The Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) had a busy year, meeting formally 12 times as a full committee. We started the year off with a survey of faculty attitudes that led us to focus on three areas: compensation; faculty and administration relations; and policies, especially relating to tenure and promotion (see Appendix 1). Results from the survey were shared with the Faculty Senate. The FWC’s direct response to the survey was two-fold: 1) in order to delve further into faculty-administration relations, we devised a follow-up survey asking faculty to evaluate the President, the Provost, and Deans; 2) we created three sub-committees, dedicated to merit-based pay-raise issues (chaired by Heath Hoffmann), tenure and promotion issues (chaired by Marty Perlmutter), and adjunct welfare issues (chaired by Simon Lewis) respectively. The sub-committees produced their own reports and recommendations. The merit-based pay-raise subcommittee drew up a list of recommendations that the FWC endorsed and sent on to Academic Affairs (see Appendix 2 [electronic attachment]). The adjunct welfare subcommittee conducted a survey the results of which we anticipate using next year; the committee made one immediate recommendation—that adjuncts be included in any and all across-the-board pay-raises. The tenure and promotion subcommittee reviewed a set of proposals from Academic Affairs that are moving through the approval process.

Other issues addressed included the formation of an Office of Economic Development and the appointment to lead that office of Robert Marlowe (see Appendix 3), a proposal by Academic Affairs to create a new rank of Professor of Practice (see Appendix 4), and concern over recent denials of sabbatical proposals (see Appendix 5 [electronic attachment]).

The Committee comprised the following members:

Viviane Bekrou, Margaret Hagood, Heath Hoffmann, Stephane Lafortune, Simon Lewis (Secretary), Marty Perlmutter (Chair), Amanda Ruth-McSwain, Allison Welch, and Kelley White.
First Meeting September 6th

Second Meeting September 20th

Discussion re assessment with Penny Brunner and Lynne Ford in attendance.

Minutes of Third Meeting (10/04/2011)

Dean’s conference room, Jewish Studies Center, 96 Wentworth Street.

Present: Marty Perlmutter, Margaret Hagood, Heath Hoffmann, Stephane Lafortune, Simon Lewis, Amanda Ruth-McSwain, and Allison Welch; absent: Viviane Bekrou, Kelley White (leave); guests: Tom Casey (Human Resources), Brian McGee (President’s Office).

1) Brian McGee presented a sheet of information providing some data indicating the ratio of faculty to staff from 2000 and 2010, compared to other state institutions. The document indicated that research universities in SC have the highest ratio of staff to faculty, and that CofC’s ratio has been fairly consistently low by comparison. Dr McGee argued that while it is true that the College needs more roster faculty, we need even more non-instructional staff to be comparable with our peers. He also pointed out that most other state universities had increased both staff and faculty numbers, but that they had done so at the same time as increasing student enrolment—something that CofC has not done.

Marty Perlmutter asked whether the outsourcing of some janitorial work (2005-6) had depressed the total number of staff recorded in 2010. Brian responded that some of the “permatemps” the College had been employing may have ended up as permanent employees with WFF, and added that the addition of physical space has necessitated additional service positions.

Amanda Ruth-McSwain asked how the document treated tenured faculty who have administrative positions. Brian answered that anyone with a 12-month contract is listed as staff rather than faculty. He added that comparison between salaries of administrators/staff and faculty is complicated by the fact that faculty on 9-month contracts may also be earning additional stipends.

Marty Perlmutter asked whether enrolment really had been flat. McGee said the headcount was almost identical, but we have fewer part-time graduate students than before, so with the additional yield this year of undergrads we’re up about 500 from 2000 (9,900 to 10,400).

Marty pointed to a recent increase in EVP lines and to the additional lines in, for example, the Division of Marketing and Communication.

Tom Casey said that there’s been a shift to support marketing and IT, and that both of those divisions are handling more and more work—a report
that he might previously have been able to get in a day he now has to wait in line for. There’s been a huge turnover of personnel at senior level: the only senior VP still here who was already here in 2005 is Victor Wilson. Brian said that there are 21 positions with VP in the title (including Associate, Senior, and Executive VP)—he didn’t think that that was more than in 2005.

Marty asked whether the Strategic Plan’s target of 100 new faculty lines by 2017 was still the goal. Brian said the target number remained the same but that it was unlikely to be achieved by 2017. It would be financed by a modest tuition raise.

Marty asked about the state of the budget and whether revenue from out-of-state fees had kept it stable. Brian explained that the auxiliary budget (approximately 1/3 of the entire budget) was slightly up, but that the Education and General (E&G) budget was $600,000 lower than last year.

Marty asked about the proposed faculty salary increases. Brian explained that increasing faculty salaries is President Benson’s #1 priority. The sum of $800,000 is available for one-time bonuses (non-recurring) for faculty and staff, and for recurring salary increases, funded by tuition dollars. Marty commented that our survey had shown that faculty would prefer cost-of-living adjustments over merit bonuses if the amount of money available is small.

In response to Allison Welch’s question on the numbers of part-time employees in 2000 and 2010, Tom indicated that there were about 200 adjuncts and 200 temporary employees now, a number little different from January 2002. A part-time employee is anyone working fewer than thirty hours a week.

Tom agreed that cost-of-living adjustments are desirable, and that bonuses are only a stop-gap. Brian added that increasing healthcare costs (not related to merit, as Alison pointed out) have heightened the general recognition of the need to increase salaries. He also confirmed that the President was aware of the Senate resolution from March 2008 that in the case of across-the-board raises being permitted by the state, all employees should get at least 0.80% of the state-approved rate, regardless of relative merit.

Marty raised concern about the growth in the areas of marketing and development and the implications for the campus. He also asked about accountability of divisions other than faculty.

The Committee thanked Brian McGee and Tom Casey for their time.

