Speaker's Note

Despite the fact that a significant percentage of our freshmen were sporting RUSH Limbaugh buttons and the state legislature seems determined to end education as we know it in South Carolina, this Fall semester started off pretty much like the other thirteen I experienced at the College. We managed to avoid hurricanes and scandals with about the same degree of skill.

Perhaps that crack is not fair. The College is seldom embroiled in the kind of bitter controversies which have racked many of the other institutions in the state. Outwardly I credit this to the common goal that the Faculty and the Administration share and the extraordinary effort made towards achieving it. Inwardly I believe this too. I know how hard all of you work. I know what the personal sacrifices are. My plan for the rest of the year is to convey this to the larger community.
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Senate Meetings
(100 Maybank Hall, 5 p.m.)
- Tuesday, October 3
- Tuesday, November 7
- Tuesday, November 28

Note To Committee Chairs
Motions to be voted on by the Faculty Senate and supporting documentation should be given to the Speaker of the Faculty by at least two Thursdays before the Senate Meeting.

Future Meetings and Events
- The College of Charleston Board of Trustees will meet on Friday, October 6 at 9:30 a.m. in the Presidents Board Room on the second floor of Randolph Hall.
- Martin Luther King Day celebrations will be held on Monday, January 15 at 8 p.m. in Sottile Theater.

President Sanders Address
(Excerpt from a presentation this past August to the S.C. Commission on Higher Education by President Sanders)

In the three years I have been at the College, undergraduate enrollment has increased only slightly, approximately 3 percent. SAT scores for this year, of course, remain to be seen and will be difficult to compare because of the new way of scoring for those taking the test after April 1995.
The time is rapidly approaching when growth in the undergraduate enrollment, although entirely possible, will not be desirable. Our neighbors on the fragile Charleston peninsula, as well as our own sense of proportion for the College, tell us that.

During the same three-year-period undergraduate enrollment increased by 3 percent, the faculty has been increased by 14 percent, from 303 to 345. We added 12 new faculty positions this year. They came to us from such wildly diverse places as Vladivostok/St. Petersburg, Russia; Capetown, South Africa; and the University of South Carolina.

All faculty at the College of Charleston teach. Faculty have research responsibilities, but only a minority are released from any classroom teaching to engage in research. Furthermore, almost all research in which the faculty is engaged involves the active participation of students. Thus, almost all research at the College, in fact, directly involves teaching.

Although we have no purely research faculty, our faculty produces an amazing amount of published material. Over the past three years, the faculty has averaged 696 books, articles, and presentations before learned societies per year. Remember, this is a faculty which totaled between 303 and 345 during the three-year period.

I can't even begin to recite the service our faculty and students have performed. Any reader of the Post & Courier will find something cultural, intellectual, or informational we offer every single day. Higher education faculty is tarred by some with the image of being irrelevant, complacently egg-headed, lazy, fat, and happy. The faculty I have come to know at the College of Charleston is concerned, committed, contributing, hard working, lean, and only reasonably happy. Furthermore, they are dedicated to their students, to the citizens who support them, and to the College of Charleston (in that order). Without question, the best thing about the College of Charleston is the faculty.

Proposals to abolish tenure abound. As a college president, I have never felt the least bit constrained by tenure. I am convinced that tenure provides a positive benefit, both to academia and to society at large. Academic freedom is only one benefit. The tortuous process which must be circumnavigated to achieve tenure typically produces an unusual discipline and commitment lasting throughout the faculty member's career.

In addition to tenure, there is another traditional aspect of academia I am not anxious to abandon. That is affirmative action. California has led the way in abolishing affirmative action at colleges and universities. That state was once the envy of the education world. All high school graduates were given an affordable college education at an excellent school - e.g., UCLA, UC-Berkeley. In the last five years, the cost of a college education in California is up 134 percent. Unsurprisingly, enrollment is down. Enrollment in California prisons is, however, up substantially. This year, for the first time, California is spending more on prisons than on colleges. Do we really want to follow California?

