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The committee met four times and was chaired by Antonio Pérez-Núñez, with Angela Flenner acting as Recording Secretary. Returning members were Mark Long, Sorinel Oprisan and Kate Owens. New members were Angela Flenner, Janine McCabe, Antonio Perez-Nunez, and Kelly Wiechman. In the collective of these meetings and the work that occurred in between, the Committee concentrated on the following issues:

1. To study and provide quantitative and qualitative information regarding faculty morale in terms of salary compensation and to provide information regarding the effects of the merit-based raise process conducted over the fall 2018.

2. To provide a list and description of significant activities/tasks that faculty at the College are currently doing but for which they are not receiving any type of compensation/incentive was conducted, as requested by President Osborne on 2/1/2019.

3. To determine whether or not full-time adjunct faculty at the College of Charleston are earning a salary greater than the poverty guidelines established by the federal government.

The Committee trusts that the College administration will find this report and its recommendations useful in recognizing and rewarding faculty efforts in maintaining and improving the College of Charleston’s reputation as a premier liberal arts and sciences institution in the Southeast.
**Action #1: Survey on Faculty Morale regarding Salary Compensation and Effects of the Merit-Based Raise Process Conducted over the Fall 2018**

1. **Introduction**

The Committee recognizes the central role that salary compensation plays in terms of faculty morale, which in turn is of vital importance in providing undergraduate and graduate students with the student-centered experience that we cherish at the College. In light of limited raise processes over recent years at the College and of the merit-based raise process undertaken in fall 2018, the Committee designed and implemented a survey of faculty in spring 2019.

This report reflects data generated from the *Faculty Compensation Survey* administered in January and February 2019. The survey and this report were designed to inform and provide recommendations to the College administration on employee satisfaction in terms of compensation, and on the effects of the merit-based raise process conducted over the fall 2018 semester. In particular, the Committee was interested in longer term reporting of faculty salary compensation satisfaction over their time in rank, and in the impact on faculty morale of the merit-based raise process undertaken in fall 2018.

In an email sent on 1/30/19, the Speaker of the Faculty invited all full-time roster faculty to respond to a short survey (comprising 7 questions) that was made available via Qualtrics. Both the Speaker’s email and the survey specified that data would be gathered and presented anonymously.

The survey began with background information reminding faculty about the fall 2018 merit raise recommendations process. It explained that total monies available were 0.869% of the College’s permanent employee salary pool; that raises were limited to 5% of a faculty member’s base salary or $2500 (whichever was greater); and that rather than supporting across-the-board raises, the process was “intended to recognize faculty and staff performing at the highest levels, rather than all of these faculty and staff who might have met a merit threshold.”

The survey gathered information about school, rank, length of service, and whether the faculty member received a raise under the recent process. Two hundred and nineteen (219) faculty responded to the survey. As can be seen below, the highest number of faculty responding were from the schools with the largest number of permanent faculty members, which includes the School of Humanities and Social Sciences and the School of Sciences and Mathematics with 32% and 27% of respondents respectively.

1. Percentage of total respondents by School
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In terms of rank, one third each of respondents were full and associate professors and one quarter were assistant professors.

2. Percentage of total respondents by Rank

![Pie chart showing the distribution of faculty ranks.]

Faculty with varying lengths of service at the College responded to the survey, with a preponderance of faculty who have been here sufficient years to make the rank of associate and full professor.

3. Percentage of total respondents by Years of service

![Pie chart showing the distribution of years of service.]

The last background information question asked faculty if they received a merit-based raise in 2018. The results indicate that the majority of faculty (79%) who responded the survey indicated that they received the above-mentioned merit-based raise in 2018.
2. The Faculty Compensation Survey

The following 4 questions used 5-point Likert scales captured the intensity of faculty feelings about (1) satisfaction in terms of salary compensation and (2) the merit-based raise process:

1. How would you rate your level of satisfaction in terms of your current salary compensation, whether you got a raise or not this year?

2. How has your level of satisfaction in terms of salary compensation changed over your time in rank?

3. What was your level of morale as a CofC employee (i.e., job satisfaction, outlook, and feelings of well-being within the workplace setting) before the merit-based raise?

4. What was your level of morale as a CofC employee (i.e., job satisfaction, outlook, and feelings of well-being within the workplace setting) after the merit-based raise?

Another question used a 4-point scale to gauge faculty understanding of the raise process in fall 2018.

5. How would you rate the level of information that you received regarding the recent merit-based raise process? (e.g., expectations, information about requirements, notifications, etc.)

For all questions a text box invited further faculty feedback which allowed for qualitative data to complement the quantitative reporting from the scaled responses to those questions.

A final question presented faculty with a text box to type their suggestions for future merit-based increase processes:

6. Do you have any specific suggestions for future merit-based increases? Please state.

Recommendations and Conclusion

The Committee trusts that the College administration will find this information and its recommendations useful in recognizing and rewarding faculty efforts in maintaining and improving the College of Charleston’s reputation as a premier liberal arts and sciences institution in the Southeast.
3. Data Analysis

The data collected from the survey were entered into SPSS for statistical analysis, including descriptive and inferential statistics. A series of one-way ANOVAs were computed in order to determine whether mean differences in the responses differ between schools, ranks and years of service at the College of Charleston.

Furthermore, the qualitative information obtained from the faculty comments for each question was analyzed by means of sentiment analyzes in order to understand the social sentiment of the faculty and to determine whether their attitude towards each question and/or topic was positive, negative, or neutral.

1. How would you rate your level of satisfaction in terms of your current salary compensation, whether you got a raise or not this year?

2. How has your level of satisfaction in terms of salary compensation changed over your time in rank?

3. What was your level of morale as a CofC employee (i.e., job satisfaction, outlook, and feelings of well-being within the workplace setting) before the merit-based raise?

4. What was your level of morale as a CofC employee (i.e., job satisfaction, outlook, and feelings of well-being within the workplace setting) after the merit-based raise?

Another question used a 4-point scale to gauge faculty understanding of the raise process in fall 2018.

5. How would you rate the level of information that you received regarding the recent merit-based raise process? (e.g., expectations, information about requirements, notifications, etc.).

The last question asked faculty to provide specific suggestions that should be considered in future merit-based exercises:

6. Do you have any specific suggestions for future merit-based increases? Please state.
Question #1: How would you rate your level of satisfaction in terms of your current salary compensation, whether you got a raise or not this year?

Executive Summary

The responses to Question 2 indicate significant, systemic, salary dissatisfaction among faculty respondents to the survey across schools and rank, whether or not a merit raise was awarded.

The senior faculty are significantly more dissatisfied than the freshman faculty members. If these findings are generalizable, the question raises salary issues in terms of salary levels and the absence of salary increases during most years over the last three decades. The results could be biased by attracting participant responses from disgruntled faculty members and from those who do not have a trust fund or a spouse/partner/alimony that may mitigate feelings of dissatisfaction.