Once Dr McGee and Mr Casey had left, the meeting came to a speedy conclusion with everyone agreeing that we should move forward with our follow-up survey on faculty concerns with some urgency.
College of Charleston  
Faculty Welfare Committee  

Fourth Meeting (10/25/2011)  

Dean’s conference room, Jewish Studies Center, 96 Wentworth Street.  

Present: Viviane Bekrou, Heath Hoffmann, Amanda Ruth-McSwain, Marty Perlmutter, Margaret Hagood, Allison Welch.  
Apologies received from Stephane Lafortune  
Guest: Provost George Hynd  

Provost Hynd had sent his apologies in advance explaining that he would be late as a result of meeting with President Benson prior to the townhall meeting later. The committee took advantage of our waiting period to discuss issues we wanted to raise with him. These included:  
Increasing the role of faculty in the institution; e.g., not necessarily assuming national searches are necessary;  
The independence of Academic Affairs (essentially, does anyone in admin have faculty’s backs?);  
The articulation of Academic Affairs up and down—with President and Board of Trustees, and with Faculty;  
The manner in which Academic Affairs promotes what we believe in (e.g., great teaching);  
The goals of Academic Affairs in regard to teaching (supporting and rewarding it);  
The manner in which Academic Affairs will implement the Strategic Plan in relation to faculty salaries and reorganization of positions (e.g., consolidation of overlapping administrative offices);  
The best way to get the Board of Trustees to fully understand what the Faculty is about;  
What to do about the on-line evaluations and their role in t&p decisions.  

When Provost Hynd arrived, these were among the topics discussed. Additional topics that Provost Hynd brought up included the openness of Academic Affairs to differential loads (Faculty focusing on teaching, focusing on research, etc.), and a heads-up about CHE’s desire to create a “university center” in Charleston.  

Since Provost Hynd’s visit was running up against the townhall meeting, we decided to put off substantive discussion of the recent survey to a supernumerary meeting on November 1st, at which Calvin Blackwell (Faculty Compensation Committee chair) would be present.
Faculty Welfare Committee

Fifth Meeting (11/01/2011)

Maybank Seminar Room

Apologies received from Margaret Hagood.
Guest: Calvin Blackwell (Faculty Compensation Committee chair)

Discussion of the recent survey focused on three broad areas to do with compensation: adjunct pay and conditions; the provision of additional opportunities that might be rewarded by pay raises; and the question of cost-of-living adjustments versus pay raises based solely on merit reviews. Questions relating to tenure and promotion and to administration-faculty communication also came up.

We decided to establish three sub-committees to further look into the following:
- Adjunct pay and conditions
- Tenure and promotion
- Cost-of-living adjustments versus raises based on merit review.

Additionally Simon would contact Sarah Owens to arrange for Heath to present a report on the survey to the Senate, while Marty would send the survey to the Provost and/or Lynne Ford, drawing attention to particular disgruntlement with deans of the School of Business and the School of the Arts.

The committee was pleased to learn that the Compensation Committee was already working on proposals to create new opportunities to reward superior performance, and that a working group is attempting to improve the current online course/teacher-evaluation system.

Although we cannot address all the issues that the survey has revealed, the consensus was that the survey contained much valuable information that might benefit other committees now and in the future.
Minutes of Faculty Welfare Committee
Sixth Meeting Tuesday November 15, 2011
Dean’s Conference Room, Jewish Studies Center

Present: Mart Perlmutter, Heath Hoffmann, Amanda Ruth-McSwain, Viviane Bekrou, Margaret Hagood, Allison Welch, Simon Lewis
Guest: Bev Diamond
Apologies received from: Stephane Lafortune

The meeting was devoted to a presentation by Associate Provost Bev Diamond of recommendations for tweaking policies and procedures in the College’s tenure and promotion review process. Bev started by recapping on the message and charge that Academic Affairs had taken away from the August retreat on this topic: that it would not be a good idea to attempt these revisions via faculty discussion; that the revisions were necessary to restore confidence in the process; that any new policies should not be cumbersome, or radically alter things. The recommendations Academic Affairs have come up with are based on policies at peer and comparable institutions, but inflected by our own institutional culture. The recommendations pertained to areas that Academic Affairs had been specifically charged to look into: provision of feedback to candidates, chairs, and deans; guidelines for solicitation of information in cases of ambiguity or incompleteness; the approval of departmental guidelines; and the possible creation of school level committees.

Once the discussion started, Bev explained that she would like the committee’s feedback before the next senior faculty retreat, scheduled for December, after which time the recommendations would go through the regular faculty governance process for approval with a view to being implemented next academic year (2012-2013).

Specific questions were raised on the following:

p.4 item C—how would a candidate know a factual error had been transmitted up the line? Bev replied that it was pretty unlikely for a truly factual error to persist throughout the process, and the goal of the various committees is to avoid lack of clarity on questions of interpretation. Committees and deans, however, should be allowed to reserve the right to come to independent judgment. The process has checks and balances built in that should minimize problems.

The most significant change recommended had to do with the recommendation that schools be allowed to form school-wide committees. One consequence of this might be that the process will become longer than it currently is, and Bev anticipated that we might both start earlier (with packet preparation) and end later (with committee deliberation). These school-wide committees would not replace the college-wide committee, but departments could choose to dispense with departmental committees (esp. in cases where departments are small), with the consequence that no additional work and no additional layer of bureaucracy has been created. Avoiding redundancy might still be an issue.
Interdisciplinary programs present their own special problems and need to be looked into further—especially as regards the recommendation that external members not be included on departmental panels.

The make-up of the College-wide committee was discussed. Marty wondered why George Hynd’s suggestions for securing representative committees (members from all schools, etc.) were not reflected in the document. Bev said that she would take that issue back to Academic Affairs.