I'm not even sure what affirmative action means in California. Apparently, it means different things in different places. I know what it means and what it does not mean at the College of Charleston. It does not mean racial quotas or racial preferences. It means, simply, acting positively to ensure equal opportunity and equal access: a fair shot at the American dream. Quite obviously, that need continues. Anybody who thinks discrimination in America is a thing of the past believes in the Easter Bunny and the Tooth Fairy.

Furthermore, affirmative action presents no problem whatsoever at the College of Charleston. We seek out minority student like other schools recruit football players, not so much for their sake as for ours. Have I said that before? Well I say it again. We seek out minority students like other schools recruit football players, not so much for their sake as for ours. Retention rates for minority students at the College of Charleston have been consistently higher than retention rates for all students. Graduation rates for minority students have been exactly the same as graduation rates for other students at the College. Why should that surprise anybody?

Without regard to California or other places, the College of Charleston will maintain inviolate its policy of admitting students without regard to
race, religion, gender, or weight. In 225 years, the College of Charleston has never had a weight requirement. I have a personal interest in maintaining the last part of the policy.

**Personal Impressions of China by Herb Silverman**

(After considerable pressure from me, Herb Silverman agreed to contribute this article to The Faculty Newsletter)


The talks in the session on Women in Science and Mathematics, as in most of the other sessions, alternated between American and Chinese delegates. The idea expressed on a banner hanging in the room, “Mathematics Empowers Women” was viewed by participants as an important way for women to become more independent. There were many common themes between the two countries: Math and science are gradually moving away from male dominance; students find math difficult; students are interested in learning what will help them find well-paying jobs. Research in both countries seemed to indicate an interesting gender difference in learning mathematics. Girls tended not to want to go on until they understood perfectly how to do a problem, while boys were more willing to live with uncertainty. It was felt that there needs to be more communication between researchers in mathematics and in math-education. A well-received comment was that teachers should not only eliminate gender bias in their teaching of mathematics, but should also explain to future teachers the importance of doing this. I was struck by one distinction between speakers from the two countries. Those from the U.S. who spoke of and had published articles on improving secondary teaching were affiliated with colleges and universities, while many of their Chinese counterparts were actually teaching in secondary schools.

Most of the Chinese women in the session said they did not feel as much sex discrimination as did their American counterparts reported feeling. Possible explanations are that the Chinese delegates weren’t as candid as the American delegates; or that the Chinese women were hand-picked by the government to participate in the conference; or that there really is less discrimination in China. My impression was that the Chinese women were reasonably open and sincere. Some of the older women and men had endured such hardship during the Cultural Revolution in the 1960s, when they were forcibly removed from respected university positions to perform hard farm labor, that a little sex discrimination was probably insignificant by contrast. While recognizing that there were problems to overcome and barriers to break, Chinese women and men seemed more anxious to focus on their progress and achievements in recent years. I was surprised by how unmodest the Chinese women were about touting their personal accomplishments. Many would begin their talks by listing their awards and achievements. Americans usually hope others will do that for them.

The strongest difference of opinion did not emerge between American and Chinese or even between men and women. It was between science/mathematics and humanities. Sessions on Equal Opportunity and Women in the Work Place had primarily Chinese in technical fields mixed with Americans in the humanities. Some of the American women expressed the view that male dominance of math and science has led to socially irresponsible behavior. They felt that science should change to incorporate women’s strengths. It should become less analytic and more descriptive. I think it is worth studying cultural issues that lead to conclusions that are not verifiable, but this should not be classified as science. Most disturbing to me was hearing some feminists say they would discourage girls from majoring in math or science.

I discovered that I am an Equity Feminist, but not a Gender Feminist. I believe that men and women should be judged on their abilities and be treated equally. I was surprised to be branded a conservative for such views, which
certainly no Charlestonian has ever called me. I don't know if this kind of philosophical difference between math/science and the humanities exists at the College. It might be worth exploring in a discussion session or a seminar series.