More than 71% of faculty members responding (N=213) reported that they were either somewhat or extremely dissatisfied with their current salary. Only 2.35% of faculty respondents reported being extremely satisfied with their salary.

Additional Results

Taken as a group across all schools and faculty ranks, just over one third of the responding faculty members (N=213), reported being “Extremely dissatisfied” with their level of satisfaction with current salary compensation, regardless of whether receiving a merit raise or not in 2019. And nearly two thirds of respondents were reported “Extremely dissatisfied” or “Somewhat dissatisfied”. Only 2.35% reported being “Extremely Satisfied”.

By school, the lowest two mean rating for this question were 1.6 for responding faculty with an appointment in two schools and 1.7 for those in LCWA. The highest two mean ratings were 2.5 (EHHP) and 2.67 (Library). The highest means sit between Somewhat dissatisfied and Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. The ANOVA showed no significant difference between schools (p=0.207), so there is a similar level of satisfaction in terms of current salary between faculty across schools, and that level has a mean value of 2.1, “Somewhat dissatisfied”.

By rank, the lowest two mean rating for this question were 1.63 for responding Senior Instructors and 1.9 for Associate Professors. The highest two mean ratings were 2.57 (Instructors) and 3.0 (Visiting Instructor or Professor). The ANOVA showed no significant difference between ranks (p=0.083), so there is a similar level of satisfaction in terms of current salary between faculty across ranks, and that level has a mean value of 2.1, “Somewhat dissatisfied”.

By years at CoC, the lowest two mean rating for this question were 1.86 for 4-6 years of service and 1.91 for 21-27 years of service. The highest two mean ratings were 2.35 (10-12 years) and 2.92 (1-3 years). The ANOVA showed a significant difference between responses by years in service (p=0.003). While all mean response by year category are below 3.0, meaning somewhat or extremely dissatisfied, new faculty members and those who are just past promotion to senior instructor or associate professor are the least dissatisfied. Those who are the most dissatisfied tend to be those who have dedicated their careers to the College of Charleston, serving 13 years or more.

Lastly, the ANOVA between those faculty members who received a merit increase this year and those who did not, no significant difference (0.500) was found with the level of satisfaction in terms of current salary. The mean response for those who received a merit increase was 2.08, which was LOWER than the mean response of 2.20 for those who did NOT receive a merit increase.

Semantic analysis showed that 66% of all comments made for this question were negative. Some 27% of the comments were neutral and only 6% were computed as positive by an automated process for quantifying the affective dimension.
Sample Comments by Sentiment

Three comments by sentiment were selected for each combination of school and rank as examples, but not necessarily exemplars. Graduate School is not included due to small response rate.

**Library**

1. Real compensation has diminished due to lack of cost of living raises while the cost of living consistently rises. The financial value of promotions is eliminated by lack of cost of living raises.
2. The cost of living to salary ratio is not a living wage for working families and professionals in the Charleston area.
3. I am very satisfied with my current salary; I feel it is fair for the time I've been employed with the College and for my position. I believe there is always room for growth both in responsibilities and compensation and that cost of living should also be considered on a yearly basis hence my saying somewhat satisfied. However, I want to reiterate that I am very satisfied with my current salary compensation at this time.

**School of Business**

1. College does not know how to manage resources. We have nepotism but more importantly misalignment of performance and pay all across the board. Directorship stipend have not gone up in 15 years. Seriously? There is no publication or consistency on ranking and evaluation or what is used for evaluation merit based and T&P process. Of course, it does not help that we have horrible leadership at the School of Business.
2. It's below average for AACSB-accredited business schools and way below self-identified peer schools.
3. Factoring in inflation I make less money now than I did as a brand new assistant professor while cost of living in Charleston has increased. New faculty make far more money than me.

**School of Education Health and Human Performance**

1. I feel based on my contribution to the university my previous experience and the size of our programs we all should be getting paid more than we do.
2. Compared to our peer institutions we are well below where we need to be. Not to mention the cost of living has increased drastically over the past years and our salaries have not ever come close to matching this increase.
3. Faculty tend to be low regionally.

**School of Humanities and Social Sciences**

1. For a challenging position that requires 10+ years of post secondary education I feel that the pay is low.
2. I got a raise of under 600 dollars. That isn't even a COLA (Cost of Living Adjustment)
3. It added about $20 to my paychecks which is an improvement. But considering what faculty at unionized schools get (an annual cost of living increase) it is pretty paltry. The faculty salaries here do not take into consideration the cost of living in Charleston at all and that is a major point of dissatisfaction for me and other faculty members with whom I have discussed this.

**School of Languages Cultures and World Affairs**

1. Our salaries do not reflect the cost of living in Charleston.
2. While it was nice to have the work that I am doing recognized the increase in salary was insufficient.
3. Colleagues hired before and after me with substantially higher salaries.

**School of Science and Mathematics**

1. It is disappointing we do not get annual raises based upon inflation. This common practice essentially everywhere.
2. The raise feels insulting because it was so small and it created greater division between my colleagues which is something that is very important to my daily work satisfaction.
3. Colleagues hired before and after me with substantially higher salaries.

School of the Arts

1. I have other pending issues with regard to compensation that I do not wish to discuss in this survey.
2. The way that the College handled the pay increase process was insulting. The total funding provided indicates that salaries are not an actual priority for the administration. I did not expect to receive an increase but I was told that my department was only able to award a single faculty member an increase. This creates a disincentive to excellence.
3. Considering the cost of living and salaries at other colleges I am underpaid. The merit pay is not enough to make a difference in my budget or debt. State employees should get cost of living raises every year.
Question #2: How has your level of satisfaction in terms of salary compensation changed over your time in rank?

The overall mean is 2.09, i.e. it is centered on “It has somewhat decreased” with a standard deviation of 1.17. This means that in one plus/minus standard deviation we should have 68% of the answers if this were a normal distribution. Obviously, not 86.38% of the answer are in this range. The distribution is also skewed towards the lower end, i.e. “It has decreased a great deal”, because almost half of the answers (48.9% of the 86.38% that fall under plus/minus one standard deviation) are in that category.

The combined answers “It has somewhat decreased/ It has decreased a great deal” get 66.66% of the total. That means 2/3 of the roster faculty who took the survey signaled a morale decrease.

Almost 2/3 of those who signaled a morale decrease are on the strong side of “It has decreased a great deal.”

Some 13.62% were on the side of “It has somewhat increased/ It has increased a great deal.”

Cannot assign the 19.72% “No change” to any of the two categories without knowing their previous morale level.