Given the deliberate vagueness about time-lines Margaret Hagood suggested that references to the 5-day period within which candidates can respond to information provided should be struck from the document. Bev agreed, and added that the period was intended to be applicable to all parties.

Marty was anxious that the creation of school-wide committees might allow deans to ride roughshod over faculty within their schools. Bev said that schools would have to develop their own guidelines here with a view to generally strengthening procedures. The idea is not to allow deans to be more autocratic. Faculty need to be given priority in determining whether or not to move to school level committees; part of their motivation to do so would be the expectation that such committees are beneficial to candidates (in expectation of fairness, understanding, etc.) as well as to the college.

Heath pointed out that the faculty sentiment in favor of school-wide committees was based on the sense that colleagues in the same school were more likely to understand the nature and quality of a candidate’s work. Bev defended the objectivity of the College-wide committee and its ability to exercise fair and accurate judgment, pointing out that even within schools there is considerable difference among departments and even within departments.

Constituting a College-wide committee, especially one that represents all schools—has always been a problem. The recommendations attempt to ease the problem, not by offering members course releases, but by reducing the work-load (removing the evaluation of instructor-renewal cases, etc.).

We agreed that we would get responses to the recommendations back to Bev before December 1st. These responses do not need to reflect consensus, but Bev indicated that she would like to be able to distinguish between feedback reflecting the concerns of one person versus opinions that reflected a general consensus of the committee.

Bev had also circulated a document pertaining to the recommendation that a new rank “Professor of Practice” be created to accommodate those (few) professors whose work as professionals and whose unique experience in their particular field makes them valuable to the College but not necessarily in ways that fit the usual academic descriptions. The rank would allow for more regular and secure employment than would be currently possible for a non-tenure track appointment. Bev pointed out that creating the new rank
was analogous to creating the rank of instructor some years ago. The goal of the new rank is not to diminish the number of tenured faculty.

The meeting ended with brief discussion of the establishment of the Office of Economic Development. Bev indicated that as far as she knew, Bobby Marlowe’s new position is something of a transfer; his old position will not be filled.

Simon
Faculty Welfare Committee

Minutes of seventh meeting
November 29th, 2011
2:30 pm Dean’s Conference Room, Jewish Studies Center

In attendance: Marty Perlmutter, Viviane Békrou, Stephane Lafortune, Simon Lewis, Amanda Ruth-McSwain, Allison Welch
Apologies from: Margaret Hagood, Heath Hoffmann

1. Presenting results of survey to Faculty Senate

The committee gave its full approval to Heath Hoffmann to present the results of the recent survey to the Faculty Senate on Tuesday, December 6th as set out in his e-mail (see copy of e-mail from Heath Hoffmann attached)

2. Responding to Academic Affairs' recommendations for T&P procedures

The Committee discussed the recommendations by the Office of Academic Affairs in regard to T&P procedure. The Committee appreciates Academic Affairs’ thoughtful and at times creative response to the issues raised at the recent retreat.

On recommendation 1 the Committee broadly supported the proposals but expressed concern about potential inconsistency between items B and C. We recommend that parallel language (using the phrase "assessment of the merits of the case") should replace the phrase "without elaboration" in item C. The Committee believes that these recommendations go a long way to meeting the desire for transparency in the T&P process. On item E, the Committee proposes that the 5 day limit within which a written correction can be furnished is unnecessarily detailed and that the relevant clause should be rewritten as follows: "the candidate may provide a timely written correction for inclusion in the packet."

On recommendation 2 the Committee endorsed Heath Hoffmann’s suggestion as follows:

The proposed recommendation says that, "The written request should be directed to the chair of the Departmental Evaluation Panel or through the panel chair to the candidate," I would suggest that the following change: "The written request should be directed through the chair of the Departmental Evaluation Panel to the candidate." My proposed change would ensure that the same procedure is followed in all cases and ensures that the candidate and panel chair are both involved in discussing how to respond to the Advisory Committee’s requests for information.

On recommendation 3, in response to the desire to leave departments (with the approval of Academic Affairs) some leeway in determining their guidelines, the Committee recommends accepting the recommendation’s first paragraph but deleting the second paragraph disallowing “quantitative minimums for performance levels.”

Recommendation 4 was the recommendation that proved the most contentious. After much discussion the Committee decided to urge Academic Affairs to hold fire on this particular proposal until it had received further discussion among the faculty. Marty Perlmutter pointed out that the recommendation in fact exceeded the specific charge that Academic Affairs had taken away from the August retreat. While some of the Committee appreciated the creativity with which Academic Affairs had crafted the possible addition of a school-wide T&P committee as part of the process, sentiment was vigorously opposed to anything that added a layer to the process.
Recommendation 5 prompted no objections from the Committee, but did prompt discussion on what can be done to make on-line course evaluations more effective. It was suggested that completion of on-line evaluations should be made compulsory, or that those completing the evaluations could be allowed to view their grades a day earlier, and so on. Other complaints about the on-line evaluations included the comment that the summaries are very difficult to read; nobody was in favor of the idea of group extra credit for completion of the evaluations.

Recommendation 6 met with broad approval. There was a question, however, as to what might happen in contested cases. Would an instructor have the right to have her/his case heard by the t&p committee in the case of a negative decision by dean and/or department.

Much discussion ensued over recommendation 7. In the end, the Committee agreed that the recommendation was too detailed and unnecessarily specific. It was suggested that the biggest need in this area is to make sure that departmental referral letters fully and clearly assess the overall quality of a candidate’s work. Such assessment might well include some of the detailed scrutiny of editorial practice of journals in which a candidate has published her/his work, but it is not necessary for the FAM to include such language. Allison Welch made a strong case against what she saw as a “binary” approach to each discrete publication (judging each one as good or not-good) rather than a holistic approach allowing assessment of a candidate’s body of work in toto. The Committee recommends that items A and E be accepted, along with the first paragraph of item B. the second paragraph of item B, along with items C and D should be struck.

