ROBERT MIGNONE, SPEAKER OF THE FACULTY  

Speaker’s Note

The overwhelming support and sympathy which my family received from the College of Charleston community during our recent loss is deeply appreciated. Each thoughtful expression of concern gave us a measure of strength to help us through the tragedy.

This has been another sad season. Last year during this same period, I had the difficult task of reporting the deaths of several members of our community. This year the task is slightly different, but no less difficult. Gary Harrison lost his wife; Boyce Cox lost his wife and Ginny Bartel lost her sister; David Cohen lost his father; John Newell lost his father; Ann Pelligrino lost her mother; and Bertie Mack lost her father. These are the reports of which I am aware. Death has struck those we love and the blow is to our hearts. This College, like any family, has circled around its own, offering comfort and strength. Speaking for the Faculty, I want to extend our sincere concern and deepest sympathies.

Another note of appreciation is overdue. The President’s party in honor of the College of Charleston Faculty on December 13, 1996 warrants our sincere thanks. The food, the decorations and the music were spectacular. As an event to brighten our spirits and lighten our hearts it was a complete success. As a gesture of appreciation from Alex and Zoe Sanders for the hard work and dedication of the Faculty and staff, I say thank you: it means a great deal. For all of those responsible for the success of the party, it was a job well done. And a special thanks to Zoe Sanders whose signature was on every flower and every delicious morsel.

Upcoming Meetings

Spring Senate Meetings (100 Maybank Hall, 5 p.m.)
- Tuesday, February 4
- Tuesday, March 11
- Tuesday, April 1

Spring Faculty Meeting (Recital Hall, Simons Center For the Arts, 5 p.m.)
- Monday, April 21
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Attachments
- Executive Summary of the Preliminary Campus Plan (The complete report will be available in the Faculty Lounge.)
- Weights for the 37 performance indicators, by sector (The complete report of the Sector Committees will be made available to College departments and will be available in the Faculty Lounge.)
Letters

(The following advertisement and letter appeared in the State newspaper and are reproduced with its permission. Both were brought to my attention by Patrick Harwood, Associate Director of College Relations, the College of Charleston.)

The advertisement:

The Crisis in Higher Education

Publicly supported four-year state colleges and universities in South Carolina need to vastly improve their performance to justify full funding by taxpayers. This is particularly true at the University of South Carolina.

Problems:

- Tuition costs continually rise, so that the price of an education is beyond the financial capacity of many South Carolina families.
- College budgets balloon to fund more staff, higher salaries, new buildings, sports arena, litigation, research, economic development, etc., etc.
- Specialized, costly academic programs are duplicated among the state’s universities. These include medical and business programs among others.
- Test score expectations for admittance or school performance ratings do not reflect reality: The majority of South Carolina’s students score far below the national average.
- Out-of-state students are recruited, admitted and subsidized to enhance prestigious programs and school reputations, not to benefit the taxpayers of South Carolina.
- Graduation rates are unacceptable.
- Job placement is poor.
- Private fund raising efforts are weak.

Solutions

- Freeze in-state tuition for two years. UVA did it. Raise out-of-state tuition.
- Require a three year cost savings program and measure results. Reward the schools that reduce costs.

The Faculty Newsletter

- Consolidate specialized programs which are
- Consolidate specialized programs which are duplicated among several schools into on university.
- Adopt test score standards that reflect the needs of the majority of students; not just the gifted few.
- Do not reward schools that raise SAT scores. Forget magazine academic rankings.
- Demand and reward higher graduation rates.
- Significantly upgrade job placement departments.
- Get serious about raising private money. Fund building projects and much of the non-core essential programs such as research with private money or grants.

The state’s university system must be more cost effective and responsive to the need of the average student. Certainly there should be honors programs for the brightest students, but attempting to create world class universities in South Carolina is an elitist goal. Most taxpayers are not elitists.

A response:

(This response by Donald E. Weatherbee, Donald S. Russell Professor of Government and International Studies, the University of South Carolina, appeared on the Op-ed page of the State, Tuesday, December 24, 1996.)

Higher education ad was chock full of misrepresentations

Last Thursday, you carried a paid advertisement on a so-called “crisis in higher education.” There was no indication as to what group, organization or individual was responsible or accountable for the essentially anti-higher education message. It was like an anonymous message slipped under the door.