Across all schools, the average of the morale change is also negative, i.e. below the neutral line (3 points = “No change”) (Fig. 1).
Across all ranks, the average of the morale change is also negative, i.e. below the neutral line (3 points = “No change”) (see Fig. 2). The most content are visiting professors. The most significant drop in satisfaction is at instructor level. The tenure-track/tenured faculty are consistently at “somewhat decreased” level of satisfaction.

Fig. 2 Change in level of satisfaction over the time in rank by rank. The vertical error bar is the standard error and the horizontal error bar is proportional to the normalized number of responses out of the total of 213.

Across all subjects, the average of the morale change is also negative, i.e. below the neutral line (3 points = “No change”) (see Fig. 3) regardless the number of service years. There is a clear descendent pattern going from almost “no change” in level of satisfaction during early years to “It has decreased a great deal” as the number of service years increase.

Fig. 3 Change in level of satisfaction over the time in rank by years of service. The vertical error bar is the standard error and the horizontal error bar is proportional to the normalized number of responses out of the total of 213.
Semantic analysis showed that the mode across all schools was negative. Similarly, the mode across all ranks was negative except for Instructor, for which the modes were negative and neutral. 66% of all comments made for this question were negative.

Sample Comments by Sentiment

Three comments by sentiment were selected for each combination of school and rank as examples, but not necessarily exemplars. Graduate School is not included due to small response rate.

Library

1. I have only received two raises during my time as CofC employee. Once was promotion after successful review and the other was to address issues of salary compression. Neither (especially promotion) was adequate in comparison with my performance and responsibilities. In addition the way in which hours are tracked in the Library is very problematic. Compared to our teaching faculty colleagues we receive less compensation but are required to account for every single hour of our time between the hours of 9-5 regardless of the fact that we so often work outside of these traditional hours whether due to special events or more often having to take work home in order to carry the workloads.
2. As I've spent more time here I see growing issues with compensation that need to be addressed but so far haven't been. We are having more and more trouble attracting new faculty because of our hiring ranges for positions.
3. Salary compression lack of regular cost of living increases few merit increase opportunities little merit money

School of Education Health and Human Performance

1. When I initially was hired I was comparing my salary to what it had been as a public school teacher. So I was fairly satisfied with the positive change. However since beginning at the College my awareness of the salary disparities between those in different departments has grown which has affected my decreased satisfaction. Additionally the lack of raises and the disparities in the amount given for raises has also negatively impacted my satisfaction over time.
2. Way too little way too late. If I didn't have to stay at CofC (due to family matters) I would have left a long time ago. Those individuals who are forward thinking or try to move forward are squashed by the status quo.
3. I think it is very clear that the workload and expectations have increased over time while compensation or financial reward for taking on a greater workload has decreased. The political forces that asymmetrically control employee compensation at state institutions have generally demonstrated willful negligence of state employee (all of them) living wage increases and perhaps willful disdain of the said workforce as a whole despite myriad challenges in accomplishing institutional mission and the individual and group sacrifices made to do so.

School of Business

1. Now that I realize how underpaid I am. I had an offer that paid me $40K more so I am know I am well below what I could if I could leave the area.
2. If inflation is Charleston is 4% (at least) a salary should have grown to allow you to afford working here. Tuition goes up each year but does not appear to be reinvested into the human capital of the institution (remember the faculty are the ones who deliver programs and experience to the students).
3. My salary has continued to shrink over my years due to inflation and the elimination of costs of living increases for state employees. I am disappointed in myself for not leaving the College earlier in my career here. It's time to advise new staff and faculty members or at least help them to prepare for scant salary increases to carry them through a career here. Adding insult to the injury the cost of living in Charleston particularly with respect to housing has increased faster than the national CPI. While my salary has not even doubled over my career here with cost of living and merit increases but the cost of real estate has increased 10-fold in my neighborhood over the same time period. And my neighborhood is not on the peninsula. I still
commute form another city into the City of Charleston. I know faculty members who are driving from north of Summerville to afford a home for their families. I don't know how new faculty members in lower paid disciplines can afford to live near enough to Charleston to work at the College. The lack of rapid and public transportation makes the problem even worse than in much larger cities in which I have lived.

School of Humanities and Social Sciences

1. Salary increases are incommensurate with the review process. It feels insulting to undergo an extensive review process for a minimal pay raise. My feelings about this have increased as I have undergone review to full professor.
2. The reason it has somewhat increased is that I received the 1/9 increase after a term as dept chair. If not for that it would have decreased.
3. I am dissatisfied by the fact that there are people of my same rank and experience who work at other institutions of higher educations in Charleston South Carolina and get paid on average 30% more than I do.

School of Languages Cultures and World Affairs

1. I received a raise after tenure. After the raise my salary caught up with the salary of my junior pre-tenure colleague. This will change once she/he gets tenure--I will again be the lowest paid faculty member in my Department.
2. When I was hired in 2007 faculty were open about the regular frequency of cost of living and merit adjustments. Since the recession of 2008 these no longer exist. Effectively we are all taking annual pay cuts as the region gets more expensive while we are paid exactly the same amount.
3. As mentioned earlier it is frustrating to see how your salary is stagnant while prices go up. You also see new hires colleagues from other department or other states making more than you. Also there is a lot of work including directing bachelor's essays undergraduate research etc. that goes unpaid and not even recognized. Finally tuition for students keep going up but where is that money going?

School of Science and Mathematics

1. For faculty members the only way to get a raise is to 1) have an offer in hand from another institution or 2) to assume significant administrative duties. My salary increased for reason #2. For staff the only way to get a raise is to 1) apply and receive a position in another department on campus.
2. The big reason - no indication of how - or why - the distribution of the limited funding was provided. Why were recommendations from Department Chairs and Deans ignored or cast aside? How and why was the final cut made?

Why can't the Board of Trustees recognize the tremendous efforts of the faculty to the continuing growth and success of the College? Would they tolerate such oversight in their respective businesses?

In short - lack of awareness and appreciation. I've spent years giving my time personal $$ and resources to the College. Doing so for a short while - a few years was one thing - but now decades later I'm questioning why I'm doing it. Receiving a minor merit raise was a slap in the face - especially since we haven't received one in years! I feel unappreciated and used. I'm now inclined to say no to all requests for help for anything that does not directly count or support my position. Or more recently I am seriously considering taking my services elsewhere.

Salary compression - both in terms of years at CofC and gender is real. While there has been talk of 'fixing' the issue nothing has been done. Happy faculty makes happy students and community. There is an apparent lack of appreciation for the efforts of the faculty who are dedicated to supporting the College's mission and students.

It is time to recognize that there is more than one way to share research results with academic peers and the greater community. It's time to catch up with the times. A means of recognizing alternate modes of publishing and distributing research is needed for purposes of tenure and promotion. For example how many books or publications are distributed to what audience(s) and the benefits of such publications to the respective audience.

