate, and why I continue to be concerned about our planned move to University status. So far, the level of planning, discussion, and cooperation necessary for such a move has not taken place. Neither has there been any discussion about the kind of university we ought to become, the types of graduate program we might offer, staffing issues, teaching loads, funding, tenure and promotion criteria, etc. I am also concerned with the potential addition of new campuses (as an urban campus we have the usual constraints on expansion). The north area campus was supposed to be a temporary stop gap to ease congestion at the College, but now appears to have acquired a de facto permanence. It is theoretically possible for faculty to teach all their courses at Ashley Phosphate Road without having to step foot on campus. The possibility of a new campus in Gaffney is also cause for concern. As it is we have adjunct faculty, who hardly ever set foot on this campus, teaching graduate education courses for us across the state. We are even poised to establishing some presence in Italy, Czechoslovakia and Poland, to complement our not particularly useful (for faculty and students) linkages with institutions in Thailand and China. The proliferation of mall courses (“shop and learn”) and non-credit courses also has some important implications for the liberal arts ideal to which we remain committed--after all the enterprise of communicating and warranting knowledge is not a business and cannot be managed, packaged and marketed as one.

5. We need to examine carefully this whole logic of expansion. In a state and a nation with below replacement level fertility and an annually shrinking pool of 18 year olds, do the demographics support our targets regarding student numbers (and just what might these be?). Much of the growth in the tri-county area has been due to immigration, and not of college age persons, and that alone is insufficient to warrant the kinds of numbers (10,000/12,000) that are being bruitied about. Despite projected changes in the age composition of our student body, 18-22 year olds will remain the overwhelming majority of our students, and how much more aggressively will we have to compete for this shrinking pool? As it is, we are recruiting further afield then we ever did before. In this climate of declining enrollments, Colleges and universities across the nation are cutting programs, and in some cases, whole departments, and I have yet to see any data or projections to warrant us continuing to buck the trend.

6. Like most faculty, I believe we have not managed our enrollment properly. Many of our classes are overflowing. Students are routinely shut out of required courses and have to scramble around to assemble any kind of schedule. Pre-registration, registration, and the first few weeks of classes are becoming progressively more chaotic. We need more full-time faculty. We need classroom space even more desperately and yet we dedicate a new conference center that is bound to be underpopulated. The conditions in Maybank and the Education Center are
deplorable—the heating and cooling systems seldom function properly, there are leaks, large areas of floor tiles missing, damaged ceilings and walls, inoperable water fountains and pencil sharpeners, stained carpets, broken furniture, and often a conspicuous absence of chalk and erasers. Something needs to be done to improve the general maintenance and cleanliness of our classroom buildings. Clearly this is a result of very heavy traffic and overuse. We need to rationalize our growth and plan accordingly, and not rush to add new sections weeks and days before a new semester by expanding the usable daily life of a classroom and hiring more adjuncts. On the subject of adjuncts, like many faculty members I am concerned over the increasing number of courses being taught by adjuncts and the likely impact of this on academic quality. We need to consider instituting some ceiling on the percentage of courses being offered by adjuncts, and I am sure accrediting bodies are going to be examining this issue more closely in the years to come.

I know many faculty members are disaffected, some are simply very tired, and still others remain totally inconvenienced that any real changes can be effected (one of my colleagues with a fine sense of the absurd, quipped that I might as well run on a platform of “free pay toilets and eternal life for everyone”) by an activist Speaker or by any kind of new faculty governing body. However, if we do not have a Speaker who persists in engaging the administration and the Board in wide ranging discussions, asks difficult questions, and is a tireless advocate for the consultative process and for faculty rights, then we will continue to find out about changes at this institution after the fact, and will become even more marginalized from the governance of this institution.

**Statement of George Pothering**

One year ago I wrote for this Newsletter an outline of my views of the role of the Speaker, emphasizing the need for him or her to be informed about what is going on at the College, to try to acquire a sense of the Faculty is on the issues confronting us, and to serve as a communications link between the different segments of the College community. Since my election I have been privileged (some have said cursed) to serve you in one of the more dynamic of my thirteen years at the College, with issues such as the reorganization of the academic departments into schools, the faculty senate proposal, and the consideration of a move to university status being among the highlights of the past year. Especially when these and other issues were the main focus of the College’s attention, I tried to keep in mind what I wrote last March and to fulfill that role as successfully as I could.

