Notes About The Supporting Data

Faculty Activity System

Since 2006 I have been pointing out errors in the Faculty Activity System. Many of these errors have now been corrected, but I still cannot rely on the system to provide completely accurate information. Here are some examples that remain:

1. Who is in the Department? (Part 1). The current individual listing of members of the Department includes four faculty members who have never been part of this Department, either as roster faculty, visitors, or adjuncts. The four people are Brenda Evitt, Thomas O'Donnell, Tom Prevost, and Greg Turner.

2. Who is in the Department? (Part 2). Marty Markowitz retired in the spring of 2009. The July 1, 2009 to June 31, 2010 Department Annual Report, however, shows Marty still to be a member of the Department.

3. What courses are taught? Although the Department Annual Report lists only the courses that have been changed (this list, by the way, is incomplete), the Chair's Report shows Laquita Blockson as having taught the following courses in the Spring Semester of 2009: 2 sections of MGMT 350 (at two different times), 2 sections of MGMT 408 (at two different times).

4. Incorrect classification of materials. There has always been a problem with the correct identification of materials, at least where edited books have been concerned. I put in a test book, described as “scholarly,” “book,” and “edited” where those choices were offered. However, in the Department report for AY 2009-2010 the entry is shown under "Other Articles, Chapters in Books, Publications of a Special Nature, including Book Reviews." Had this been a real entry, I would obviously have known the difference because the entry was mine. In that case, I would “only” have had to move the entry to a correct place (though “Edited Books” is still not a heading generated by the system. Had the entry belonged to someone else, I would never have known about the error without comparing the Annual Report to the person’s CV.

5. What are the defaults, really? The section on faculty publications notes that “At least one completed date field is required for this entry to appear on any report covering a defined period of time.” In other words, without a date, an entry should not have been included in the AY year listing. But there are numerous entries in the Departmental Report for Tom Kent, despite the fact that there were no dates on what he entered into the system. I have highlighted these in
What this means, of course, is that the system still has errors of sufficient magnitude that its reports cannot be trusted without checking all of the entries against the individual faculty member CVs. It goes without saying that this is an unnecessary burden on both the Department Chairs and the faculty who are required to report their activities in at least these two places (actually more, but I will return to that later in my discussion of obstacles).

**Student Credit Hours**

Anyone who would like to hear a collective sigh of exasperation should attend a meeting of Department Chairs who have just heard “the Delaware study.” The Delaware model of computing instructional costs has become very popular, with more than 250 institutions participating. On the other hand, some places that might be aspirational peers for a liberal arts and sciences university are not among these. For example, Antioch, Babson, Claremont, Duke, Harvard, New York University, Swarthmore, Williams, Willamette, William & Mary, and the University of Richmond. William & Mary is the only public institution in this group, and indeed, the vast majority of institutions in the Delaware data base are what we used to call “state-supported institutions.” But when state funds pay less than 10% of institutional costs (less than that for the College of Charleston), state-supported hardly seems like an apt description.

If current funding trends continue, very soon state support for higher education will vanish entirely. When that happens, and there are no more governmental requests to justify the costs of instruction, what function will all the Delaware data collected at the College of Charleston really serve?

The answer to this question is critically important. The College has just completed a Strategic Plan, the first overall goal of which is to produce an excellent “personalized” education. The way to have personalized education is to stay as close as possible to the College’s advertised 16:1 student-faculty ratio. (At least, that is what the Fact Book says it is.) On the contrary, the way to generate higher per-faculty student credit hours (SCH) is, however, to have fewer professors teaching more courses to more students per course. The Department of Management and Entrepreneurship, for example, could increase its roster faculty SCH average by more than 20% each semester by offering one section of MGMT 105 to 150 students in Wachovia Auditorium. We would be willing to bet that the parents of these first-year students would not regard the change as an enhancement of “personalized education.” There may be a rare star teacher who can deliver a “high impact” experience to a lecture hall full of students. But as a general principle the College is going to have to choose between its strategic goal of personalized education and its current interest in high numbers of SCH per faculty member.
If in the future the Delaware data collected at the College of Charleston are to be used for internal decision making, we would suggest that the data deserve a finer-grained analysis than they now receive. The current use of the data assumes that
- all students are created equal (i.e., a graduate student is the same as a sophomore),
- all departments offer a combination of “service” courses that satisfy either General Education or preprofessional program requirements, and
- every major requires half a dozen or so courses taught by members of the department responsible for the major.