Without knowing the agenda or motives of the messenger, it is impossible to initiate an informed discussion about some of the issues raised. As an individual who has spent more than three decades as a faculty member in the South Carolina university system, I must confess that I am offended by a format that does not allow that kind of mutual exchange.

I do not have the space or time to rejoin to each of the specifications of failure. neglect
or other sins of higher education leveled in the ad. Let me only respond to some of the more egregious errors of fact or interpretation that characterize the broadside.

I will quickly admit that there is waste and duplication in higher education, not only in South Carolina, but nationally.

This, however, is not the fault of the educators; it is inherent in the political system in which elected representatives both want a share of the pie for their localities and to satisfy constituent groups. It seems that every time the institutions of higher education attempt to rationalize, limit or otherwise become more educationally efficient, constituent groups and politicians mobilize to defeat it.

Recent examples include the issues of the College of Criminal Justice at the university, the creation of an independent Coastal Carolina, the political building of a parallel system in the tech schools, etc. If there is a crisis, it is not in higher education; it is in political leadership.

With respect to the charge that we are overpaid, this is simply laughable. The average faculty member in South Carolina has seen pay lag woefully behind counterparts elsewhere in the Southeast. Moreover, on a qualification basis, faculty members are well behind both other public and private employment sectors. You do not make a career in education because of the pay scale.

Connected to this is the issue of increasing bureaucratization. This, too, is not wholly the fault of the institutions of higher education.

The writer of the advertisement obviously is unaware of the magnitude of reporting, record-keeping, program-building, etc., requirements laid on higher education by federal and state legislation and regulation.

Ultimately, this also is the responsibility of the politicians and their special-interest constituencies. And, I would point out, if the Commission on Higher Education and the Legislature have their way, the burden will become greater, not diminished.

The complaint about tuition increases is easily taken care of. Let the politicians adequately fund the institutions. As a proportion of the state budget, higher education has been taking hits. I would also point out that tuition does not pay for research, nor do appropriated funds. Most research is funded by so-called “soft money,” that is, grants and contracts. This has positive impact on the research universities in student development and retention and budgetary support through overhead of the facilities. Research also has direct social and scientific payoff. Not incidentally, it is research as an intellectual exercise that helps to balance low pay. This is one of the so-called “intangible” rewards of an academic career. Intangibles tend to be overrated, however, particularly for struggling young faculty members with growing families and low pay.

Finally, with respect to the charge of elitism in terms of a desire for higher SAT scores and the hateful slam at the Honors College, if elitism means creating a university environment that will produce graduates able to function competently in a variety of economic, social and political situations requiring educational skills acquired at a national university standard, then I must confess to being an elitist.

South Carolina will always lag behind the rest of the nation, and most significantly its neighbors in the Southeast, if (1) the best students leave the state and (2) the universities are turned into glorified vocational schools.

The person(s) responsible for the ad obviously did not understand that higher university entrance requirements will for the high schools to produce better students. This, of course, has been a major emphasis of both Democratic and Republican state administrations.

That advertisement was mean spirited, poorly informed and outrageously irresponsible.

---

**Preliminary Campus Master Plan Study**

The report by Ray Huff Architects PA, on the preliminary campus master plan for the use of the newly acquired and soon to be acquired space and facilities, was reported to various campus groups on Tuesday, January 28, 1997.

Attached to this Newsletter is the Executive Summary of that report. The complete document, “Concept Alternatives Report” will be made available in the Faculty Lounge and the Office of the Secretariat, both on the second floor of Maybank Hall, middle section.
Performance Funding

For the past year, I have attempted to keep you informed of the progress and details of implementing the new statute, Act 359, requiring higher education in the state of South Carolina to be based entirely on performance.

The first phase was completed in early Fall 1996. Three task force committees made up of business leaders, Commission members and institutional representatives divided up the 37 performance indicators defined in the statute among Academics, Administrative Management and Planning/Institutional Effectiveness; and developed measures for their respective indicators. The recommended measures were reported in the September 1996 issue of the Faculty Newsletter.