Recommendation 8 struck the Committee as fine and sensible, although the second sentence struck us as redundant.

Heath Hoffman indicated in his e-mail that he approved of recommendation 9, but the Committee was otherwise opposed to it. Marty Perlmutter pointed out that the recommendation did not appear to have anything to do with the specific concerns raised at the August retreat, and he suggested the recommendation be deleted. The Committee agreed.

3. Discussion of Professor of Practice proposal

The Committee decided to put off discussion of the Professor of Practice proposal till next semester.

4. Finding a way to get bonuses to adjuncts

The Committee briefly discussed the possibility of responding to the apparent inequity of excluding full-time, long-term adjunct employees from eligibility for the current bonuses. We agreed that some sort of recommendation ought to be made to Academic Affairs—for instance, urging Academic Affairs to make money available for bonuses as a top priority if and when it should be available. In any case, one of the three sub-committees next semester will be addressing structural issues in regard to adjunct pay. Simon Lewis’s position on this was that such deferral of action would, again, leave adjuncts un(der)-rewarded.

5. Response to formation of Office of Economic Development and appointment of Bobby Marlowe as its head.

The Committee was a little chary of discussing this issue in light of its apparently tangential relation to the Committee’s charge. Nonetheless, the Committee decided that insofar as it was not clear that suitably qualified faculty had been eligible to apply for the post, the appointment could de facto be considered a Faculty Welfare issue. Accordingly, Simon Lewis was charged with drafting a letter to be sent to Brian McGee and Tom Casey inquiring what the process for the appointment was, whether faculty had been eligible to apply, and whether the post had even been advertised. Additional anxieties concerned the potential appearance of a conflict of interest in the appointment, the job description (if any) and questions of accountability in relation to it, and
the appearance once more that in a time of limited resources, administrative positions get priority over faculty needs.

6. Response to Lynn Cherry about Faculty committees

Since the required response date for Lynn Cherry’s request is not until next semester, the Committee deferred discussion on this topic until our next meeting.

7. Change in FAM to Post-Tenure Review process

Marty Perlmutter will contact the Chair of the By-Laws Committee to see whether any faculty Welfare issues are at stake in the alteration in wording in the FAM to the post-Tenure Review process.
Faculty Welfare Committee meeting  
January 20th, 2012  
Apologies received from: Viviane Bekrou, Margaret Hagood, and Amanda Ruth-McSwain (on the campaign trail for Herman Cainolina Colbert)

1) In response to the draft document suggesting the designation of a new rank, Professor of Practice, the Faculty Welfare Committee had the following concerns:
   --we are unclear exactly what need the new rank meets that could not already be met by one of the existing ranks: adjunct, visiting professor, or even tenure-track. It was noted, for instance, that we already have a good number of performers, writers, musicians, etc. who are also expected to teach, perform service, etc.; in their case, the FAM already allows for non-academic work to "count" as evidence of research and professional development.
   --we are concerned that the addition of a new rank might fragment the common purpose of the faculty as a whole
   --we are concerned that, if a Professor of Practice occupies a line formerly assigned to a tenure-track faculty member, departments may find it harder to deliver both their own departmental curriculum and their contribution to the general education curriculum
   --we are concerned that evaluation might prove problematic.

2) In response to Brian McGee’s letter answering our questions about the new Office of Economic Development and the appointment of Bobby Marlowe to head the new office, the Committee remained concerned about the absence of a transparent policy that might allow faculty to apply for positions such as Mr Marlowe’s when they are created.

3) Marty Perlmutter will chair the tenure and promotion sub-committee, Heath Hoffmann will chair the merit raise sub-committee, and Simon Lewis will chair the adjunct sub-committee. All sub-committees will attempt to meet before the next meeting of the full Committee on February 10th.
1) Beth Goodier reported to the committee on the progress of the ad hoc committee tasked with improving the on-line course evaluations. She indicated that the committee is most interested in removing some or all of the demographic questions and asking the students if the SCIP questions concerning the type of class (lecture, discussion, etc.) can be administered a different way (or eliminated altogether). Members of the Welfare Committee aired their views on the usefulness on some of the demographic questions and on the question of “incentives” to students to complete the surveys. Marty wanted the ad hoc committee to know that there is substantial resistance to offering extra credit, for instance, for completing the surveys. Heath said that he thought the problem with the evaluations was becoming more of a morale issue than it should be, as faculty are feeling that the burden is falling on them to make the system work. Allison wondered whether the ad hoc committee had taken into consideration situations where students might have to do evaluations for classes and their associated labs. Beth suggested that we might have to weather a cycle of non- or low-return until there are no students left who have any memory of having done the survey on paper.

2) Reports from sub-committees:
   a. Adjunct
      Simon reported that the sub-committee had met with Devon Hanahan who was on the sub-committee of the Compensation Committee that is also looking into adjunct pay and conditions. Their committee is planning on sending out a survey to all schools in SC to figure out what other colleges pay their adjuncts, etc. In the meanwhile our committee will continue to think about possible mechanisms for pay raises as well as ways to make healthcare affordable.
   b. Merit pay
      Heath reported that the sub-committee is in the information-gathering phase. They are surveying chairs to see how each department goes about the merit review, what rubrics (if any) they use, and how burdensome the process is on faculty. Amanda is surveying deans to learn how chairs are assessed, and asking the Provost to let them know how deans are assessed. They are also reviewing the substance of the language in the FAM and on the relevant Academic Affairs web-pages, and Viviane is inquiring into the practice at our peer institutions.
   c. T&P
      Marty reported that the sub-committee had not met but would do so. Heath pointed out that the FWC was named in Bev Diamond’s most recent e-mail recording the last round of discussions on T&P and setting out next steps. Most of the FWC committee appeared to have passed over that e-mail, so we were grateful to Heath for drawing our attention to it.