One thing that my experiences this past year has shown me however is that communication between the administration and the faculty and within the faculty itself needs to be enhanced, and that a greater sense of awareness of each other needs to be developed between the faculty and our Board of Trustees. I shall return to this last point later on, but as an aside I would like to note here that among the real pleasures of my year as Speaker have been the occasions when I have been able to meet with the men and women on the Board. I have found that they take their mission seriously and express many of the same concerns as the faculty. One of the objectives of the Speaker for the remainder of this year and for the coming year should be to develop more ways for the Board and the faculty to understand each other.

Now to the main focus of this narrative. During this academic year, the two most dominant issues over which faculty have raised their concerns have been, and for a while should continue to be, those of the further organization of departments into schools and the prospect of the College becoming a university. Somewhat less volatile has been the faculty governance issue, perhaps because the latter is an issue that is totally within our control to decide, while with the first two the faculty only serves in an advisory capacity - the actual decisions rest with someone else - in the case of schools, with the President, and in the case of university status, with the Board of Trustees and South Carolina Legislative Assembly. Of all the concerns expressed over these two issues, the one that repeatedly surfaces is that the opinions of the faculty are being ignored or misrepresented by our decision-makers and those advising the decision-makers. In the latter case, of course, our own Faculty Advisory Committee came under fire for recommending to President Lightsey that more than one new school be formed instead of the one additional
school supposedly favored by the majority of those who forwarded their opinions to the Advisory Committee. In my opinion, however, the results of the survey conducted by Professors DeAlbuquerque, Olejniczak, and Wilder did not reflect an overwhelming consensus in favor of just one school.

Though these two issues have received the most widespread and public attention, at other times I have heard frustration expressed in smaller forums (such as departmental meetings, faculty committee meetings, meetings of the council of chairs, the discussions conducted by the ad hoc committee on hearings, and the recent reorganization meeting of the AAUP, etc.) over lack of information about or discussion of such issues as advising, growth, proliferation of adjunct faculty, scheduling of courses, the condition of classrooms and buildings, and class sizes. Sometimes the opportunities and responsibilities of my position have allowed me to acquire a broader perspective of what is going on and hence to provide some of the information sought. Frequently, however, the reception of this information has been followed an expression of dissatisfaction that it had to come from the Speaker rather than from the administration.

For me, the major purpose of this Newsletter is to get more information to the faculty about the issues at the College which influence us. However since it is distributed throughout the campus (besides all faculty it is received by all administrative departments heads together with at least one additional copy for their department, it is available to students via the SGA and Cougar Pause, and is mailed to each member of the Board of Trustees) the Newsletter provides an additional forum for getting your opinions heard by others. Unfortunately, a greater awareness of this use needs to be fostered, and if re-elected Speaker, one of my goals for next year will be to persuade more departments to share their information with the rest of the campus via the Faculty Newsletter. I want to target academic departments here as well. I think it is just as important that the rest of the campus know what the faculty in these departments are doing as it is for these faculty know what the rest of the campus is doing.

To conclude this thought, I think the faculty should know that I have found that the requests which I make to the administration for information have been met almost always with cooperation, and in some cases eagerness. I especially want to single out Sue Sommer-Kresse and Susan Sanders in this regard who regularly send me reports without my requesting them first. It is my hope that in time the Faculty Newsletter will be more widely seen as the communications medium it is intended to be and that others around the campus will likewise routinely send the Speaker copies of information that involve the interests of the faculty.