The second phase began this past fall. Four Sector committees representing Research Universities, Teaching Universities (The College of Charleston’s sector.), Technical Colleges and University of South Carolina Branches (Two-year institutions.), began the work of assigning weights (as a percentage) and benchmarks to the 37 indicators, as appropriate for their respective sector. The composition of the Sector committees was similar to the Task Force committees and some people served both on a Task Force committee and a Sector committee. By December 10, the Sector committees made their reports to the Steering committee of the Commission on Higher Education, which was established to direct the implementation of Act 359.

What was supposed to happen next was that the Steering committee, based on recommendations from the Sector committees, would make its recommendation to the Commission on Higher Education for weights and benchmarks for the 37 performance indicators. A base funding method which would give some degree of consideration to the enrollment and facility needs of a given institution, which Act 359 purposely ignored, was to be forwarded, also, by the Steering Committee to the full Commission. (The reason Act 359 ignored enrollment and facility needs, was that the framers of Act 359 acted under the belief that an enrollment driven formula was in large part to blame for what they perceived as the wrong priorities and, consequently, the poor performance in the state’s higher education institutions. But as the process of implementing Act 359 evolved it became evident that enrollment could not be ignored without creating an untenable instability in the year to year operation of these institutions.)

However, the Sector committees, unlike the Task Force committees which were developing the measures for the performance indicators exclusively assigned to their respective committees, each had the same 37 performance indicators to weigh and benchmark. The result was that from four committees evolved four different philosophies and approaches to weighing and measuring the 37 performance indicators. As you will see in the attached list of weights for the four Sector committees, they differ; and sometimes they differ dramatically. This is especially true when the weights for the Research University Sector committee is compared with the other three sectors.

It is hard to imagine that this nonconformity would have been acceptable to the Commission on Higher Education. The Steering committee had few choices: it could forward the recommendations as they were, thwarting the expectation that the recommendations would be somewhat consistent among the sectors; it could attempt to homogenize the weights and benchmarks, disregarding the work of some or all of the Sector committees; or it could defer recommending weights and benchmarks, arguing that these determinations are the ones most subject to refinement as information and experience are accumulated. The Steering committee chose the latter option and only recommended the measures to the Commission, which were approved by the Commission and will be forwarded to the General Assembly this legislative session with the understanding that developing the weights and benchmarks are ongoing processes.

Base funding taking into consideration the enrollment and facilities at each institution, and other aspects of funding based on the performance indicators are currently being studied by the Commission staff with the help of a consultant group, MGT of America, based in Tallahassee, Florida. A recommendation is expected sometime this spring.

Funding based on performance is to be phased in over three years, with funding based entirely on performance by Fall 1999. For the 1997-98 academic year, the plan is to use 25% of new money appropriated for higher education based on 14 of the 37 performance indicators, where performance can be measured using existing reporting procedures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. MISSION FOCUS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (A) Expenditure of Funds</td>
<td>0.167%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (B) Curricula</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (C) Approval of a Mission Statement</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (D) Adoption of a Strategic Plan</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. (E) Attainment of Goals</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. QUALITY OF FACULTY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. (A) Academic &amp; Other Credentials</td>
<td>0.167%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. (B) Performance Review Systems</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. (C) Post-Tenure Review</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. (D) Compensation</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. (E) Availability of Faculty to Students</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. (F) Community or Public Service Activities</td>
<td>0.167%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. INSTRUCTIONAL QUALITY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. (A) Class Sizes &amp; Student/Teacher Ratios</td>
<td>0.167%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. (B) # of Credit Hours Taught by Faculty</td>
<td>0.167%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. (C) Ratio of Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td>0.167%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. (D) Accreditation of Degree-Granting Prog.</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. (E) Emphasis on Quality Teacher Educ.</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. INST. COOPERATION &amp; COLLABORATION</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. (A) Sharing &amp; use of Tech., Prog., Equip., Supp., Source Matter Experts</td>
<td>0.167%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. (B) Cooperation &amp; Collab. with Private Industry</td>
<td>0.167%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. ADMIN. EFFICIENCY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. (A) % of Admin. Costs vs. Academic Costs</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. (B) Use of Best Mgmt. Practices</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. (C) Elimination of Unjustified Duplication</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. (D) Amount of General Overhead Costs</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI. ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. (A) SAT &amp; ACT Scores of Student Body</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. (B) High School Standing</td>
<td>0.187%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. (C) Post-secondary Non-academic Achievement</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. (D) Priority on Enrolling In-state Students</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII. GRADUATES' ACHIEVEMENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. (A) Graduation Rate</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. (B) Employment Rate for Graduates</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. (C) Employer Feedback on Graduates</td>
<td>0.167%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. (D) Scores of Graduates</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. (E) # of Graduates who Continue their Education</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. (F) Credit Hours Earned of Graduates</td>
<td>0.167%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII. USER-FRIENDLINES OF INST.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. (A) Transferability of Credits</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. (B) Continuing Education Programs</td>
<td>0.167%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. (C) Accessibility</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX. RESEARCH FUNDING</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. (A) Financial Support</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. (B) Amount of Public &amp; Private Sector Grants</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL OF ALL PERCENTAGES | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: CONCEPT ALTERNATIVES REPORT
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Executive Summary