3) Updates on old business
   a. TERI
      Marty reported that there has been no resolution of the Post-TERI awards available to College of Charleston employees. There is no College-wide procedure for awarding the grants, and they have generally not been awarded to faculty members who have completed their TERI. The concern is equity—what applies to one group of employees (e.g., faculty) should apply to all other groups of employees, and not
another. The equity concern would not be avoided if the Provost’s Office restricted Post-Teri awards, but the President’s Office did not also do so.

b. Professor of Practice
Marty reported that Bev may get back to us again with a revised proposal explaining more precisely what purpose the proposed position serves. From Academic Affairs’ point-of-view the position is apparently most pertinent to the School of the Arts. Sentiment of the committee still seemed to confirm that our current range of positions is adequate.

c. OED
We may hear back from Brian McGee in due time.

4) Heath noted that he had had a number of thank you notes and e-mails in response to our two surveys of the faculty last term. He suggested that we should survey the Business School as a follow-up to the earlier surveys, which revealed marked discontent within that school. Heath will approach Provost Hynd with this suggestion before we conduct the survey.

5) Simon reported that he and Marty had met with Susan Rozzi, chair of the Advisory Committee to the President. Susan had requested the meeting as a result of her anxiety that the committee was not able to represent College concerns to the President in as comprehensive a way as would be most desirable. Simon mentioned his idea for creating a sort of “cabinet” comprising chairs from key faculty committees. Kelley suggested that the Advisory Committee might serve as just such a cabinet. The suggestion went down well and is something we should revisit. The suggestion was also floated that committees should present reports or some digest version of their minutes at the monthly Senate meetings, possibly via the Speaker of the Faculty.

6) Simon proposed that we use some version of the second survey's set of questions on communication between administration and faculty as the basis for an annual set of evaluations by faculty of senior administrators (President and President's Office, Provost and Provost's Office, Deans).
Faculty Welfare Committee

Minutes of 10th meeting held on March 30th, 2012
11:00 a.m., Dean’s Conference Room, Jewish Studies Center

1) Professor of Practice (Bev Diamond, Valerie Morris, Marion Mazzone)

In response to our unenthusiastic response to the initial presentation of the draft policy creating a “Professor of Practice” rank at the College of Charleston, Bev Diamond brought along Marian Mazzone and Valerie Morris who, as chair of the Art History Department, which houses the Historic Preservation program, and as Dean of the School of the Arts, has the most immediate interest in creating the post as they wish to find a way to hire Jim Ward, a landscape architect. Marian explained that Jim’s expertise doesn’t fit an academic model, that his professional work does not lend itself to the kind of peer review that traditionally has validated both the work of academic art historians and the work of practicing artists, but that his professional expertise makes his work for the department vital, not least in that he can provide opportunities for students that art historians and artists cannot. Jim’s is not the only case in the SotA: Valerie Morris also mentioned Scott Shanklin-Peterson who has been a permanent visitor without a satisfactory title, but whose contribution to the Arts Management program is and has been fundamental to the program. Remarking on this state of affairs, Bev Diamond argued that we’ve been violating the letter of the law in the FAM for years now in a number of cases, and that creating a Professor of Practice rank could clean things up.

Bev reassured us that the PoP rank would not be used as a way to add cheap non-tenure track lines. In fact, the number of instructors, she said, has not been going up in recent years, despite the severe budget cuts, and, besides, we should not assume that PoPs would be hired at lower salaries.

We also need not worry about PoP overwhelming faculty in any given school as SACS and other accreditation needs would forbid that.

None of the current titles really suit the kind of person Art History is looking for—they don’t want a visiting line, but a permanent one, they don’t want an instructor, but someone working in upper levels of the major/program, and it really isn’t legitimate to call the person an artist[or executive]-in-residence.

In response to questions from Heath Hoffmann, Bev said that creation of a PoP rank would create appropriate flexibility in hiring and should relieve some problems (especially of nomenclature). She further added that it was very unlikely that opportunistic hires of PoPs would have a negative impact on the ranking of new lines, etc., since in all likelihood there will be very few new PoPs anyway, and all will have to go through the budgeting and ranking process.

Marty asked whether creating the PoP rank, in part out of the perceived need to clean up the nomenclature of people already hired, would necessitate our renaming some of the positions of existing faculty. Bev thought not, especially in the case of senior faculty. She did say, however, that it would be good to evaluate all the titles of such positions.

As a concluding comment Marian asserted that if Historic Preservation were to advertise for a job teaching landscape architecture, the program would assuredly like to be able to advertise for the position as a PoP.
As only four of the Faculty Welfare Committee were present, we decided to shelve full discussion of the proposal until the following meeting.

2) Text book royalties
After brief discussion, those present agreed that the better way to address the question of royalties for books and materials produced by a teacher and used in her/his class, was to ask the teacher to self-report that s/he has assigned her own work, and to donate the (estimated) royalties.

3) Reports from subcommittees: Merit Pay Raise System (Heath Hoffmann); Tenure and Promotion (Marty Perlmutter); Adjunct Welfare (Allison Welch [Simon Lewis])
Heath Hoffman and Amanda Ruth McSwain reported on their recommendations for streamlining the current merit pay raise system and for establishing consistent, regular evaluation procedures for chairs and deans. Heath will present the sub-committee’s findings at the Faculty Senate meeting on Tuesday April 3rd.
Simon Lewis reported on the adjunct sub-committee’s adjunct faculty survey, pointing out that the one immediate recommendation was for a base-rate increase for adjunct courses any time there is a pay raise for non-adjunct faculty.