Shortly I hope that we will have an electronic mail system to complement the Newsletter as medium for campus communication. Since President Lightsey has approved the acquisition of an new academic computer, the implementation of a campus-wide system is one step closer. As Speaker, I hope to take full advantage of its potential to reach many people across campus more quickly and with less effort than conventional campus mail and even the phone system in some cases. Furthermore, with an anticipated hook-up to a wide area network, our campus can finally enjoy the opportunities to communicate with colleagues around the world that many other campuses enjoy. As Speaker I would look forward to working with the Academic Computing Department and the various academic departments to promote and facilitate the use of this resource by all interested faculty. One of the concerns expressed by several faculty over the partitioning of the departments into the schools is the potential lack of contact with their colleagues that may eventually result from such new associations. The ease and rapidity with which news, information, and memoranda can be disseminated electronically to a large number of subscribers can make e-mail an important new tool for building a better-informed and more communicative campus.

There are two final notes I would like to make. First, as I noted earlier, I think the faculty, indeed the whole campus, needs to be better informed about our Board of Trustees, and that the members of the Board need to know about our faculty from individual faculty and representatives of the faculty. Another of my goals for the coming year would be to work with the Board to formulate a way to have regular, direct interactions between them and us.

Next, I think some scheduled meetings of representatives of our faculty committees (the chairs of those commit-
tees being the likely candidate, of course) would be useful so that these bodies can have a way of interacting in order to learn what the others are doing. Among some of the refrains I heard coming from some committees concerning the Advisory Committee’s recommendations to the President on schools, were those which began “Well we thought they were going to...,” while the Advisory Committee had its own expectations of what it was going to receive from those committees. Periodic reports on each other’s activities - with the opportunity of follow-up discussion - and reports from other members of the College could be one way to avoid similar misunderstandings in the future and to ensure that matters that may fall within the purview of several committee are afforded the opportunity of a comprehensive discussion. Such a coalition of representatives could also benefit the Speaker by serving as an informal executive committee to help him or her put together a more representative faculty response on those occasions when such a response is needed on relatively short notice.

Let me conclude, in a round-about way, with one final goal. Over the past year many of you have approached me with words of encouragement and advice on the job I have doing, and asked me how I like being Speaker. Surprise seems to be a common reaction, when I say that I am enjoying the position. Well, it’s true, I do. But this does not stem from some megalomaniacal sense of newly acquired power, but from the opportunities its has given me to meet with members of the College with whom I had irregular or no contact previously. Thus, my final goal is to project as positive an image as possible of the enjoyment the position can bring in the hope more people will later be willing to allow themselves to be nominated for Speaker if asked by the Nomination’s Committee.

As I reported at the February faculty meeting, in January the Board of Trustees decided to defer a its decision on university status until its April meeting, but did allow the College to initiate the legislative actions required for this change and to conduct a needs assessment for graduate programs in the tri-county area which will be requested by the Commission on Higher Education.

The Board’s ad hoc committee studying the issue of university status made the recommendation to begin the legislative actions now because of the normally lengthy period of time required to get a bill passed by both Houses of the Legislative Assembly. A bill related to our change in status is expected to be filed at the end of this month and introduced into both the State House and the State Senate for separate actions by each body. Following initial readings by these bodies, each version of the bill will be passed on to a respective Education Committee for another hearing. This could occur in late May or early June. Assuming a favorable report from these committees, each bill will be placed on the calendar for consideration by the full House or full Senate as is appropriate. This could not reasonably be expected to occur before next January, the beginning of the second session of the legislative term. Each body will then give its version of the bill second and third hearings. Depending on which version of the bill offers the earliest chance of passage one of them will be pushed by the College. Assuming this version of the bill is eventually approved by both the House and Senate, it will then be sent to the Governor for his signature. If this process should fail to be completed by the end of the legislative term in June, 1992, however, it will automatically die and the whole process started anew when the next legislative term begins in January of 1993.

The Board emphasized however that all legislative action on the university status bill can be halted at any time should the Board decide not to pursue university status.

A common question asked in relation to the College’s consideration of a move towards university status is “What advantages will this have for the College?” Conrad Festa, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs furnished me with the following copy of a statement he made to the ad hoc committee of the College’s Board of Trustees which was charged with investigating the change to university status. They outline his views on this question.