Why should we seek external grant funding? Why should we go out of our way to engage with the public? Why spend the extra time? It's time that the efforts of faculty are recognized and appreciated.
Extramural funding supports more than faculty research - consider the staff and students and resources enabled with the extra funding.

Working with the public not only raises awareness of all the exciting things going on at the College but helps to engage and connect the 'town with the gown'. Why do it? Why spend the extra time? Doing so out of the good graces of one's heart or personality only goes so far.

3. Increasing cost of living in Charleston. When I arrived eventually bought my house and started a family I was able to save money every paycheck fly to see my family for holidays and add money to supplementary retirement account. As of 5-4 years ago I cannot afford any of this. The cost of college tuition has skyrocketed in the last 15 years while my salary has remained essentially flat not even keeping up with inflation. parking rates have skyrocketed, cost of food, my house insurance, car insurance, electricity costs, all have greatly surpassed my salary increases.

School of the Arts

1. The fact that we don't get cost of living increases coupled with the fact that raises are irregular and somewhat arbitrary is discouraging. I am receiving more money then when I began at CoC but that is largely because of my increase in rank and additional responsibilities for which I am compensated. Otherwise my base salary has not significantly increased.

2. Once I became aware of how grossly underpaid I am in comparison with colleague I've become substantially less satisfied. In particular as a faculty member of the School of the Arts comparing my salary with those of colleagues in the humanities (!) and social sciences with a similar degree level of teaching experience and publication record I am deeply disappointed that my Dean and School seem unable to similarly match our compensation.

3. when I started annual "cost of living" increases were quite regular - then over time years with no increase became ever more common - coupled with years were faculty received raises - but staff did not - makes for a toxic environment
Question #3: What was your level of morale as a CofC employee (i.e., job satisfaction, outlook, and feelings of well-being within the workplace setting) before the merit-based raise?

Question #4: What was your level of morale as a CofC employee (i.e., job satisfaction, outlook, and feelings of well-being within the workplace setting) after the merit-based raise?

Results

The results (see Fig. 1) show that the level of employee morale variation in the level of employee moral before and after the merit-based raise. The percentage of faculty who reported “low” or “very low” moral increased from 46% before the merit-based raise to 58% after the merit-based raise. A decrease was also found among faculty who reported “acceptable” moral, which went from 34% down to 25% after the merit exercise. Faculty who reported high or very high level of morale, decreased from 20% before the merit-based raise down to 17% after the merit-based raise.

**Fig. 1 Level of morale before and after the merit-based raise**

![Bar chart showing the percentage of faculty morale before and after the merit-based raise.](chart.png)

**Comparison before and after merit-based raise**

The overall faculty morale average was 2.65 out of 5 (5 =very high level) before the exercise, and an average of 2.39 (1=very low) after the merit exercise. A t-test comparison between the level of morale before revealed that differences before and after the merit based-raise were statistically significant: $t(212)=36.27., p=0.000$, which suggests that the merit-based raise had a negative effect on faculty morale.
Question #5: How would you rate the level of information that you received regarding the recent merit-based raise process? (e.g., expectations, information about requirements, notifications, etc.)

Results

The majority of the faculty who responded indicated that the information provided regarding the merit process was “scarce” (Fig 1). Of the 213 faculty, the majority (59%) reported that the level of information that they received regarding the process was less than adequate, including 47.42% who reported that the information was scarce and 12.21% who indicated that they received no information at all. By contrast, only 5.16% reported that the amount of information they received was abundant, and 35.21% indicated the information was adequate.

Fig 1. Overall level of information on level of information regarding recent-merit based process (n=217)

Comparisons by School

The ANOVA results showed that differences with respect to the level of information that faculty received regarding the merit-based raise process were statistically significant across schools $t(7)=12.98, p=0.001$. The School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs received the lowest score (M= 1.96), followed by the School of Science and Mathematics (M=2.12), and the School of Education, Health and Human Performance (M=2.14) with the majority of the scores ranging from scarce to no information at all.

Average score (level of information) by school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lang., Cultures, WA</td>
<td>mean = 1.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>mean = 2.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Health &amp; TP</td>
<td>mean = 2.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>mean = 2.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities &amp; SS</td>
<td>mean = 2.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>mean = 2.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>mean = 2.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extremely Dissatisfied = 1, Extremely Satisfied = 5
Question #6: Do you have any specific suggestions for future merit-based increases? Please state.

A total of 160 responses were given; additionally, 53 respondents left the question blank or responded with “No comment” or “None”. The most common themes referred to (1) limited information/transparency regarding the merit-based process and (2) limited and/or lack of funding for pay raises to address cost of living, which are impacting Faculty well-being and morale at the College of Charleston.

Suggestions based on Faculty responses:

1. Level of Information/Transparency

Recommendation #1: The creation of a list of specific, quantifiable criteria that would be used across the College when assessing a faculty member’s eligibility for a merit-based increase. Phrases like “create a rubric,” “have clear criteria,” “provide a scale with coefficients based on criteria”, “develop specific guidelines” were common.

Example comments about transparency or requesting more information:
- Clear quantifiable criteria not what is currently in the FAM which is a quagmire.
- Make the criteria clear and offer them more often so that people can work toward them. Make them large enough so that it's worth working toward.
- It would be helpful if the process was more transparent to the faculty.

2. Pay raises

Recommendation #2: Merit-based pay increases should happen more regularly, perhaps on a scheduled basis, with a shorter window between raises. However, it should be noted that respondents often pointed out that cost of living increases do not happen regularly enough, and creating annual raises (cost of living raises, annual raises, or cost of living adjustments) would be appreciated more than the occasional merit-based raise. Many respondents mentioned that issues relating to salary compression should be higher priority than merit-based increases.

Example comments about frequency:
- Merit raises should either be given regularly (so that merit evaluations done on an annual basis matter) or they should consider larger windows of time.
- Make them more frequent, set out detailed guidelines for chairs on how to evaluate faculty for merit compensation, and take salary compression into account.

Recommendation #3: Unless the merit pool were substantially higher (allowing for 3-5% raises for those eligible), then an across the board raise would be preferred. Overall, comments relating to more funding for cost-of-living raises, more funding to combat salary compression, and more funding for the merit raises were common.

Example comments about increasing funding:
- Well obviously have more money to distribute. Maybe freeze administrators' salaries.
- Increase the merit pool. Publicize decision making standards.
- We need regular annual raises so that merit raises are not the only method of offering pay raises to faculty. Obviously a larger pool of funds from which to draw merit raises would help.
Conclusion

The Committee recognizes the central role that salary compensation plays in terms of faculty morale, which in turn is of vital importance in providing undergraduate and graduate students with the student-centered experience that we cherish at the College. In light of limited raise processes over recent years at the College and of the merit-based raise process undertaken in fall 2018, the Committee designed and implemented a survey of faculty in spring 2019.