Pedagogically, the first of these assumptions is absurd on its face. Just imagine a graduate Environmental Sciences course taught to 100 students at a time by a straight lecture method. The second assumption is also false. There are probably others, but among those we know well, neither MGMT nor MKTG has general service courses that satisfy GenEd or preprofessional program requirements. Indeed, MGMT 105, our only course that does not require junior standing, cannot be taken for BADM degree credit. The third assumption is also false. As I note in more detail below, BADM has only two required courses within MGMT, ACLS has 7 major requirements, ECON has 7, HTMT has 6, and INTB has 4. The chart below shows what happens to roster faculty SCH when (a) no courses below 300 are considered, and (b) all individual instruction (internships, independent study, etc.) is removed.

If departments are to be compared on SCH generated, it is important to ensure that the apples are compared to other apples, not to fruit baskets.
Evaluation Of Instruction

Every third-year review, tenure review, or post-tenure review asks for a table that represents the faculty member’s student course evaluations. The table is often questions from the student evaluation (rows) by courses (columns). A cell entry is the mean score on that particular evaluative item for the specified course. (As the evaluation system is about to change, in the future one expects that the numbers will be medians, and consequently even less informative. In some quarters, much ado is made about these average teaching ratings. Is any of that justified by the data? Probably not, for both philosophical and practical reasons.

On the philosophical side, I suspect that most of us believe that “teaching” is not limited to “hours in the classroom” any more than “practicing law” is limited to litigation time in front of a judge or jury. Teaching involves remaining current in the material to be taught, preparing for each class, constructing suitable means of assessing student performance, and - every instructor’s favorite - making the sometimes difficult decisions involved in grading. Teaching also requires continuous adjustments such as those needed to motivate students to be involved in the course, those intended to keep the material fresh, and those reflected in the development of entirely new courses. At the doctoral level, supervision of student research is probably best categorized as “research,” but when the supervised students are undergraduates, serving as a Bachelor’s Essay or Independent Study advisor is really highly targeted tutoring, that is, “teaching.”

Now let’s turn to some of the practical issues with student course evaluations. As those data are presented to faculty and Department Chairs at the College of Charleston, there are two important problems. First, the summary by course presents a mean score, but without any indication of the standard deviation. (Yes, faculty members and Chairs could figure it out on their own, because there are frequencies of individual scores. But an attempt to communicate meaningful statistical information should not require additional work by the reader.)

The result is that the mean score by itself does not deserve the exalted position to which it seems to have been elevated. One faculty member might get a mean score of 4 because half of the respondents give scores of 2 and the other half give scores of 6; another faculty member might have the entire class give scores of 4. Arguably, the classroom performance of these two faculty members could be quite different. This is, of course, why one publication rule of the American Psychological Association is that mean scores should never be presented without being accompanied by some estimate of dispersion.

Even within a class, the mean scores across items can vary widely. For example, in the MGMT Department’s courses for Fall 2007, the correlation between the mean of item means and the standard deviation of those item means was -.85. There is no reason to believe that the same situation did not obtain during calendar 2008 or 2009.
In other words, when a course is very highly rated, there was no rating difference among items, but when a course was not highly rated, there was substantial across-item variability. In this instance, then, the within-course ratings did not satisfy the statistical assumption that the mean and variance will be uncorrelated. No responsible journal editor would accept a paper with this sort of statistical flaw uncorrected. But I have never even heard anyone discuss variability in conjunction with student ratings.

Next, the way the course evaluations are frequently discussed makes it sound as though they represent unambiguous statements about the overall effectiveness of a professor. No one ever says that a faculty member is “an excellent teacher of a particular course taught at a particular time, given a particular level of performance among the students.” This omission is, of course, an example of a classic principle in social psychology - a principle literally called the “fundamental attribution error” (FAE). This error causes perceivers to overemphasize an individual actor’s contribution to an outcome while underestimating the importance of situational variables.