There are several reasons why the College of Charleston should seek and achieve university status.
The first is that as a state supported institution it should seek to rise to its fullest potential to meet its designated mission and the educational needs of the population that it serves. For years, almost twenty now, educational specialists, the business community, and the population at large have expressed the need for expanded higher education, graduate education and specifically the need for a university in this part of the state. Study after study reveal that the need still exists and that the need is growing each year. We as the senior multi-purpose institution in this area are the logical and most well prepared school to play the part of a university. The fact of the matter is that we are already playing that role, and there is no way that we can turn our backs on that responsibility and opportunity. Official designation as a university certifies both academically & publicly what we have been doing, and it clarifies and crystallizes a vision for this institution.

Second, the achievement of authorized university status brings with it several important advantages: one, we will get from the state the support necessary to more easily provide graduate education; two, we will be a much more attractive school for the strongest and the best faculty candidates. Three, we will be able to add faculty, thereby increasing our ability to offer more varied programs on the undergraduate level staffed by excellently qualified faculty; four, we will be able to afford more opportunities for undergraduate research as well as graduate research and research possibilities for our faculty. Five, we will be looked on much more favorably by both private and governmental funding agencies (the money we generate through grants is essential as additional support for our everyday curricular and operating endeavors). Six, our reputation for quality faculty, diverse academic programs, and leadership in higher education will enhance considerably our ability to attract the best students and allow us to stabilize our undergraduate enrollment at the quality level we have all been seeking; and, finally, as a state supported institution it will raise our funding base from that of a college to that of a university (certainly no small consideration). By being a university in name as well as function we will serve the business and development interests of our region. To all foreign investors as well as many other investors right here in the United States a college represents little more than a high school educational institution. The presence of a university and its ability and willingness to meet the graduate and professional educational needs of these companies makes our area a more attractive place to settle; in fact, the presence of a university is one of the very top considerations of these companies in their decisions of where to settle). The job opportunities and the wealth brought into a geographical area by the new business and industrial companies will clearly bring benefits to the educational institutions which serve them.

The need, the opportunity, the responsibility, and benefits to university status is clear.

Potentially, there is a down side, however, and many of the persons who have come to speak today have addressed it. Conventionally, but let me hasten to say that not always, universities support the graduate endeavors to the detriment of the undergraduate endeavors. The most important value sometimes neglected is excellence in undergraduate teaching. That is a danger that we must keep clearly in mind as we discuss this matter and, if we do proceed with university status, a matter that must be constantly monitored by the faculty and the administration and the Board of Trustees of this institution. We must never let an opportunity go by to emphasize our primary mission and our principle value -- undergraduate teaching and a liberal education. We must, both as faculty and as administrators, make absolutely clear through our policies and our decisions, most especially our personnel decisions, that we value the endeavors of undergraduate teaching and of excellence in the classroom. Although there is a danger of letting that value slip, and I have seen it happen, it is absolutely within our power to prevent that from happening, and I have seen that too.

Clearly, we will be helped in that endeavor by a growing national commitment to undergraduate education. We have read the articles critical of those research universities that have neglected their undergraduate mission. I can promise you we will never place our priorities differently from what they have been and are right now.
Sue Sommer-Kresse, Vice President for Enrollment Management sent along several reports. First we have the following Enrollment Report for the current Spring semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head Count</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>6509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next two reports contain data required by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education. The report of “Number of Students per Class Hour by Discipline” provides a five-year history of average class enrollments by discipline.

Number of Students per Class Hour by Discipline

Fall 1986-Fall 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Fall 86</th>
<th>Fall 87</th>
<th>Fall 88</th>
<th>Fall 89</th>
<th>Fall 90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Art</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.S.O.L.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.I.L.</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Seminar</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Studies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studia Humanitatis</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>110.3</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>227.8</td>
<td>562.0</td>
<td>519.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Classes</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>127.1</td>
<td>124.5</td>
<td>126.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Classes</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate 1st Level</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>144.3</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Classes</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>232.6</td>
<td>471.4</td>
<td>420.0</td>
<td>718.1</td>
<td>761.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Classes</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sue provides the following observations about the data in the above reports.