4) Any other business
Heath Hoffmann explained that he had had a long conversation with Provost Hynd and was moving to the conclusion that a follow-up survey of the Business School based on our earlier surveys might not be the best idea. Instead we should probably work on institutionalizing annual surveys of deans and other senior administrators, using more specific questions than the few included in this year’s survey (e.g., about communication).
Minutes of 11th Faculty Welfare Committee meeting of April 6th, 2012
11:00 a.m., Dean’s Conference Room, Jewish Studies Center

1) Heath Hoffmann introduced discussion of the recommendations drawn up by the Merit Pay Subcommittee. We decided to submit the plan to Academic Affairs asking them to review and return the plan. Before submitting the plan we decided to add back in the recommendation that everyone should get minimum raises when the pool of money available for raises across the board amounts to an average of only 2% or less. We also discussed the recommendation that chairs’ annual reviews of faculty in their department be omitted from 3rd year, and t&p reviews. We agreed to keep the recommendation so as to remove the possibility of chairs’ reviews (which should properly be formative) being used in evidence against candidates. We approved the recommendation that deans and chairs be evaluated in a uniform and consistent manner. Allison Welch asked whether we should also recommend similar evaluation of program directors. Marty Perlmutter suggested we should add them; since we are expecting Academic Affairs to read and review the document as a whole, they can let us know if they think it is too complicated to devise and carry out program director evaluations.

2) On the subject of textbook royalties, Heath and Allison both thought that faculty members should be given leeway to donate funds to charities of their choice, and not be restricted to donating royalties to the Foundation only. After brief discussion including the question of allowing chairs to decide when the assigning of a textbook might be appropriate, we decided to ask Academic Affairs to amend their recommendation by using the language in Kansas University’s policy that allows faculty leeway to donate funds as they see fit.

3) On behalf of the Tenure and Promotion Subcommittee, Marty reported that things were moving forward, partly based on our input. Academic Affairs was holding a further meeting on April 16th.

4) The Adjunct Welfare Subcommittee (Allison, Stephane Lafour, Simon Lewis) reported on the findings of the recent survey. Because of pressure of time, action in response to the survey is mainly deferred until next semester, but the report had clearly identified— as expected—that the two major concerns were with compensation and with benefits. Next semester we will push ahead with schemes to provide merit-based raises for long-serving high-performing adjunct faculty members. In the meantime we recommend that one basic desire of the faculty at large be respected: namely that adjunct salaries should be increased whenever there is a general faculty pay-raise. On the question of benefits, we may find that our hands are tied by state law; besides, the issue may be better and more appropriately dealt with by the Compensation Committee. At least we probably ought to ask Human Resources to help adjuncts find decent deals for insurance. The Committee is also interested in devising schemes that allow for professional development opportunities and mentoring for adjuncts, and it is likely that we will recommend some kind of adjunct council along the lines of the recently created staff advisory council.

In discussion on this topic, we all agreed that this was a very important item for the Committee. Since not all chairs do regular evaluations of adjunct faculty, we have to assume that the rehiring of adjunct faculty multiple times indicates merit. Since the survey revealed that adjuncts themselves are eager for high quality teaching to be recognized, we ought to find some way to reward such meritorious work. Marty suggested that increasing basic rates of pay is key here, since it is in fact the easiest, least labor-intensive way to achieve the goal of rewarding adjuncts adequately for their work. The Committee endorsed the Subcommittee’s report.
Minutes of 12th Faculty Welfare Committee Meeting held at 11 a.m. on Friday, April 20th, 2012 in the dean’s conference room at 96 Wentworth Street.

1) Wrap-up reports from sub-committees
   a) Since Heath had instigated the Sabbatical sub-committee he circulated the letter to Academic Affairs that he’d drafted and amended slightly on committee members’ recommendations. All present signed the letter and Heath will forward to Academic Affairs, since a timely response prior to next Fall’s sabbatical season is important.
   b) Allison Welch reported that there was nothing more to add from the Adjunct Welfare sub-committee; as reported on April 6th, we expect a newly constituted sub-committee to work on a proposal for pay increases for adjunct faculty in the Fall.
   c) Marty Perlmutter reported that there was nothing new from the Tenure and Promotion sub-committee either. There was some discussion about the need to clarify whether invited research might “count” on tenure and promotion reviews, and a degree of dissatisfaction with the notion that the winning of grants (and the writing of grant applications) counted only as service, an area that has itself been de- and under-valued in recent years. There was additional discussion of the question of individual enrollments and how that factored into faculty members’ work-load.

2) Professor of Practice proposal revisited
   The bulk of the meeting was given over to revisiting the draft proposal for the creation of a new rank, Professor of Practice. Consensus of the Committee appeared that unlike a bottle of fine wine the draft proposal did not get better with age. The Committee agreed that we were not ready to approve or support the document in its present under-developed form. The present proposal is too vague on key points and seems to offer too much variability as to its application. It is not clear from the document whether the purpose is to enable the hiring of full-time professors whose research and professional development is difficult to assess under the current rules of the FAM, or whether the goal is to create a new rank somewhere between an adjunct professor, a visiting professor and a senior instructor. The permanence of the rank seems unclear, too, as the proposal suggests that anyone employed in this rank would start out more or less on the same terms as a visiting professor before – possibly – morphing into an arrangement closer to those of a senior instructor. Members of the committee were also concerned that a line appointed to a professor of practice might compete with regular faculty lines and thus undermine the Strategic Plan’s stated commitment to tenure-track positions. It was felt that the issue that the proposal seeks to address might be more appropriately addressed by using the senior instructor designation, with the understanding that senior instructors need not necessarily be limited to teaching at the introductory level. If Academic Affairs decides to go ahead with creating the position it was suggested that they should not do so before consulting more widely than this committee. If the College does create the proposed rank, the Committee would like to see a very firm limit on the number of such positions.
Conscious that this second negative response would be disappointing, the Committee came up with a number of suggestions for dealing with the issue the new rank seeks to address. It was suggested that Academic Affairs might do any or all of the following:

a) Clarify/modify the language in the FAM concerning research and professional development so that it can cover not only academic work and creative work (as it does now), but also the kind of work that Jim Ward was actually hired to do and did. This would involve figuring out appropriate ways to measure and evaluate such work that would be equivalent to peer review in the same way that we have figured out ways to measure and evaluate the creative work of musicians, writers, and artists.

b) Clarify, specifically, the language in the FAM concerning senior instructors to ensure that that language is fully in line with actual current practice.

c) Rather than creating a new rank (and hence confusing things still further), sort out all the various job-titles at one go, clarifying what we already have (including visiting positions, executives-in-residence, etc.).