This report presents the preliminary findings and space utilization alternatives of the Planning Team and summarizes issues and proposals relative to the College of Charleston Preliminary Campus Master Plan Study. Following the acquisition of several new properties, the College endeavored to develop a plan for utilization of the new facilities. The administration recognized the need to study how new facilities would be used and how their usage might affect existing programmed space on the campus. The acquisition of approximately 247,000 gross square feet of new space provides an opportunity for the institution to meet many pressing and immediate space needs. The findings outlined within this report provide the basis for a proposed strategy for utilization of facilities, both existing and newly acquired.

Intent of the Study

The purpose of the study is to conceptually examine how recently acquired and existing facilities available for new uses (herein called “New Uses”) could be utilized to relieve overutilization of existing facilities and to accommodate expanding programs. Also, included in this study are existing facilities that will change occupancy if programs relocate as a result of the recommendations of this study.

The Study specifically addresses the recently acquired BellSouth Building and Bishop England High School properties. In addition, the Study proposes the development of uses for existing College owned property presently underutilized. The former Sears building is the only facility discussed here that fits this characterization. In addition the Study makes broad recommendations for reusing space by programs moving to other facilities such as the Robert Scott Small Library.

Planning Process

The planning process is a multi-phased effort intended to provide recommendations for utilization of selected facilities on campus. The planning horizon for the Study is five years. The process entails three phases.

Institutional Planning Issues

- Strategic Direction
- Enrollment Growth
- Clarification Of Undergraduate and Graduate Missions
- State Funding Requirements
- Comprehensive Campus Master Plan

Physical Planning Issues

- Infrastructure Inadequacies
- Utilization of “New Use” Facilities
- Long-Term Expansion Options
- Relationship to Neighborhoods
- Replicating Core Campus Structure And Character
- Erosion of Campus Edges
- Student Support Programs and Facilities
- Connecting West and North Campus Districts to Core Campus
- Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflicts
- Dispersed Campus Versus Program Zoning
- Location of Proposed Library
- Formal and Informal Gathering Spaces
- Outdoor Recreational Space
- Scale Of New Buildings
- Class Change Interval
Program/Space Needs Assessment

Summary of Issues
The intent of the Study is determining how expanding college programs and overcrowded facilities can be relieved. In particular, the Study makes recommendations for use of "New Use" facilities.

Based on review of the supplied information and investigation, the preliminary findings of the report are:

- Enrollment is targeted at a growth rate of 2-3 percent annually. Actual enrollment increase for the 1996 school year reached approximately 4.5 percent.
- Evaluation of space needs presented to the planners suggests that departments needs are more extensive than may be warranted. The assumption of the planners is that the needs data submitted can be used conceptually and more specific recommendations will depend on professional academic programmers' analysis of the needs in concert with the Schools.
- No matter what the various schools request, only a finite amount of space is available.
- Approximately 247,000 square feet of "New Use" facilities will be available for use within the next two to five years.
- The Robert Scott Small Library represents approximately 72,000 square feet of "New Use" space but this space will not be available until the new library is constructed.
- The Bishop England High School tract will not be available to the College until construction of the new high school is completed. Currently, it is anticipated the facilities will be available by the fall of 1998.
- Apparently, the most pressing academic needs are for expansion of the School of Sciences and Mathematics, reorganization of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, School of the Arts and the Library. This Study is unable to confidently prioritize other program needs because information is not available.
- There appears to be a pressing need for general unassigned instructional space for the College. It is beyond this study to quantify this actual need.