- This study, based on information gathered from 213 permanent roster faculty at the College of Charleston, found a significant, systemic, salary dissatisfaction among faculty respondents to the survey across schools and rank, whether or not a merit raise was awarded. The results also revealed that dissatisfaction in terms of salary was higher among senior faculty. Factors such as scarce salary raises over the years/decades leading to salary compression, salary inversion and increase cost of living may explain these results.

- It was also found that the 2018 merit-based raise had a significant negative effect on faculty morale, including those who received a raise. Some of the reasons might be related to the limited funding available for this merit-based raise, limited information about the process, and the level of information/transparency in some departments/schools regarding how the raises were determined.

Again, the Committee trusts that the College administration will find this report and its recommendations useful in recognizing and rewarding faculty efforts in maintaining and improving the College of Charleston’s reputation as a premier liberal arts and sciences institution in the Southeast.
Action #2: List and Description of Significant Faculty Work without Compensation

**Rationale:** During the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President on 2/1/2019, President Osborne asked the Faculty Compensation Committee to provide (1) a list of significant activities/tasks that faculty at the College are currently doing but for which they are not receiving any type of compensation, (2) a description of the activities and (3) the estimated time (in hours) devoted to each task.

**Definition:** The Faculty Compensation Committee defined “significant activities/tasks” as those activities for which faculty do not receive any type of compensation that (a) are not part of the teaching, research or service commitments for the academic year, (b) are optional, but not required, (c) cannot be anticipated at the beginning of the academic year, and/or (d) require a significant amount of time and work.

**Action:** To provide the administration with a report that includes (1) a list of significant activities/tasks that faculty at the College of Charleston are currently doing but for which they are not receiving any type of compensation, (2) a description of the activities and (3) an estimated number of hours that faculty devote to each task.

In order to complete this action, the Faculty Compensation Committee first identified a preliminary list of significant tasks that included:

1. Independent Study
2. Honors Directed Projects (including Bachelor’s Essay and/or Honors Immersed projects)
3. Program and Course Assessment
4. Program and Curriculum Development
5. Grant Writing for research not funded (that did not include faculty summer salary or course reduction or return of indirect costs to the faculty member)
6. Sustainability
7. Advancement (Fundraising)
8. Recruitment (Student/faculty)
9. Grant Writing for students, programs and other needs of the institution.

Subsequently, in March 2019, the committee created and shared a 34-item anonymous survey with all roster faculty at the College of Charleston that aimed to collect information on (1) the activities/tasks that roster faculty have done and/or are currently doing, and (2) the amount of time that they spent during the academic year working on such tasks. In addition to these two questions, faculty were also asked to describe the work they did for each task.

A total of 108 roster faculty members completed the survey in March 2019.
Results

Question #1: List of significant tasks that faculty do without any type of compensation

The results indicate that the most frequent activities that roster faculty at the College of Charleston have done involve Independent Studies (89.62%), Recruitment of Students/Faculty (78.85%), Bachelor’s Essays and Honors Projects (71.43%), Program and Curriculum Development (74.51%), and Program and Course Assessment (68.63%).

Table 1. List of significant tasks and percentage of faculty who have done them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Study</td>
<td>89.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Essay (Including Honors Projects)</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program and Course Assessment</td>
<td>68.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program and Curriculum Development</td>
<td>74.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Writing for research not funded that did not include faculty summer salary or course reduction or return of indirect costs to the faculty member</td>
<td>43.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>28.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement (Funding)</td>
<td>27.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment (Student/Faculty)</td>
<td>27.84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question #2. Description of the five most common tasks (independent study, bachelor’s essay, program and curriculum development, program and course assessment)

(1) **Independent Study**

Faculty at the College of Charleston mentioned the following work as part of their involvement in independent studies with students:

- Selecting and assigning readings to student.
- One-on-one meetings with students, usually on a weekly basis.
- Discussing the readings that the student has completed for the week.
- Overseeing undergraduate/graduate research, from project ideas to design, data collection, analysis, and writing.
- Helping them generate hypotheses, design experiments, interpret results.
- Providing feedback, reviewing, and grading the student’s work.
- Drafting and submitting IRB proposals.
- Training students in the lab, including safety concerns.
- Training students on specific tools needed to conduct research work.
- Supervising the students in submitting abstract proposals and creating posters for presentations.
● Giving feedback on writing and poster presentations
● Designing and teaching a specific course to meet the needs of a particular student
● Writing grants to support students’ travel for research.

(2) Bachelor’s Essay and Honors Immersed Projects

Faculty at the College of Charleston mentioned the following work as part of their involvement in Bachelor’s Essay and Honors Immersed Projects:

● Creating individualized syllabus
● Selecting and assigning readings to student and/or helping student master a literature, and/or providing curate readings list.
● One-on-one meetings with students, usually on a weekly basis.
● Discussing assigned work with student
● Teaching student the type of writing, conventions, and communication skills necessary to complete their BE and/or to present their work in a poster or oral presentation.
● Providing extensive feedback on the writing through various drafts.
● Coordinating and supervising research, from project ideas to design, data collection, analysis, and writing.
● Providing feedback, reviewing, and grading the student’s work
● Drafting and submitting IRB proposals
● Learning and/or training students on specific tools needed to conduct research work.
● Giving feedback on writing and poster presentations
● Writing grants for funding

(3) Program and Curriculum Development

Faculty at the College of Charleston mentioned the following work as part of program and curriculum development:

● Attend meetings to discuss program/curricular issues
● Develop curriculum guideline
● Design program's strategic plan
● Propose and evaluate program changes
● Propose new courses/minors/majors/programs
● Develop curriculum for new courses
● Revise/adjust curriculum
● Promotion of programs to current and future students
● Grant writing for new programs
● Hiring of personnel for new programs
● Develop, recruit and run Study Abroad
● Develop exchange programs

(4) Program and Course Assessment

Faculty at the College of Charleston mentioned the following work as part of program and course development:

● Program assessment planning
● Development of assessment tools
● Evaluation or artifacts
● Organization of materials for those assisting with the assessment
● Collecting and analyzing assessment data
● Writing and entering report in Compliance Assist
● Convening a meeting to share results,
● Discussion of changes to the assessment and curriculum
● Development of those changes
● Implementation of changes

(5) Recruitment (Student/Faculty)

Faculty at the College of Charleston mentioned the following work as part of recruitment:

a) Student recruitment:

● Attending recruitment events (e.g., major/minor fairs, admission faculty panels, accepted students day, etc.)
● Organize recruitment and information sessions for students
● Reaching out directly to students (via email and/or phone calls)
● Participation in LEARN, various community activities (Metro Charleston Chamber, CRDA, area high schools)
● Meeting with interested students/families
● Participation in departmental K-12 recruitment event
● Participating in the Faculty Connect call campaign
● Give tours

b) Faculty recruitment:

● Reading applications and documents
● Meeting with colleagues
● Conduct interviews (e.g., Skype, phone, etc.)
● On campus interviews
● Dining with candidates
● Picking up candidates
Question #3. Estimated time devoted to each task

Faculty at the College of Charleston involved in independent studies reported to work an average of 79 hours per academic year, ranging from a minimum of 20 hours to 325 hours (SD=64.8). Similar results were found in the time devoted to Bachelor’s Essays with an average of 78 hours per academic year, ranging from 10 hours to 310 hours per academic year.