The Committee strongly believed that it would only take a few slight changes in FAM language to achieve the desired goal.

Simon will draft the Committee’s formal response to the proposal and circulate it to the Committee before returning it to Academic Affairs.

3) Agenda for next year

It was agreed that as many of the present Committee as possible would meet on the following Friday, April 27th, to pass the baton to the incoming Committee and to set a tentative agenda for next year’s work. Among issues for the 2012-2013 Committee to address are the following:

a) Establishing a permanent system for evaluating chairs, deans, etc.;

b) Completing proposals for adjunct pay-raises and a merit-based pay-raise system;

c) Legal liability;

d) Perceived prioritization of non-faculty needs over faculty needs;
Appendix 1
Letter sent to President, Provost, and Speaker of the Faculty in response to survey results

September 8, 2011

[addressee]

Dear

In advance of the first meeting of the Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Heath Hoffman circulated a survey asking the faculty to identify the issues they considered it most important for the Committee to address this year. In fairly short order, and with minimal prompting the survey generated 92 responses with a total of 240 items. Analyzing the data, it was apparent that the survey reveals three particular areas of concern: compensation; faculty and administration relations; and policies, especially relating to tenure and promotion.

Although we acknowledge that the relatively small sample means that we should be cautious in drawing general conclusions from the survey, the Committee considered that the issues match quite closely with those that we currently hear about in conversations around campus. In addition, the tone of the comments suggests that we should indeed be taking the comments seriously; those of us who have been involved with similar opinion-sounding exercises over the last few years at the College were struck by the decidedly pessimistic and aggrieved tone of many of the remarks, something that had been notably absent in the SWOT survey, for instance, or even in the 2006 conversations about the identity of the College.

The Committee will be considering its own response to the survey (which may include a more detailed survey measuring the degree of concern faculty have with the three issues mentioned above), but in the first instance we considered it important to alert you to the findings of the survey, and to suggest that it might be helpful to faculty and tactically appropriate for the administration to issue some kind of statement acknowledging a level of frustration about compensation and tenure and promotion issues, and briefly describing the administration’s current steps to address those issues to the best of our ability under the current economic circumstances. Such a statement would go some way to allaying concerns over faculty-administration relations--the third issue identified by the survey.

It may be that some of the disgruntlement on campus at the moment is the inevitable result of the current recession, but we firmly believe that good communication between administration and faculty can go a long way to mitigate the situation and restore morale.

Yours etc.
FWC
Appendix 2

Recommendation from subcommittee on merit-based pay-raises.

[electronically attached]
Appendix 3

Letters re Office of Economic Development (December and January)

December 19, 2011

Dr. Brian McGee, Presidential Chief-of-Staff
College of Charleston
66 George Street
Charleston, SC 29424-0001

Dear Brian,

In light of the recent creation of the Office of Economic Development and the appointment of Mr. Bobby Marlowe as Senior Vice-President to run the new office, the Faculty Welfare Committee would greatly appreciate it if you could answer the following questions:

1) what was the process for the establishment of the office and for the appointment of Mr. Marlowe?
2) was the post advertised--and if it was not, why not? Does state law not require such a post be advertised?
3) were qualified faculty eligible to apply--again, if not, why not?
4) was the administration confident that there could be no suspicion of conflict of interest (given Mr. Marlowe’s former position as chairman of the Board of Trustees at the time of President Benson’s appointment)?
5) is a job description for the position publicly available and what process of evaluation will be followed in assessing Mr. Marlowe’s performance?
6) was the administration not anxious that the $15,000 raise in salary might once more give the appearance that in a time of limited resources, administrative positions get priority over faculty needs?

Although this matter may be tangential to the charge of the Faculty Welfare Committee, the Committee decided that insofar as it was not clear that suitably qualified faculty had been eligible to apply for the post, the appointment could de facto be considered a Faculty Welfare issue.

We look forward to hearing from you at your convenience.

Yours truly,

Simon Lewis
For and on behalf of the Faculty Welfare Committee

cc. Tom Casey, Lynn Cherry
January 30, 2012

Dr Brian McGee, Presidential Chief-of-Staff
College of Charleston
66 George Street
Charleston, SC 29424-0001

Dear Brian,

Thank you for your letter of January 5, 2012 in response to the queries from the Faculty Welfare Committee concerning the establishment of the new Office of Economic Development. The Committee discussed your letter at our most recent meeting, on January 20th, 2012. We remain concerned about the absence of a transparent policy that might allow faculty to apply for positions such as Mr Marlowe’s when they are created, and about the absence of opportunity for faculty (and staff) to meet with and provide feedback on candidates for such positions.

From a narrow faculty welfare perspective our concern lies in the relative ability of administrators to be rewarded with promotions by assigning them new responsibilities for which there is no competition.