Recommendations

Summary of Recommendations
Preliminary findings present two strategic alternatives for utilization of "New Use" facilities. These planning recommendations are based on information developed during the information gathering phase of the Study. The alternatives proposed represent a conceptual proposal for developing the College in three phases, 1) short-term (consisting of years 0 - 2), 2) intermediate-term (representing years 2 - 5), and 3) long-term (5 - 15 years). Short and intermediate term phases of this duration are generally more reliable for making development decisions. The recommendations of the long-term plan are more dependent on a variety of issues difficult to predict -- funding, policy changes, economic trends. The near term proposals encompass more certainty as many of the requisites for these time periods are relatively certain -- determination to construct a new library, availability of Bishop England site.

The long-term recommendations are speculative but do identify opportunities for future development that could influence decisions regarding near-term development.

Institutional Planning Recommendations
Based on the findings, it is apparently evident that various key institutional planning issues need to be addressed. These issues, outlined in Section 1.4.1, have a direct bearing on development options for the College. The specific recommendations are:
1. Develop A Broad-Based Strategic Direction That Is Communicated To The College Community.
2. Confirm Enrollment Goals And Develop Specific Strategies To Address Enrollment Growth.
3. Undertake A Review Of Graduate And Undergraduate Missions.

Physical Planning Recommendations
1. Effective Utilization of the "New Use" Facilities.
3. Continue to Work Closely with Neighborhoods in Ensuring Compatibility.
4. Capture, in so much as possible, the Character, Structure and Quality of the Core Campus.
5. Establish Strong Campus Edges to Reinforce the Urban Presence of the College.
6. Prioritize Development of Student Activity Facilities to Regain Parity Between Enrollment and Student Activity Services.
7. Develop Specific Strategies for Addressing the Disruption of Major Arteries Through the Campus.
8. Continue Efforts to Address Open Recreational Space.
10. Review Proposed Location of the New Library for Alternative Opportunities.
11. Develop a Policy for Facility and Open Space Planning to Ensure Development of Formal and Informal Gathering.
12. Develop a Mix of Building Scales in Future Development.

Alternative Strategies
The primary determinations for the alternatives are:

1. The most pressing space needs appear to be the School of Sciences and Mathematics, the School of the Arts, and the new library.
2. There is no distinction in the conceptual strategies between the short-term proposal for Alternative Strategies A and B.
3. The Science Center should continue to be the primary specialized teaching facility for the sciences and other research-based programs.
4. Science courses that are not dependent on specialized facilities can occur in locations other than the Science Center without detriment to the program.
5. The needs of Sciences and Mathematics can not be adequately addressed until the new library is constructed.
6. The eventual relocation of the library will make the Robert Scott Small Library facility available for redevelopment.
7. Introductory sciences courses, generic classrooms, and computer labs may be a good reuse of the existing library.
8. The location of the existing library makes this a prime candidate for redevelopment for academic functions.
9. The BellSouth facility will serve as a "swing-space" in the near-term. With over 61,000 net square feet of space, this facility is ideal interim space for a variety of uses, including unassigned classroom space, faculty offices, support functions and special programs.
10. The longer term use of this facility should be for support, such as auxiliary services, and special programs while maintaining limited academic space for overflow purposes.
11. An expanded food service operation should occupy the ground floor when the College obtains the unlimited use of this floor.
12. The 3rd floor of the former Sears building should be used for Arts short-term expansion.
13. The former Sears building basement should serve as the "one-stop" location for Enrollment Management Operations.
14. The Language Division should be housed in the upper floors of the J. C. Long Building, if Administrative Computing is relocated.
15. Consolidation of humanity and social science programs should occur as new academic space is developed and existing spaces used by other programs is vacated.
16. As student oriented functions like Enrollment Management are relocated, consolidation of related administrative offices and programs should be moved to Randolph Hall.
17. Bishop England's main campus can be used for academic and faculty office uses for the near-term but the condition and inefficiencies of these facilities strongly suggest eventual replacement with new facilities.
18. The Bishop England Freshmen Annex can be used for special programs, support functions or administrative activities in the near-term. Like the main high school campus, this facility does not warrant substantial long-term investment.
19. The location of the proposed library has significant impact on the development pattern of the campus.
20. Investment in streetscape improvements along Calhoun, Coming and St. Philip would address the conflicts these streets entail and contribute to campus legibility.