I must admit my views have changed in the past couple of years. I used to think men and women were (or should be) the same from the neck up. In general terms, I now accept differences in ways of knowing. For instance, men tend to be more competitive and women more cooperative. I don't know how much is culturally based. I remain a strong advocate of affirmative action programs as a way to improve the overall quality of institutions. I like the rationale for affirmative action given by one of the speakers, Dr. Patricia Wirth, Department Head of Teletraffic Theory and System Performance at AT&T Bell Labs in New Jersey. She said their stated policy is to "value individual differences because of the richness they bring to thinking, creativity, and problem-solving."

Our Chinese hosts were very cordial and they were very attentive to our needs. Security, however, was extremely tight. Both uniformed and plain clothes guards appeared everywhere. Spontaneity was discouraged. One evening, a small group of American literature professors traveled to our hotel to meet with some Chinese professors. Although the meeting was planned over a four-day period in a very open manner, evidently permission had not been sought from just the right Chinese authority. Security guards interrogated the Chinese participants immediately following the meeting. At 3:00 a.m. that night the chief of Beijing security appeared at our hotel and abruptly canceled all previously planned and authorized visits by the Americans to various Chinese institutions, including several schools and hospitals. It took much hasty discussion between our Chinese conference sponsors and high-level authorities to reinstate some of the planned site visits.

At that time I was able to meet with colleagues at Beijing Institute of Technology, the M.I.T. of China. They have doctorate programs in applied math, applied chemistry, applied dynamics and engineering, applications of computers, optics, and about a dozen other applied areas. B.I.T. has listed in its catalog twenty-seven cooperating foreign universities & institutes, of which seven are American. I asked how an institution becomes included and was told it usually begins with communication between scholars and exchanges of students and colleagues. If the College of Charleston wants to explore establishing this kind of relationship, I can furnish you with additional information.

Security was tightest for our visit to Olympic Stadium to witness the opening ceremony of the NGO International Forum on Women. We needed special passes that required much negotiation by our hosts. We had our picture taken three different times. We were searched thoroughly before entering the stadium. Those with water bottles were made to empty the water and had their bottles confiscated. Each row of seats contained a security guard. The opening ceremony went smoothly.

We were taken to most of the well-known sites in Beijing: the Great Wall, Forbidden City, Summer Palace, Temple of Heaven, Great Hall of the People, huge banquets, and--of course--Tian'anmen Square. We were all pretty much on good behavior, not because of fear for ourselves but because we didn't want to put our Chinese hosts in jeopardy. Even Patricia Ireland, head of NOW, did not bring up issues that would embarrass our hosts. My most controversial statement was wearing an Independence Day T-shirt featuring the Statue of Liberty to Tian'anmen Square.

This was my first visit to a Communist country, but China seemed in many ways to be quite capitalistic. It has the world's largest McDonalds, several Kentucky Fried Chicken restaurants, a Hard Rock Cafe, and souvenir trinkets for sale everywhere. There was ample evidence of a managed and bureaucratic society, with much division of labor and many apparently meaningless jobs. We could not enter a restaurant or hotel without having two people open the door for us. Some workers seem to be professional standers-at-attention, looking like Citadel cadets. Once I tried to exchange a 100 yuan bill for a 50 and five 10's at a hotel money exchange. I received two 50's and was told to come back in an hour when the person responsible for 10's would return.

News and information are strictly controlled. The uprising in Tian'anmen Square in 1989 was purposely not reported in the Chinese media. I found it fascinating to read the China
Daily, a newspaper published in English. It contained one sentence about Harry Wu: "Convicted spy, as he wished." Incidentally, I left for China from San Francisco amid much fanfare on the same Air China plane that had just delivered Harry Wu from China.

The following typical item from the Sept. 1 China Daily illustrates how the Chinese government views its occupation of Tibet: "Freed from the yoke of serfdom, Tibetans are enjoying extensive freedom and human rights as never before. The Dalai Lama clique and foreign anti-China forces claim that the Hans are practicing racial chauvinism in Tibet. That's a sheer lie. Many who accuse China of human rights abuse in Tibet are former serf-owners or their children. Their nostalgia for feudal serfdom is understandable."