From a broader perspective relevant to the recently circulated Ethics Policy our concern lies in the grayness of determining whether a new set of responsibilities constitutes a new position. In this case, it strikes us as inconsistent that the directorship of the Office of Economic Development appears to have been treated as a new position worthy of a press release but not as a new position worthy of advertising for applicants. We consider there to be a significant issue here with shared governance, also. In the past, faculty and staff have been invited to weigh in on candidates for positions at a similar level in the institutional hierarchy. That is surely a good thing for the health of the institution and we would like to see the practice implemented consistently.

We would like a transparent policy to be created to address similar new positions in the future. Specifically, if new positions are to be created with significantly restated responsibilities, we recommend:

- a) that the position should be advertised, and
- b) that faculty and staff should be included in the search process (by being invited to provide feedback after attending a job-talk, for example).

Yours truly,

Faculty Welfare Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marty Perlmutter, Chair</th>
<th>Simon Lewis, Secretary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viviane Békrou</td>
<td>Margaret Hagood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath Hoffmann</td>
<td>Stephane Lafortune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Ruth-McSwain</td>
<td>Allison Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4

Letters re Professor of Practice issue (January and April)

January 30, 2012

Dr Beverly Diamond, Associate Provost
College of Charleston
66 George Street
Charleston, SC 29424-0001

Dear Bev,

The Faculty Welfare Committee met last Friday (January 20th, 2012) to discuss the draft document you had shared with us proposing the creation of a new rank of Professor of Practice to cover the appointment of unusually talented and successful individuals whose achievement in a particular line of practice, while not academically oriented, may make them valuable additions to the faculty of the College of Charleston.

In discussing the proposal, the Faculty Welfare Committee expressed the following concerns:
--we are unclear exactly what need the new rank meets that could not already be met by one of the existing ranks: adjunct, visiting professor, or even tenure-track. It was noted, for instance, that we already have a good number of performers, writers, musicians, etc. who are also expected to teach, perform service, etc.; in their case, the FAM already allows for non-academic work to "count" as evidence of research and professional development;
--we are concerned that the addition of a new rank might fragment the common purpose of the College as a liberal arts and sciences university, and undermine our sense of being a faculty united in the creation of knowledge and the arts;
--we are concerned that departments may find it easier to secure lines for professors of practice, than for tenure track positions. That would exacerbate the issue that already exists with the instructor position at the College;
--we are concerned that, if a Professor of Practice occupies a line formerly assigned to tenure-track faculty member, departments may find it harder to deliver both their own departmental curriculum and their contribution to the general education curriculum;
--we are concerned that evaluation might prove problematic.

As you can tell from the above, there was little enthusiasm for the proposed new rank, but we would not rule out considering a revised proposal.

Yours truly,

Faculty Welfare Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marty Perlmutter, Chair</td>
<td>Simon Lewis, Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viviane Békrou</td>
<td>Margaret Hagood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath Hoffmann</td>
<td>Stephane Lafortune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Ruth-McSwain</td>
<td>Allison Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 26th, 2012

Dr Beverly Diamond, Associate Provost  
College of Charleston  
66 George Street  
Charleston, SC 29424-0001

Dear Bev,

The Faculty Welfare Committee met last Friday (April 20th, 2012) to revisit the draft document you had shared with us proposing the creation of a new rank of Professor of Practice to cover the appointment of unusually talented and successful individuals whose achievement in a particular line of practice, while not academically oriented, may make them valuable additions to the faculty of the College of Charleston. The bulk of the meeting was given over to revisiting the draft proposal but we regret to inform you that the Committee remains unwilling to endorse the proposal in its present under-developed form.

Specifically, we found the following:

- the present proposal is too vague on key points and seems to offer too much variability as to its application;
- it is not clear from the document whether the purpose is to enable the hiring of full-time professors whose research and professional development is difficult to assess under the current rules of the FAM, or whether the goal is to create a new rank somewhere between an adjunct professor, a visiting professor and a senior instructor;
- the permanence of the rank seems unclear, too, as the proposal suggests that anyone employed in this rank would start out more or less on the same terms as a visiting professor before – possibly – morphing into an arrangement closer to those of a senior instructor;
- members of the committee were also concerned that a line appointed to a professor of practice might compete with regular faculty lines and thus undermine the Strategic Plan’s stated commitment to tenure-track positions;
- it was felt that the issue that the proposal seeks to address might be more appropriately addressed by using the senior instructor designation, with the understanding that senior instructors need not necessarily be limited to teaching at the introductory level.

If Academic Affairs decides to go ahead with creating the position we suggest that you should not do so before consulting more widely than this.
committee. If the College does create the proposed rank, the Committee would like to see a very firm limit on the number of such positions.

Conscious that this second negative response will disappoint you, the Committee came up with a number of suggestions for dealing with the issue the new rank seeks to address. It was suggested that Academic Affairs might do any or all of the following:

a) Clarify/modify the language in the FAM concerning research and professional development so that it can cover not only academic work and creative work (as it does now), but also the kind of work that Jim Ward was actually hired to do and did. This would involve figuring out appropriate ways to measure and evaluate such work that would be equivalent to peer review in the same way that we have figured out ways to measure and evaluate the creative work of musicians, writers, and artists.

b) Clarify, specifically, the language in the FAM concerning senior instructors to ensure that that language is fully in line with actual current practice.

c) Rather than creating a new rank (and hence confusing things still further), sort out all the various job-titles at one go, clarifying what we already have (including visiting positions, executives-in-residence, etc.).

The Committee strongly believed that it would only take a few slight changes in FAM language to achieve the desired goal.

Yours truly,

Faculty Welfare Committee

Marty Perlmutter, Chair

Simon Lewis, Secretary

Viviane Békrou

Margaret Hagood

Heath Hoffmann

Stephane Lafortune

Amanda Ruth-McSwain

Allison Welch

Kelley White
Appendix 5 [electronically attached]

Letter requesting data about sabbatical denials and offering recommendations/clarifications about the college’s sabbatical leave policy.