It is important to note that large differences in range might be due to the fact that some faculty members reported working with 3-4 students per semester on independent studies/bachelor’s essays. Those working with one student reported between 30-50 hours of work per academic year.

Table 2. List of significant tasks and average time in hours reported for accomplishing the tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Average Time (hrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Study</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Essay (including Honors Immersed Projects)</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program and Course Assessment</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program and Curriculum Development</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment (Student/Faculty)</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third most time-consuming task reported is Program and Curriculum development, which averaged almost 70 hours, ranging from 2 hours to 500 hours per academic year (SD=86.8). An explanation for the large variation in the reported time is that some faculty, instead of referring to work related to program and course assessment at the departmental, school and/or college level, they indicated the time spent to curricular development or changes in the courses they teach, as in the comments below:

“Typically, I tweak or redesign all of my courses each year”

“I have developed and taught a new special topics course”

Hence, if this question had asked the respondents to only report on program and curriculum development beyond the courses they teach, variation in range might have been lower.
**Final Observations**

1) It is not unexpected that a low percentage of faculty members responded given that faculty members do what they are paid to do according to the FAM. Rather, that 108 faculty members reported that they step up to do more than they get paid to do is noteworthy.

2) The percentages across uncompensated tasks are surprisingly high for faculty work that directly impacts students, if not also in other categories. Therefore, it could be noted that the faculty members appear to deliver a portion of the college’s mission and arguably the student recruitment differentiators of this university and do so without additional compensation. Not to remunerate and/or compensate faculty members who deliver the differentiators of the College in an increasingly competitive landscape for new students is a disconnect that should be noted.

3) Why faculty members do the uncompensated work was not investigated. Some may deliver out of servant leadership to the College, others may be preparing their resumes for other offers beyond the College. It may also be reasonable to assert that faculty members are responsible professionals who embody the core values of the institution in their actions. This question may be one that could be investigated in the future.
FCC Adjunct Information and Compensation Report

In an effort to determine whether or not full-time adjunct faculty at the College of Charleston are earning a salary greater than the poverty guidelines established by the federal government, the Faculty Compensation Committee identified several important questions.

1) Are adjuncts at the College of Charleston earning more than the federally established poverty guideline? If so, by how much and if not, by how much?
2) Are full-time adjuncts at the College of Charleston earning a living wage in the Charleston metropolitan area?
3) Are full-time adjuncts able to live on adjunct faculty wages, or is additional income supplementation such as spousal support or another part-time job necessary?

General Poverty Guidelines for 2019

As of January 11, 2019 the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has published the following national Health and Human Services Poverty Guidelines for 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Persons in Family/Household</th>
<th>Poverty Guideline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$12,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$16,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$21,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$25,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$30,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$34,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$39,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The poverty rate in South Carolina is currently 17.2% which means that 806,422 residents reported income levels below the poverty line last year. South Carolina’s poverty rate is higher than the national average of 15.1%.

According to HUD, the FY 2018 income limits documentation system determined that the median family income for the Charleston-North Charleston SC MSA was $74,500. The Charleston-North Charleston, SC MSA includes Berkeley County, Charleston County, and Dorchester County.

According to South Carolina’s Department of Social Services, approximately 703,023 residents receive assistance from SNAP (Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program). The income limit for SNAP eligibility is approximately 130% of the federal poverty level. For example, a single person who earns $15,684 per year ($1,307/month) or less may qualify for SNAP, and a family of three whose income is $26,556 ($2,213/month) or less may qualify for benefits.
A single College of Charleston adjunct would only be eligible for SNAP benefits if s/he taught no more than four courses per year as the income eligibility limit of 130% of the poverty guideline is $15,684 per year. Without access to tax and dependent information, there is no accurate way to determine how many College of Charleston adjuncts are eligible for South Carolina’s SNAP or how many are living at or below the federal poverty line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courseload</th>
<th>Without a Ph.D./terminal degree</th>
<th>With Ph.D./terminal degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 course/3 credits</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 courses/6 credits</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td>$5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 courses/9 credits</td>
<td>$9,900</td>
<td>$9,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 courses/12 credits</td>
<td>$14,200</td>
<td>$14,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of Adjunct Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Credit Hours Taught by Adjunct Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AY</th>
<th>Taught by Adjunct Faculty</th>
<th>Total SCH</th>
<th>Percentage of SCH Taught by Adjunct Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2015</td>
<td>103,469</td>
<td>301,316</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>104,476</td>
<td>298,440</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>109,755</td>
<td>298,808</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sections Taught by Adjunct Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AY</th>
<th>Taught by Adjunct Faculty</th>
<th>Total Sections</th>
<th>Percentage Taught by Adjunct Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2015</td>
<td>1677.2</td>
<td>4636</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>1731.7</td>
<td>4708</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>1763.1</td>
<td>4688</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Living Wage Analysis for full-time College of Charleston Adjuncts

According to the living wage data for Charleston/N.Charleston, prepared by Amy K. Glasmeier, Ph.D. in 2018 and reported by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology [1], adjunct pay by the College of Charleston is not a living wage for the Charleston/North Charleston metro area under certain circumstances of the household, and not above the poverty wage in more extreme circumstances, but in all cases is above the federal minimum wage.

A living wage is defined by Carey Anne Nadeau of Open Data Nation as a measure of the minimum hourly income before taxes for family unit sustainability at a minimal level, taking into account the costs for living across essential categories (food, child care, medical, housing, transportation, and other costs) and the cost of living by metro area. An excerpt of the Living Wage Model [2] defines the concept further.

“The living wage model is an alternative measure of basic needs. It is a market-based approach that draws upon geographically specific expenditure data related to a family’s likely minimum food, childcare, health insurance, housing, transportation, and other basic necessities (e.g. clothing, personal care items, etc.) costs. The living wage draws on these cost elements and the rough effects of income and payroll taxes to determine the minimum employment earnings necessary to meet a family’s basic needs while also maintaining self-sufficiency.”

The living wage for maintaining self-sufficiency in a metro area also depends on the family unit characteristics of the household [2]. Twelve combinations of income earners and dependencies are used for comparison. They include: one adult families with 0, 1, 2, or 3 dependent children, two adult families where one adult is not in the labor force with 0, 1, 2, or 3 dependent children, and two adult families where both adults are in the labor force with 0, 1, 2, or 3 dependent children.