The FAE is both pervasive and non-conscious. Consider just two examples from the Fall 2008 courses. In the first of these, a professor had average ratings in one course that were over a whole point lower than the ratings for a different course. In another case, a professor had ratings for two sections of an identical course that differed more than ¾ of a scale point. In each of these instances, it is realistic to wonder which course rating represents the true capabilities of the professors involved.

Finally, there is a growing literature on the various factors that may influence the course evaluations that students provide. One that has received a great deal of attention is “grading leniency” (see, e.g. Greenwald, 1997). There is the stereotype of the professor who - almost explicitly - trades lenient grading for high evaluations. Like many stereotypes, it is often overblown, but still contains a kernel of truth. Again, some prominent social psychological theories - reciprocity, attribution, and cognitive consistency - can be adduced as explanations for the leniency effect. There are multiple studies that suggest how this can happen, in the complete absence of any underhanded intent on the part of the instructor. In the words of Gillmore and Greenwald (1999), “the full causal sequence is (a) student complaints cause (b) a revised syllabus, which leads to (c) higher grades, which in turn produce (d) higher ratings” (p. 519). One recent study takes the situational variables even farther, by demonstrating that discussion sections given chocolate by an independent experimenter right before the evaluations were collected gave higher course ratings than did the discussion sections with no chocolate (Youmans & Jee, 2007).

The overall conclusion from both conceptual and empirical evidence is that although student course evaluations are an indicator of a professor’s effectiveness, is it a mistake to use them as the only indicator of effectiveness. Although there are regression-based procedures for removing leniency effects, a very simple way to temper the overall influence of student course evaluations is to presume that any
teaching scores that fall within plus or minus 1 standard deviation from the overall mean of average scores are essentially indistinguishable from one another. For the Spring of 2008, the overall mean was 5.2, with an SD of .56; for the Fall of 2008 the mean was again 5.2, with an SD of .49. For the Spring of 2009, the mean was 5.4 with an SD of .57; for the Fall of 2009 the mean was 5.3, with an SD of .58. Basically in any of these semesters, for a teaching evaluation score to be considered “different,” it had to be farther than .5 in either direction away from the mean. Across the three years, only some 7% of the Department’s courses fell below -1SD limit.

References

Background Description Of The Department

This might be the place where every department chair claims that his or her department is in some important way either special or different. Not to disappoint, I will do the expected. But with some numbers.

Between the Spring of 2008 and the Fall of 2008, the total number of undergraduate majors in the School of Business tumbled from 1163 to 846, with most of the drop occurring in BADM (626 to 443), HTMT (161 to 108), and INTB (164 to 113). Since then, all business disciplines have fluctuated around a generally level track, so that in the Spring of 2010 the numbers, respectively, were 491, 96, and 139 for BADM, HTMT, and INTB. At present, BADM accounts for more than 50% of all the majors produced by the School of Business. In Spring 2010 BADM was the third largest major at the College of Charleston, after Biology and Communication, but in some years we are 4th (after Psychology).

How is it possible to produce so many majors with a departmental faculty roughly half the size of Biology, Communication, or Psychology? The answer has to do with the structure of the BADM major. BADM is an intentionally broad-based degree program that exposes students to all functional areas within business. Thus there are only two MGMT courses required of all BADM majors. By contrast, ACLS requires 7 of its own courses, ECON requires 7 of its courses, HTMT requires 6 of its courses, and INTB requires 4 courses taught by its home department. Moreover, with the exception of INTB (which requires MGMT 325, International Business) no other major in the School requires any MGMT courses. Certainly other majors select some of our courses as potential electives, but students in every major other than INTB could graduate having taken only MGMT 301 and MGMT 408.
When all but two of our courses are electives for everyone else, we are simply not in a position to generate enrollment numbers through requirements. Indeed, the structure of the BADM major generates most of its required courses in departments other than ours (i.e., ECFN -- for FINC 303; and MKTG -- for DSCI 304, 320, and MKTG 302).