I believe one of the most effective ways for China to move peacefully toward a democracy is for their students to see first hand how a democratic country with a free press operates. I was surprised that our tour guide, a bright 20 year old university student, was unaware of World War II. The years 1925-1949 seem never to be mentioned in China. I hope the College will make every effort to recruit Chinese students. It will bring more diversity to the College and, perhaps, more openness to China.

**Cyber-Privacy by Bob Mignone**

When I turn on my computer and click the mouse to enter a network, I sense that everything on my computer and all of my communications are exposed to snooping, viruses and assorted vandalism. Wolfram Research, the makers of Mathematica, a powerful software for doing mathematics on the computer, searching for more than the licensed number of copies, automatically counts the number of Mathematica programs operating on networks connected to the Internet where Mathematica has been licensed and reports this back to headquarters.

Computer security and privacy are timely issues. How vulnerable to eavesdropping are computer communications through networks? What legal protection can we expect against eavesdropping? What are our responsibilities when we communicate over networks? How can we avoid becoming cyber roadkill on the information highway?

At the risk of sounding like the opening salvo of an Ann Humphreys Manners Minute segment on NPR, I decided to begin a dialogue on this issue. The intent of the dialogue is a better grasp of the level of privacy we can expect through electronic communication and the responsibilities we assume as we "boldly go" through cyberspace.

One Friday morning recently, I dropped by Academic Computing to ask some questions in order to try and gain some understanding of what happens when we send and receive communication through Internet via the campus network. My face is familiar to the folks at Academic Computing, since they are singularly responsible for the masterful job of installing and networking the new computer classroom that went on-line in Maybank Hall this Fall. Responsibility for the computer classroom is mine. This made me sensitive to how the job got done. The people at Academic Computing are geniuses. Their patience with my ignorance is worthy of praise. Just the other day I was over there in a panic, convinced that the computer classroom had the horrible virus I had read about the night before in the New York Times. The virus displays a click box with the numeral one in it. I saw exactly this in the monitor preference file of the system folder. As they carefully explained without laughing, the box with the one was in the right place and refers to the one monitor that the computer is connected to. There would be boxes in that place with other numerals had the computers been connected to more than one monitor. No, the computers in the classroom probably did not have this new virus.

As ignorant as I am compared to the graceful expertise of my friends in Academic Computing, the gap is easily as vast between Herb Silverman and myself.

One day last spring I had Herb standing in his office, turning in circles with his finger on his head reciting Walt Whitman’s “One hour to madness and joy! O furious! O confine me not!” in order to get his computer to connect with Ashley: it worked. To Herb, I am a computer genius.
What I learned that Friday about cyber-privacy on campus is that, for the most part, no one is looking over our shoulders at our messages or our communications. E-mail messages, for instance, via Ashley will remain in your mailbox on Ashley until you delete them, if you login directly to Ashley and use its e-mail software to read your messages. If you use software on your office computer such as Eudora or POPmail, then your messages exist on your office computer and a record of the message senders and receiver, only, remain on Ashley. Think of it as a photo of an envelop addressed to you which records your address and the return address of the sender, but nothing of the letter inside. These records are generally purged on an hourly basis and help the system operators trace problems when they occur.

Communication on the World-Wide-Web operates similarly, except that no record is kept of client/server links except, perhaps, at the server on the other end from which information is being requested. Edisto, the College of Charleston server for the World-Wide-Web, does not currently record client requests for information, but will start to soon.

The security of virtually any system can be undermined. It is possible for someone to either guess a password, for instance, to your Ashley account or to employ a program such as a “sniffer” to catch your e-mail software sending your password to Ashley and intercept it. Then, of course, your mail can be read. But this is not, as far as I know, a problem on campus, anymore than a problem exists of unauthorized people opening up and reading letters sent to us through (please, don’t let me say this) “snail mail”.