For the Charleston-N.Charleston metro area, the following three tables shows the 2018 living wage for each of the 12 household combinations and includes a comparison to the poverty wage and to the federal minimum wage [1].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hourly Wages</th>
<th>1 Adult</th>
<th>1 Adult 1 Child</th>
<th>1 Adult 2 Children</th>
<th>1 Adult 3 Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living Wage</td>
<td>$ 12.33</td>
<td>$ 23.96</td>
<td>$ 27.34</td>
<td>$ 33.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Wage</td>
<td>$ 5.84</td>
<td>$ 7.91</td>
<td>$ 9.99</td>
<td>$ 12.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Wage</td>
<td>$ 7.25</td>
<td>$ 7.25</td>
<td>$ 7.25</td>
<td>$ 7.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The FCC compared the 2019 full-time adjunct pay rate at the College of Charleston with the 2018 living wage data, poverty wage data and minimum wage data reported by MIT for the Charleston/North Charleston metro area. The hourly rate for full-time adjunct pay was computed for comparison purposes in two ways. The first way was to assume that the full-time pay, earned over a 9-month period, is supplemented by work at the same pay rate over the three non-paid months. The second way was to assume that the full-time pay earned over a 9-month period is the total income for that adjunct faculty member, paid over 12 months without additional summer income, whereby renormalizing the hourly pay over a 12-month period.

The results, given below, show the difference between full-time adjunct pay on both hourly scales and the living wage, poverty wage and minimum wage, the three standards of comparison. Wage differences at or above zero are shown in green and indicates that the College of Charleston adjunct pay meets the standard of comparison. Wage differences below zero are shown in red, indicating that the College of Charleston adjunct rate of pay does not meet the wage standard of comparison. Table 1 shows the difference comparison for the living wage standard for family units with one adult (the adjunct faculty member) and combinations of zero to three children. Tables 2 shows the difference comparison for the living wage standard for family units with one adult (the adjunct faculty member), a second non-working adult, and combinations of zero to three children. Table 3 shows the difference comparison for the living wage standard for family units with two adult workers, including the adjunct faculty member and combinations of zero to three children.
**Table 1:** One Adult Worker. Shown in the following three tabular groupings are the living wage, poverty wage and minimum wage comparisons for the adjunct faculty member in the Charleston metro area with zero to three children and no other adult in the household.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Adult</th>
<th>1 Adult 1 Child</th>
<th>1 Adult 2 Children</th>
<th>1 Adult 3 Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living Wage Comparison</strong></td>
<td>$12.33</td>
<td>$23.96</td>
<td>$27.34</td>
<td>$33.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct PhD Rate (full time) 9 mo</td>
<td>$18.21</td>
<td>$5.88</td>
<td>$(5.75)</td>
<td>$(9.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct PhD Rate (full time) 12 mo</td>
<td>$13.65</td>
<td>$1.32</td>
<td>$(10.31)</td>
<td>$(13.69)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Adult</th>
<th>1 Adult 1 Child</th>
<th>1 Adult 2 Children</th>
<th>1 Adult 3 Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty Wage Comparison</strong></td>
<td>$5.84</td>
<td>$7.91</td>
<td>$9.99</td>
<td>$12.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct PhD Rate (full time) 9 mo</td>
<td>$18.21</td>
<td>$12.37</td>
<td>$10.30</td>
<td>$8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct PhD Rate (full time) 12 mo</td>
<td>$13.65</td>
<td>$7.81</td>
<td>$5.74</td>
<td>$3.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Adult</th>
<th>1 Adult 1 Child</th>
<th>1 Adult 2 Children</th>
<th>1 Adult 3 Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Wage Comparison</strong></td>
<td>$7.25</td>
<td>$7.25</td>
<td>$7.25</td>
<td>$7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct PhD Rate (full time) 9 mo</td>
<td>$18.21</td>
<td>$10.96</td>
<td>$10.96</td>
<td>$10.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct PhD Rate (full time) 12 mo</td>
<td>$13.65</td>
<td>$6.40</td>
<td>$6.40</td>
<td>$6.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2:** Two Adults, One Working. Shown in the following three tabular groupings are the living wage, poverty wage and minimum wage comparisons for the adjunct faculty member in the Charleston metro area with zero to three children and other adult in the household who does not work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living Wage Comparison</th>
<th>2 Adults (1 Working)</th>
<th>2 Adults (1 Working) 1 Child</th>
<th>2 Adults (1 Working) 2 Children</th>
<th>2 Adults (1 Working) 3 Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 19.73</td>
<td>$ 23.58</td>
<td>$ 26.17</td>
<td>$ 29.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct PhD Rate (full time) 9 mo</td>
<td>$ 18.21</td>
<td>$ (1.52)</td>
<td>$ (5.37)</td>
<td>$ (7.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct PhD Rate (full time) 12 mo</td>
<td>$ 13.65</td>
<td>$ (6.08)</td>
<td>$ (9.93)</td>
<td>$ (12.52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Wage Comparison</th>
<th>2 Adults (1 Working)</th>
<th>2 Adults (1 Working) 1 Child</th>
<th>2 Adults (1 Working) 2 Children</th>
<th>2 Adults (1 Working) 3 Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 7.91</td>
<td>$ 9.99</td>
<td>$ 12.07</td>
<td>$ 14.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct PhD Rate (full time) 9 mo</td>
<td>$ 18.21</td>
<td>$ 10.30</td>
<td>$ 8.22</td>
<td>$ 6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct PhD Rate (full time) 12 mo</td>
<td>$ 13.65</td>
<td>$ 5.74</td>
<td>$ 3.66</td>
<td>$ 1.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Wage Comparison</th>
<th>2 Adults (1 Working)</th>
<th>2 Adults (1 Working) 1 Child</th>
<th>2 Adults (1 Working) 2 Children</th>
<th>2 Adults (1 Working) 3 Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 7.25</td>
<td>$ 7.25</td>
<td>$ 7.25</td>
<td>$ 7.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct PhD Rate (full time) 9 mo</td>
<td>$ 18.21</td>
<td>$ 10.96</td>
<td>$ 10.96</td>
<td>$ 10.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct PhD Rate (full time) 12 mo</td>
<td>$ 13.65</td>
<td>$ 6.40</td>
<td>$ 6.40</td>
<td>$ 6.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Two Adult Workers. Shown in the following three tabular groupings are the living wage, poverty wage and minimum wage comparisons for the adjunct faculty member in the Charleston metro area with zero to three children and one other adult in the household who also has the same rate of pay.
Summary of Results

1) An adjunct faculty member can live just at the living wage level if and only if s/he has no children or other adult dependents.
2) An adjunct faculty member does not have a living wage when s/he does not have an adult partner and has one or more children, even with pay from a second, summer job at the same rate of pay.
3) An adjunct faculty member does not have a living wage when s/he has a non-breadwinning partner and zero or more children, even with pay from a second, summer job at the same rate of pay.
4) An adjunct faculty member does not have a poverty wage when he has a non-breadwinning partner and three or more children and does not work a second job.
5) All full-time adjuncts have compensation above the federal minimum wage.
6) Adjuncts at the College of Charleston represent more than ⅓ of the faculty.
The full-time College of Charleston adjunct pay rate exceeds the poverty wage for all cases except when supporting a non-wage earning partner and three or more children.