Because our department is responsible for the BADM capstone course (MGMT 408, Business Policy), we believe that it is critical to send our graduates (and future donors) out with exactly the sort of personalized high impact offering one would expect from such a course. In short, the course sections are normally limited to 24 students per section. I do not personally know when this decision was made, but it was certainly prior to the time that the separate Department of Management and Entrepreneurship came into being, because it has been there longer than I have (Fall of 2005). Indeed, of the course time slots allotted to Management and Entrepreneurship, nearly 60% are in rooms that have system-recognized limits of 24 students. Needless to say, all of these background factors limit the department’s ability (and yes, our desire) to respond to pressures for increased class sizes.

Responses To The Report Template

A. Courses and Curriculum

Course changes. This was the inaugural year of the interdisciplinary Minor in Leadership, Change, and Social Responsibility (LCSR). We expect that this addition of students from outside the School of Business will benefit both our LCSR concentrators and the non-business students as well.

A number of curricular changes were passed by the Faculty Senate and appear in the 2010-2011 Catalog:

• ENTR 321 (New Venture Planning) was changed to eliminate MKTG 302 as a prerequisite.
• ENTR 335 was changed to make ENTR 321 a co-requisite or prerequisite; the course title was changed to New Venture Finance.
• ENTR 406 had its title changed to Social Entrepreneurship in order to align more clearly with the current literature on the topic
• MGMT 403 (Entrepreneurial Leadership) was created from a highly successful MGMT 360. This course will be an elective in both LCSR and ENTR.
• Both the ENTR and LCSR concentrations had their requirements changed to reflect the course changes above.

Special topics. Although the department’s limited major requirements work against us when it comes to class sizes, they work in our favor when one considers the opportunity for innovation. In a Research 1 university, the faculty use their research
time to keep abreast of developments in their disciplinary specialties. Here, however, that valuable objective is most effectively achieved by giving faculty members the opportunity to develop new courses that reflect their intellectual and research interests. The 2009-2010 year saw several of these:

- **MGMT 360 (Social Network Management and Analysis).** Amy Davis’s has applied her past research to this course, which teaches students how particular network configurations influence efficiency, innovation, and financial performance in varied managerial and entrepreneurial settings.

- **MGMT 360 (Intercultural Business Communications).** Bonnie Grossman developed this course (which also contributes to globalization efforts) to provide students with the tools to avoid intercultural blunders, as well as to allow students of different cultural backgrounds to better see the “water” in which they are themselves swimming. (This course was done with the approval of the Department of Communication.)

- **MGMT 360 (Ecopreneurship).** Dave Hansen is widely regarded as “the green guy” in the School of Business. That is clearly reflected in this new offering (one for which we will be seeking permanent status). The course brings business undergraduate students together with EVSS graduate students in the study of new and existing sustainable businesses.

- **MGMT 360 (The Dark Side of Leadership).** Carrie Blair Messal’s seminar examined the personal and situational factors that account for the fact that two-thirds of working Americans say that their greatest source of stress at work is their immediate boss. We expect that this course will become a regular offering. As this is written, the course is part of a CAREER grant proposal to be submitted to the National Science Foundation.

- **MGMT 360 (Biomedical Commercialization).** Kelly Shaver and Mark Kindy (Chair of the neurosciences department at MUSC developed this course to give both science students (primarily biology) and business students hands-on experience with biomedical technology companies located in the Charleston Innovation Center, a joint creation of the City, MUSC, and the South Carolina Research Authority (SCRA). This course will be submitted to stand on its own, because it is one of the elements in Shaver’s Lowcountry Partnership for Biomedical Innovation grant from the National Science Foundation (IIP-917987) to the College of Charleston