1. The highest average class size is in the School of Business with an average of 30.6. Note that this is the one department which has elected to offer some entry level classes taught by excellent faculty with limits of 100 or more.

2. At the lower division level 60 of our courses enroll fewer than 30 students. 2.4% of the lower division classes enroll more than 60 students.
3. At the upper division level 55% of the courses enroll fewer than 25 students. 0.9% of upper division courses enroll more than 50 students.

4. Factors which influence class size include the following.
   a. The College of Charleston has added 30 new faculty lines in the last two years. The need for more full-time faculty and the need to replace adjunct faculty is being addressed.
   b. Departments in which faculty receive three hours teaching credit for a one credit course (science labs), will tend to have a higher average class size, because faculty are available to teach fewer credit hours within the authorized 12 hour load.
   c. Double sections may be requested by departments thereby providing higher average enrollments.
   d. Release time for administrative duties and funded research does not affect class size (it does increase the number of adjunct faculty required to teach scheduled sections). Faculty may elect to teach nine hours, but must teach the same number of students, thereby average class size does increase.

---

**Fall reports of Standing Committee (Continued)**

**Academic Standards Committee:** The Academic Standards Committee met seven times in the fall semester, 1990. Student petitions were received and acted upon as follows:

- Exceptions to 7 of last 37 rule: 3 received and 3 granted
- Exceptions to Minimum Degree Requirements: 2 received and 2 denied
- Approval of Alternative to Language for LD Students: 3 received and 3 approved

The Committee sent the following recommendation to Dr. Lightsey concerning the establishment of schools:

**June 28, 1990:**

It is proposed that the departments of the College of Charleston that are not a part of one of the already existing schools be a school of arts and sciences and be called the College of Charleston.

The committee presented the following proposals to the faculty and both were accepted:

1. Policy for awarding of college credits on the basis of placement examinations in languages.

2. Introduction to Geography and higher level courses in geography be acceptable transfer courses for elective credit.

The Committee re-established that the faculty had voted (May 3, 1982) to accept Religious Studies as a separate area under the Humanities Requirement.

**Committee on Graduate and Continuing Education:** I received a five page report from Linda Plunkett, Chair of this committee summarizing their meetings over the fall semester. The committee's meetings were held to discuss issues and concerns that may arise should the College of Charleston (1) attain university status, or (2) establish a school system for the entire College. Rather than reproduce the entire report here, I will include just the questions or issues addressed. Copies of the complete report will be placed in the faculty lounge in Maybank Hall and on reserve in the library.

1. **Relationship Between Undergraduate and Graduate Programs**
   a. Who will teach graduate courses -- tenured or untenured faculty, or both?
   b. How will teaching loads and research expectations be defined and balanced?
   c. What will be the criteria for calculating release time for graduate faculty?
d. Maintaining the quality of undergraduate program.

e. Will graduate programs require Saturday and evening classes? Given the needs of the community, will graduate programs be daytime or night programs, or both?

f. Will sufficient financial support be available in the form of reduced teaching loads, additional faculty lines, release time for research, and much more support for library resources, especially journals?

2. Definition of Graduate Faculty

a. Who will be considered graduate faculty? Should the faculty manual's definition of "graduate faculty" be revised?

b. What should the guidelines be for distinguishing program faculty from graduate faculty?

3. Restructuring of the Graduate Council

a. How should the graduate council be structured?

b. Should all departments have input into the development of graduate programs?

4. Deans of Graduate Programs

a. Is a graduate dean necessary, and if so what might be his/her duties?

b. Maintaining minimum standards of graduate programs

c. What role would the dean play in the selection of faculty to teach graduate courses?

d.

5. Cross-Listing of Degrees With Other Area Institutions

a. Should graduate degrees be developed as joint programs with other institutions?

b. How should the possibility of area duplication of graduate programs be handled?

c. How will the College of Charleston insure the high quality of course content and teaching in joint programs?

6. Approval of New Graduate Programs

a. Will new graduate programs be presented to the graduate faculty of the College, or will they be submitted through the College-wide faculty? Which body will be the curriculum committee for graduate programs?

b. Will there be a language requirement at the graduate level?