The full-time College of Charleston adjunct pay rate does exceed the minimum wage for all cases by at least $6.40 per hour when adjunct pay is spread over 12 months and $10.96 when spread over 9 months with a summer income from a second job.

Other potential inequalities for full-time adjuncts at the College include

1) Low/no support for professional development
2) Low/no support for professional travel
3) Little or no representation in faculty governance
4) Few or no job benefits such as health, dental, life or disability insurance
5) The necessity to take on a second, part-time job and/or summer job to sustain a household at the living wage level depending on household characteristics
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Default Question Block

Introduction

The Faculty Compensation Committee at the College of Charleston has created the following survey in order to gather information on employee satisfaction in terms of compensation, and on the effects of the recent merit-based raise. The ultimate goal of this survey is to inform and provide recommendations to the administration based on the responses.

Information regarding the merit raise process that was conducted during the fall semester of 2018:

The funds available for merit raise recommendations were 0.869% of the College’s permanent employee salary pool. Individual increases were firmly limited to 5% of the base faculty salary or $2500, whichever was greater.

The process was not intended to support across-the-board raises by providing a similar percentage or dollar amount for most or all of the faculty in a given unit. Instead it was “intended to recognize faculty and staff performing at the highest levels, rather than all of these faculty and staff who might have met a merit threshold”. In practice, however, and given the modest funding made available for this merit raise process, alignment with this expectation varied across departments and schools.

This survey is intended for all full-time roster faculty members. It is not intended for adjunct faculty.

Survey Anonymity: We want to assure you that your responses are completely anonymous. Responses to this anonymous survey cannot be traced back to the respondent. No personally identifiable information is captured unless you voluntarily offer
personal information in any of the comment fields. Additionally, your responses are combined with those of many others and summarized in a report to further protect your anonymity.

Do you consent to your personal data being processed as described above? You must click "Yes" in order to take the survey.

Yes
No

a) Your school:
Graduate School
Library
School of the Arts
School of Business
School of Education, Health, and Human Performance
School of Humanities and Social Sciences
School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs
School of Science and Mathematics
School of Professional Studies

b) Your rank:
Visiting Instructor or Professor
Instructor
Senior Instructor
Assistant Professor
Associate Professor
Full Professor

c) How many years have you worked at CofC
1-3
1. Did you receive a merit-based raise in Fall 2018

Yes
No

2. How would you rate your level of satisfaction in terms of your current salary compensation, whether you got a raise or not this year?

Extremely satisfied
Somewhat satisfied
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
Somewhat dissatisfied
Extremely dissatisfied

Please explain (2):

3. How has your level of satisfaction in terms of salary compensation changed over your time in rank?

It has increased a great deal
It has somewhat increased
No change
It has somewhat decreased
It has decreased a great deal

Please explain (3):

4. What was your level of morale as a CofC employee (i.e., job satisfaction, outlook, and feelings of well-being within the workplace setting) before the merit-based raise?

Very high
High
Acceptable
Low
Very low

Please explain (4):

5. What was your level of morale as a CofC employee (i.e., job satisfaction, outlook, and feelings of well-being within the workplace setting) after the merit-based raise?

Very high
High
Acceptable
Low
6. How would you rate the level of information that you received regarding the recent merit-based raise process? (e.g., expectations, information about requirements, notifications, etc.)

Abundant
Adequate
Scarce
No information at all

Please explain (6):

7. Do you have any specific suggestions for future merit-based increases? Please state below:
Default Question Block

The Faculty Compensation Committee has been asked to create a list of significant activities/tasks that roster faculty at the College of Charleston are doing, but for which they are not receiving any type of compensation.

These may be tasks that (a) are not part of the teaching, research or service commitments for the academic year, (b) are optional, but not required, (c) cannot be anticipated at the beginning of the academic year, and/or (d) require a significant amount of time and work.

The following anonymous survey aims to collect information on (1) the activities/tasks that roster faculty have done and/or are currently doing, and (2) the amount of time that they spent during the academic year working on such tasks.

Your contribution by completing this survey is greatly appreciated.

Please indicate if you have done in the past or are currently doing any of the following tasks at the College of Charleston:

1. Independent Study

   Yes
   No

If you answered YES, please provide a description of the work you did

   [blank space]
If you answered YES, please indicate the estimated TIME you spent working on this task during the academic year (in hours)

2. Bachelor's Essay

Yes
No

If you answered YES, please provide a description of the work you did

If you answered YES, please indicate the estimated TIME you spent working on this task during the academic year (in hours)

3. Honors Immersed

Yes
No

If you answered YES, please provide a description of the work you did

If you answered YES, please indicate the estimated TIME you spent working on this task during the academic year (in hours)
4. Program and Course Assessment

Yes

No

If you answered YES, please provide a description of the work you did


If you answered YES, please indicate the estimated TIME you spent working on this task during the academic year (in hours)


5. Program and Curriculum Development

Yes

No

If you answered YES, please provide a description of the work you did


If you answered YES, please indicate the estimated TIME you spent working on this task during the academic year (in hours)


6. Grant Writing for research not funded (that did not include faculty summer salary or course reduction or return of indirect costs to the faculty member)

Yes
No

If you answered YES, please provide a description of the work you did

If you answered YES, please indicate the estimated TIME you spent working on this task during the academic year (in hours)

7. Sustainability

Yes
No

If you answered YES, please provide a description of the work you did

If you answered YES, please indicate the estimated TIME you spent working on this task during the academic year (in hours)

8. Advancement (Fundraising)

Yes
If you answered YES, please provide a description of the work you did

If you answered YES, please indicate the estimated TIME you spent working on this task during the academic year (in hours)

9. Recruitment (Student/faculty)
   Yes
   No

If you answered YES, please provide a description of the work you did

If you answered YES, please indicate the estimated TIME you spent working on this task during the academic year (in hours)

10. Outreach-Campus/Community engagement
   Yes
   No
If you answered YES, please provide a description of the work you did

If you answered YES, please indicate the estimated TIME you spent working on this task during the academic year (in hours)

11. Grant Writing for students, programs and other needs of the institution.
   Yes
   No

If you answered YES, please provide a description of the work you did

If you answered YES, please indicate the estimated TIME you spent working on this task during the academic year (in hours)

12. Other tasks not listed here (Please indicate)