**Interdisciplinarity and impact.** Dave Hansen’s Ecopreneurship course and Kelly Shaver’s Biomedical Commercialization course are explicitly interdisciplinary. But they are not the only examples. When one of Gordon Dehler’s MGMT 408 (Business Policy) was a last-minute substitute, the result was that only 5 students enrolled. Gordon made the group into a single team that created a complete strategic plan for a unit of MUSC. Both the head of that unit and the President of MUSC, Ray Greenberg, were on hand for the final presentation by the students. One of Gordon’s MGMT 408 sections for Fall 2010 will do other projects at MUSC (despite the fact that the class is full at 24).
Contributions elsewhere. The department considers itself outward-looking and is therefore proud of its contributions elsewhere. Harland Hodges routinely teaches all DSCI courses (typically DSCI 304, Production) during each Fall Semester, and this year was no exception. Gordon Dehler taught in the Honors program, Carrie Blair Messal has done courses for the First Year Experience program and an adjunct, Carmen Paz Aparicio, has developed in interdisciplinary Learning Community course for Fall 2010. Indeed, the supporting data provided show that our department was responsible for 40% of the FYSE credits generated by the entire School of Business (MKTG had the other 60%). The overall amount for the School is small, but we are proud of our contribution.

B. Diversity

The department was not involved in recruiting during the 2009-2010 academic year. We expect to be recruiting during the 2010-2011 academic year, largely through the placement program conducted by the Academy of Management, the international professional organization for management scholars. Specifically, we will be recruiting through the Business Policy and Strategy division (5424 members), the Critical Management Studies division (852), Entrepreneurship division (2738 members, 1/3 of whom are international), the Gender and Diversity in Organizations division (1332), and the Social Issues in Management division (1661).

Among our faculty continuing into the 2010-2011 academic year, the department has 1 of only 2 black females in the School of Business, 3 white females, 1 female international visitor (Spain) and 6 white males in our total of 11 faculty members. Our black faculty member is, by the way, among only a handful of minority entrepreneurship scholars in America.

C. Professional Development and Research

Because many of the professional activities in which our faculty engage occur outside the normal 9-month range of the academic year, our “Academic Year” report corresponds to the fiscal year (July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010). Thus, for example, the Babson Entrepreneurship Research Conference (which occurs in June) is here for 2010, whereas the Academy of Management meeting (which occurs early in August) is here for 2009.

Two other features of this report should be noted. First, in the descriptions of scholarly activity, there is no duplication of entries. That is, a publication or presentation that includes multiple members of the Department is mentioned only once, and the listing will be in alphabetical order of the first-appearing co-author (all members of the department are listed in bold print). Second, although the College’s merit review system “counts” publications in a year that they are accepted by journals, not the year in which they are actually published, this report is a record of activities that have been completed.
The report includes scholarly activity broadly defined – honors and awards received, editorial activities, grant funding received – as well as publications and presentations. There were several personnel changes this year. First, we welcomed a new adjunct professor, Carmen Paz Aparicio, who has been a real asset in many ways to our undergraduate offerings. We were able to fill our Administrative Coordinator position with Spruill Dunn, who established record-keeping systems we will use for the future, ensured that all of our records will be maintained electronically, and through both personal contact with visitors and written communications served as our “brand manager.” She created the Department’s first Newsletter, establishing a model that will continue. Unfortunately for us, Spruill left in March to accept a highly responsible position in the private sector. We have also lost Sandy Krezmien-Funk, who occupied a visiting line that was responsible for the 200-level business writing courses (which will consequently not be continued). Finally, at the end of the year we lost John Clarkin to Northern Kentucky University.

There were other faculty developments. Three faculty, Amy Davis, Bonnie Grossman, and Carrie Blair Messal (Blair and Messal are the same person, new last name in October) were third-year review candidates, and all were retained on the progression toward consideration for tenure.

**Honors and Awards**


Blockson, L. C. (2009). Fox24/My Charleston’s African American History Month’s Outstanding Citizen (one of five honorees).


**Grant Funding Received**

Blair, C. A. (2009). Funding provided for the creation and implementation of a course for Freshmen integrating a freshman level management course with an on-campus leadership opportunities seminar. Awarded.


Books


Chapters


Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles


Other Articles


Presentations


Hansen, D. J. (2009, August). Teaching social and sustainable entrepreneurship. In W. Schulte (Chair), Symposium presented at the Academy of Management, Chicago, IL.