Concerning this topic, Jerry Hollister of Academic Computing says: “Sniffers are commercial products used by hackers and network administrators alike, for different purposes, of course. Ashley’s networking software came with a free packet analyzer. Using one effectively requires a knowledge of network protocols beyond that of the average teenage vandal. Password cracking programs, on the other hand, are easy to obtain and use. They are a threat to people with accounts on machines that run the UNIX operating system. In our case that’s Edisto and Stono. These programs rely upon a spelling dictionary as the basis for password matches. Never select a word that is in the dictionary for a password on a UNIX system. Note: I break this rule myself with the Faculty Modern Pool, because I regard that system as fairly secure.”

Listening to the radio recently, I learned that communication through public electronic bulletin boards on the Internet can be legally monitored, but private communication such as e-mail can only be monitored with a court order. However, America On-Line has made it a practice of keeping private e-mail messages, through its service, for four days. This is done, presumably, in case a law enforcement agency obtains the proper authorization to read them.

Now you know at least as much as I know about cyber-privacy. What do you think? If you can correct, elaborate, add to, etc., please let me know.
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AAUP Report On United Way Giving by Richard Nunan
(Submitted by Richard Nunan, Department of Philosophy and AAUP chapter president)

Many of you probably remember that, during last fall’s Trident United Way campaign at the College, your local AAUP chapter expressed concerns about the fact that United Way participation entailed support of the Coastal Carolina Council of the Boy Scouts of America. As a member agency, the local Boy Scout council is entitled to participate in Trident United Way’s revenue distribution plan. A few years ago the Boy Scouts chose to adopt a national policy which explicitly discriminates against gays, atheists, and agnostics. This development, coupled with the fact that Trident United Way’s revenue-sharing plan had the effect of insuring that even designated contributions assisted all member agencies indirectly, was in conflict with the AAUP principle that college and university faculty should avoid participation in discriminatory policies, however tangential that involvement.

Trident United Way has now decided to broaden its revenue distribution options in a way which will enable prospective contributors to participate without having to support any particular member organizations which they
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Many of you probably remember that, during last fall’s Trident United Way campaign at the College, your local AAUP chapter expressed concerns about the fact that United Way participation entailed support of the Coastal Carolina Council of the Boy Scouts of America. As a member agency, the local Boy Scout council is entitled to participate in Trident United Way’s revenue distribution plan. A few years ago the Boy Scouts chose to adopt a national policy which explicitly discriminates against gays, atheists, and agnostics. This development, coupled with the fact that Trident United Way’s revenue-sharing plan had the effect of insuring that even designated contributions assisted all member agencies indirectly, was in conflict with the AAUP principle that college and university faculty should avoid participation in discriminatory policies, however tangential that involvement.

Trident United Way has now decided to broaden its revenue distribution options in a way which will enable prospective contributors to participate without having to support any particular member organizations which they
would rather not support. When you receive your United Way pledge form this year, you will discover that you now have three donor choice options: 'Community Care', 'Targeted Care', and 'Specific Care'. The last of these constitutes the significantly new feature in United Way distribution, but it might be helpful to explain all three.

'Community Care' is the traditional United Way distribution system, designed for those who like the philosophy of shared giving, with an independent citizens' allocation board deciding how charity dollars could best be distributed throughout our local communities. Under this arrangement, after reviewing budgetary requests from member agencies, and any non-United Way income resources those agencies may have, the Trident Citizens' Allocation Board sets goals in dollar amounts which they will try to secure for each member agency through United Way's annual campaign. Conditional on a successful campaign, member agencies will thereby have some reasonable expectations to work from in planning their own annual budgets. If the annual campaign meets or exceeds expectations, each member agency will be funded at or above the goal designated for that agency by the Board.

'Targeted Care' works the same way as Community Care, but for a subgroup of member agencies which provide the particular set of services which you designate under the Targeted Care option. In the unlikely event that designated giving in one of these areas exceeds the sum of the dollar goals set by the Allocations Board for the relevant member agencies, the Board would review the possibility of sharing the surplus among the agencies providing that particular class of services, or seek to support still other local organizations providing those services. Either way, the Board would see to it that all Targeted Care contributions went to the kinds of services for which they were designated. On the other hand, all contributions to Targeted Care have the effect of freeing up Community Care dollars to meet Allocation Board goals for other member organizations. E.g., if Targeted Care giving were to fully fund local programs for older Americans this year, then Community Care dollars which might have gone to support those programs could instead be used to insure that the Board's goal for the Boy Scouts would also be met. In this way, Targeted Care giving does help all member agencies indirectly.