On Monday March 18, Edward (Ted) Fiske, education editor of the New York Times, will be on campus to give a lecture. His talk will be held in the recital hall of the Simons Center immediately after the faculty meeting, or at 6:00 p.m., whichever is later. A reception will be held immediately following Mr. Fiske's lecture.
On February 26 a reorganization meeting was held for the College of Charleston chapter of the AAUP. Elected as officers at this meeting were George Pothering, President, Bill Olejniczak, Vice-President, and Herb Silverman, local chapter counselor. The offices of secretary and treasurer are awaiting eager candidates. The next meeting will be held on Thursday, March 21 at 3:30 pm in room 103 of Maybank Hall. All interested faculty are invited to attend.

The following statement was posted on a bulletin board on a wall adjacent to the Computer Science Department's office. I don't remember whether or not we took a formal vote in the department adopting this code, but it has remained posted for several weeks, so if there has been any opposition to it, it's not been of the rampaging sort. Other departments are free to augment, amend, or post as they see fit.

**Code of Professional Conduct**
*Department of Computer Science*

**Faculty Office Conduct:**

1. When the door is closed do not enter a faculty office without knocking.

2. If there is no response after knocking, do not check to see if the door is locked (unless you work for Public Safety). You may call, or leave a message on the door or with the secretary.

3. Do not enter a faculty office without permission even when the door is open.

4. When interacting with a faculty member, have your questions prepared in advance and do not set up camp in the office.

5. Do not eat or drink in a faculty office without permission.

6. When addressing a professor, first ask if he/she has time to consider your problem, question or request. Do not assume that the professor always has time at that moment for your question.

7. When waiting outside the door of a faculty office for your turn with the professor, keep the noise level under control (no yelling, belching, whining).

**Classroom Conduct:**

1. Do not show up to class late, especially on the day an assignment is due. If attendance is not mandatory, be respectful enough of the professor and your contemporaries to show up on time and not interrupt class.

2. If you have to leave class early, please tell the professor before class starts, especially if it is regular. If you are leaving to get to the cafeteria before it closes, have the courtesy to make up a better story.

3. Do not begin to pack your books or squirm before the professor has dismissed the class. If you feel that the professor is unaware of the time, get the attention of the professor (avoid blurtin cut, beeping your watch, or making bodily noises). If you feel that you cannot remain in class for the last few minutes until the professor is finished, consider not coming to class and withdrawing.

REMEMBER: If you expect the respect of the faculty, extend your respect first. These rules are waived for any student under 4 years old who doesn’t know better.

The Faculty Advisory Committee to the President has received assurance from President Lightsey that he is interested in reviving a faculty club (with NO MEMBERSHIP CHARGE FOR FACULTY) at the College. He has asked for recommendations on services and facilities. Please let us know what you think by completing and returning the following questionnaire.
1. Are you interested in seeing a faculty club at the College of Charleston?
   _____ Yes _____ No _____ Undecided
   If yes or undecided, please complete the rest of the questions.
2. What type of food service would interest you? [Check all that apply.]
   a. _____ breakfast _____ lunch _____ dinner _____
      _____ between-meal snacks _____ between-meal coffee/hot tea/iced tea/sodas
   b. _____ light meals _____ heavy meals
   c. _____ ala carte pricing _____ one price/all you can eat
   d. _____ full service _____ buffet service
   e. _____ weekdays only _____ weekends
   Comments
3. How frequently would you use the facility?
   a. _____ for breakfast
   b. _____ for lunch
   c. _____ for dinner
   d. _____ mid-morning
   e. _____ mid-afternoon
   f. _____ late (4-6 pm) afternoon
   Comments
4. Please list any suggestions for the location of a faculty club.
5. What other suggestions do you have for a faculty club?
6. We currently have a dining room with cafeteria style, one-price, all-you-can-eat service in Craig Dorm. If you use this facility, what suggestions do you have for its improvement? If you don’t use it, why not?

*************************

Please remove and return to Hugh Haynsworth, Secretary of President’s Advisory Committee, Dept. of Mathematics, by APRIL 1, 1991.