Shaver, K. G. (2010, April). *Behave!* Keynote address presented at the Gateway Conference on Entrepreneurship, St. Louis, MO.


**Editorial Board Memberships**

Dehler, G. E.
*Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion*
*Journal of Management Education*
*International Journal of Management Practice*
*International Journal of Management Philosophy and Concepts*

Hansen, D. J.
Case Editor for *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*

Rudd, H.
*Journal of Small Business Management*

Shaver, K. G.
*Journal of Applied Social Psychology*
*Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*

**Ad Hoc Reviewing**

Blockson, L.
*Business and Society*
*Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*
D. Service Contributions

Faculty members in the department are involved in service activities at the College, local community, national professional, and international levels.

Blockson, L.
Campus Facilitator and Liaison, Jimmy and Rosalyn Carter Center Partnership Foundation, Service Entrepreneur Program
Departmental Representative, Faculty Senate
Office of Undergraduate Research and Creative Activities, Reviewer
Clarkin, J. C.
Dixie Plantation Strategy Committee, Committee Member, Board Member
Faculty Advisor, Students in Free Enterprise (SIFE),
Strategic Diversity Management Council (SDMC), Committee Member
Institute of Certified Franchise Executives (ICFE), Advisory Board, Board Member

Davis, A. E.
Member of East Cooper Entrepreneurial Women.

Dehler, G.
External Assessor, Academic Promotion, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
Member of SBE Faculty Development Committee
Member of Ad Hoc Committee on the Development and Evaluation of Teaching Conducting monthly New Faculty Institute seminars [Fall 2009 - ongoing]

Hansen, D. J.
Organizer, “Summit” meeting of international researchers in marketing and entrepreneurship.
Organizer, Monthly Green Business Networking Events
Planning Committee, Charleston Green Business Expo

Hodges, H.
Departmental Representative, Faculty Senate

Messal, C. B.
Director - Schottland Scholars Program, Internal to College of Charleston, School of Business & Schottland Family

Rudd, H. F.
Co-Director, “Western Europe: Study Abroad” program with Dr. Olejniczak
Director of the “New South Carolina” program.
Outside member on HTMT’s third year review of Dr. Wayne Smith

Shaver, K. G.
Organizer, PSED 101 2009 (international research workshop)
External evaluator for a doctoral dissertation completed at the Queensland University of Technology in Australia
External evaluator for tenure/promotion candidate, CMAS of Israel
Member, Continuity Council of the Entrepreneurship Division of the Academy of Management
Elected (by the Faculty Senate) member of the Governance Committee, charged with reforming the size and processes of the Faculty Senate
Institutional faculty representative to the Federal Demonstration Partnership
E. Outreach Activities

At the organizational level, the Department has instituted its own newsletter, for the joint purposes of informing the local community about its activities while providing a connecting point for graduates of our programs. This newsletter can be found on the Department’s Web site, http://sb.cofc.edu/academicdepartments/business/newsletter/index.php

Individually, members of the Department are heavily involved in the business life of the region through board memberships, presentations, and activities, all of which are listed below.

Blockson, L. C.
*Entrepreneurial tips for 2009: Use economic uncertainty to your advantage.* Black Pages USA (Charleston Trident edition), 142-143.

Clarkin, J. C.
National Foundation for Teaching Entrepreneurship
Education Foundation, Advisory Board Member
Youth Entrepreneurship South Carolina, Advisory Board Member
South Carolina Investor Network, Advisory Board Member
ThinkTEC, Advisory Board Member
Gavalas-Kolanko Foundation, Advisory Board Member
Management/Executive Development, Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE)

Grossman, B.
Technical/Professional Work, Evening Post Publishing, Charleston, SC,

Hansen, D. J.

Kent, T.
I provide service to the community by working with my wife to redistribute food that is contributed by several grocery stores to community organizations such as the Ronald McDonald House, the Crisis Ministry, and several others.