Conversely, agencies which do not fully achieve their Allocation Board goals through Targeted Care giving will be able to rely on Community Care revenues to make up the difference.
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'Specific Care' is a genuinely novel option. Under this provision you may designate your contribution for one or more specific member or non-member agencies, and that contribution will be kept separate from the general revenue stream. That is, in the case of a member agency, your contribution will go directly to this agency without being debited against the Allocation Board's goal for that agency. Such contributions will therefore have no immediate effect, direct or indirect, on the revenues allocated to non-designated member agencies. As an element of the designated agency's independent sources of revenue however, Specific Care contributions may still influence future Citizens' Allocation Board distribution decisions. But note that this particular constraint applies equally to any member agencies to which you now contribute independently of the United Way campaign. The Allocation Board has a mandate to distribute revenues in such a way as to be employed effectively as possible, and that necessitates attention to independent revenue sources.

For those who would prefer, Specific Care also permits contributions to any non-member agencies which satisfy all of the following criteria. The recipient must:

1. be approved as a 501(c)(3) charitable organization under the U.S. Code;
2. be registered with the SC Secretary of State to engage in public solicitation under the SC Charitable Solicitations Act;
3. have a mission related to human health or human services;
4. located in, or provide services for, South Carolina.

E.g., My Sister's House would satisfy all four criteria, but the John Ancrum SPCA would violate (3), and Amnesty International of the USA might violate (4). Since there will be hard cases, Trident United Way is prepared to determine whether any non-member designee satisfies all four criteria.
At least for the first year of this new initiative, Trident United Way will defray its usual operating expenses (12%) from contributions to non-member organizations as well as member agencies. That policy will be reevaluated for non-member organizations after Trident United Way gets a clearer picture of the processing costs incurred by this additional burden. Note however that funds funneled through United Way come to the non-member recipient with no fund-raising administrative costs for that organization. I.e., if this new aspect of the United Way campaign is successful, non-member recipient organizations might reasonably consider reducing their own overhead budgets accordingly.

I would like to express my personal appreciation to Trident United Way and the Citizens' Allocation Board for demonstrating flexibility in accommodating community concerns about previous distribution practices. Under the new system, there are genuine options for a broad range of views concerning the scope of legitimate community giving. I hope each of you will consider supporting this year's United Way campaign in whatever manner you find personally congenial.

**Sexual Harassment Liaisons and Implementation Committee**

(The following memorandum was submitted by Sue Sommer-Kresse, Vice President for Enrollment Management)

The new College of Charleston Sexual Harassment Grievance Policy has been distributed to faculty and staff members. A brochure that outlines the policy will be distributed to students soon.

The new policy provides for faculty and staff liaisons who have been specifically trained to deal with sexual harassment matters on campus and the College's process for handling these complaints. If you are interested in serving as a liaison for the campus please contact: Dollie Bond, Director of Human Resources (953-7031) or Sommer-Kresse (953-7031). Training sessions will be offered in September and October to accommodate the schedules of the volunteer liaisons.

Also, an implementation committee with the purpose of planning educational programs to prevent sexual harassment and establish a positive environment for all members of the campus community will continue to meet. If you are willing to help with these efforts please contact Rachel Rogers (953-5522).

**Correction**

(Howard Rudd, Dean of the School of Business & Economics asked that this clarification be made)

In A. Appropriation Issues, of the Summer Report Volume 1 Issue 1 of The Faculty Newsletter, I reported, in paragraph 3, that The General Assembly provided an appropriation of $300,000 (non-recurring) in the Surplus Appropriations Bill for the College of Charleston to use for the Center for Entrepreneurship at the School of Business.

It should have been noted that this sum is for the building and not for any use.

Robert Mignone, Speaker of the Faculty Department of Mathematics The College of Charleston Charleston, SC 29424 MignoneR@Ashley.CofC.edu (803)953-5740