Rudd, H. F.
Board Member, South Carolina International Trade Council

F. Obstacles
In any endeavor, there are two critical resources, one more precious than the other. These are cash and time. Time is the more precious because we are given only 24 hours per day apiece, time cannot be expanded, more time cannot be created. It is possible, though unpopular, to raise tuition to enhance funding of critical programs and needs. More positively, additional financial support for departmental activities can be produced by success in obtaining external grant funding. Many times this funding carries very low limits on indirect cost recovery (often 10%) or less, so by the time these indirect cost recoveries reach a department, they are able to make a difference only around the edges.

On the other hand, when there is a full recovery of indirect costs, the department’s share can be substantial. As an example, the department’s share of the recovery from the Lowcountry Partnership for Biomedical Innovation will, for two years, exceed the research funding provided to the department in the College budget. Does the department need additional funding? Of course. Is that likely to happen? Probably not.

Time, however is another matter. Universities are well-known for failing to understand the opportunity costs associated with -- for example -- reporting requirements of all sorts. Consider some examples that range from the mundane to the important.

- **PDF forms that cannot be saved.** Most of the College’s procedures require some sort of form, and often there are PDF versions of those forms available online. The difficulty is that they cannot be saved to the hard disk of the person completing the form. This means that people either have to (a) type into the form and print it to save a paper copy, or (b) print the form as blank and hand-write in the information, again saving the work by making a paper copy.

- **Platform-dependent forms.** The macros that assign a TA number on a Travel Authorization will not work on the versions of Excel that can be purchased for a Mac. Cougar Trail claims that Safari is an unsupported browser that may produce errors when it is used. Yet Safari produces fewer problems when doing off-campus access than does Firefox. The entire world is not dependent on Microsoft any more. We should not be either.

- **Access.** Many of the most productive faculty members do their research and writing at home. They are available to students through email. But things like Internet Native Banner, or the Cascade Server for Web updates work only from on-campus -- despite the fact that they require a separate login. In the era of eBay and PayPal, there is simply no acceptable rationale for requiring people to be on campus to use College facilities.

- **Too many signatures.** Anyone who has ever hired an administrative assistant, or proposed a modification in one prerequisite for a course, knows that way too many people are involved in these processes. Hiring an administrative assistant requires the approvals of (a) the Dean, (b) the EEO office, (3) the Provost, (4) Human Resources, (5) the President, and (6) finally back to Human Resources for the generation of an offer.
• Duplicative reporting. I have saved the “best” of these for last. Annual evaluations are on a calendar year. Within those annual evaluations, teaching and service are to be evaluated for the immediate past year, whereas research is to be considered for a running three-year period. This means that every faculty member subject to evaluation, and every Chair conducting an evaluation, has to consider three years of data to perform an evaluation for one year. If that were not enough, reports such as this one are on an academic year, not the calendar year, so that faculty members are forced to update their materials at the end of the Fall Semester and at the end of the Spring Semester instead of just one time per year. No business would operate this way.

As administrative requests multiply, and as the responsibility for providing data devolves to the faculty, all of that reporting takes critical time away from the faculty’s responsibilities for teaching, research, and service. Especially in years where there will be no raises for instructional faculty, the reporting burden becomes truly onerous. The equivalent would be to require students to turn in all specified homework despite the fact that from the beginning of a semester it has already been established that all students in the course will be given a grade of C.

From the time I arrived at the College of Charleston in the summer of 2005, the Tate Center for Entrepreneurship has been an extremely important resource to students, the department, and the College. The Director of the Tate Center served as the advisor to the student group, Students In Free Enterprise (SIFE), and as the major force behind the creation of Cougar Undergraduate Business Enterprises (CUBE), which itself is staffed primarily by SIFE students. Administrative assistance for both of these organizations -- including those needed to accompany SIFE students on their several successful regional and national competitions -- have always come out of the Tate Center for Entrepreneurship’s budget. At the present time, however, the Tate Center (a) has been renamed to eliminate the word “Entrepreneurship,” (b) the Director has left to take a position elsewhere, (c) the three staff positions have been repurposed, and (d) the external programs that provided resources have all but disappeared. During each of two summers, the Tate Center sponsored up to $30,000 in professional development funds on a competitive basis. The Tate Center was one of the School’s primary connections to the local business community, a connection we now appear to have lost. We can only hope the loss will not be permanent.