The committee met 7 times between April 2019 - February 2020 and was chaired by Devon Hanahan, with Tom Ivey acting as secretary. The primary goal of the committee was to revisit the committee's March 2013 resolution and to advocate for the salary increases necessary to achieve the 5 year goal of reaching the salary mean of our peer institutions by 2018. The salary increases from 2013-2018 did not reach this goal, and this committee determined to revisit the issue and raise the proposal anew under the aegis of Dr. Hsu's presidency.

September/October:
- D. Hanahan asked members to continue to update the committee's glossary of terminology (See Appendix I).
- T. Parry agreed to serve as the committee's liaison to the Adjunct Welfare Committee.
- J. Wilhelm adjured the committee to update the reports on My Charleston, one of which still refers to Elise Jorgens as the provost.
- The committee drafted a one-page set of questions to be posed to President Hsu at the first Faculty Advisory Committee meeting (See Appendix II).
- President Hsu was receptive to the inquiries, which encouraged the committee to continue its plans to draft a new resolution.

November:
- The committee heard T. Parry's report from the Adjunct Welfare Committee and discussed potential ways of improving adjunct morale and compensation. D. Caveny said that the College had a much lower adjunct dependency level than the national rate of 73%, and that our goal should be to work towards an instructional model (and allocation of faculty) where we need to use adjunct faculty only for the coverage of unanticipated and temporary needs (such as unexpected enrollment growth or instructional needs associated with sabbaticals and vacant positions).

December:
J. Wilhelm reported information obtained from preliminary reports of the strategic planning focus groups conducted by Blue Beyond, as summarized in a slide presentation delivered by the president at the last senate meeting. Diversity, Inclusion and equity and fair compensation are concerns that come up most frequently. Other highlights included a lack of transparency in budgeting. Several committee members attended these sessions, and Wilhelm for her part felt that Blue Beyond seems to do a good job of listening and fairly representing the discussions in their summaries.

The committee studied past compensation activity (See Appendix III.) to inform their plan of creating a new proposal based on the most recently available IPEDs and CUPA-HR data.

January:

D. Hanahan reported on her meetings with the Presidential Advisory Committee and with Faculty Speaker Simon Lewis. The two most important elements were that: (1) President Hsu anticipates that our increasing enrollment will allow him to improve faculty compensation, which he is now listing as a top priority. Until the increased enrollment shows that it can be maintained, he prefers to deliver the increase as a bonus rather than as a salary increase. There are no more details at this time. (2) Both President Hsu and S. Lewis emphasized the importance of the Faculty Compensation Committee's role in keeping our needs at the forefront of the BOT's attention. S. Lewis also stressed the need for current members to commit to several years on the committee to make it a more effective agent of change.

In response to a suggestion from D. Caveny that the committee research and select a standard cost-of-living analysis instrument, D. Hanahan pulled up several cost of living indices and shared the results she obtained by entering an annual salary of $75,000 with plans to move to Columbia, SC or Elon, NC. (See Appendix IV.) All committee members were asked to experiment with the links (and others they might find) and bring their recommendations to the February meeting.

February:

The committee sought and received permission from Provost Welch to ask deans to use the title Senior Adjunct Lecturer in their schools as merited according to the language in the FAM. (See Appendix V.) All deans responded favorably.

The committee created a power point showing the latest compensation data from CUPA-HR and IPEDs and planned to finish it with a proposal to take to the Faculty Senate in April. (See Appendix VI.)

March/April:

Because of the schedule disruption and fiscal chaos engendered by the onset of COVID-19, the committee decided to table their proposal until the 2020-2021 academic year.
Recommendations for next year's committee:

- Revise data and write proposal for Faculty Senate.
- Select a standard cost-of-living analysis index.
- Follow up with deans about the use of the title Senior Adjunct Instructor in the event that any future bonuses might be shared.

Respectfully submitted,
Devon W. Hanahan
Chair, Faculty Compensation Committee, 2019-2020

Appendix I: College of Charleston Faculty Compensation Committee Terminology

AAUP - The American Association of University Professors (www.aaup.org) annually reports average faculty salaries by rank and for all ranks combined in the publication Bulletin of the AAUP and the blog Academe.

Carnegie Classifications - The Carnegie Classification™ has been the leading framework for recognizing and describing institutional diversity in U.S. higher education for the past four decades. Starting in 1970, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education developed a classification of colleges and universities to support its program of research and policy analysis. Derived from empirical data on colleges and universities, the Carnegie Classification was originally published in 1973, and subsequently updated in 1976, 1987, 1994, 2000, 2005, and 2010 to reflect changes among colleges and universities. This framework has been widely used in the study of higher education, both as a way to represent and control for institutional differences, and also in the design of research studies to ensure adequate representation of sampled institutions, students, or faculty. (from http://classifications.carnegie.org/)

CGPI/Best Places - CGPI stands for Culpeper Geographic Pay Index. Both CGPI and Best Places are pay differential indices that provide a relative comparison of salary based on costs of living in different locales.

Compression - Salary compression occurs when there is little difference in pay among a group of employees regardless of their skills or experience. Compression is the result of the market-rate for a job outpacing the increases historically given by the organization to higher-tenure employees. Therefore, newcomers can only be recruited by offering them as much or more than more senior employees.

CUPA*HR - The College and University Professional Association for Human Resources is the association for HR professionals in higher education, CUPA-HR provides leadership on higher education workplace issues in the U.S. and abroad. They monitor trends, explore emerging workforce issues, conduct research, and promote strategic discussions among colleges and universities. Their salary reports are published annually. Some of their reports are:
Inversion - Salary inversion refers to situations in which the starting salaries for new faculty increase faster than those for existing faculty members. See Compression.

IPEDS - The Integrated Post-secondary Education Data System is the primary source for data on colleges, universities, and technical and vocational postsecondary institutions in the United States. It can be found at http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/.

NFSS Report - The National Faculty Salary Survey is a report generated by CUPA-HR's Surveys Online application. In compliance with Department of Justice Safe Harbor Guidelines, statistics will not display when the profiled group includes fewer than 5 institutions or if one institution's data comprise more than 25% of the total.

Peer institutions - These are the institutions with whom we compare our salaries. Our current peer group includes 21 members. Peers are chosen on a variety of factors, including location, size, curricula, etc.

Aspiration peers - These are institutions with whom the College would like to be associated.

Cross-application peers - These are institutions to whom a significant number of our students applied in addition to the College of Charleston.

Qlikview - Qlikview is a task-specific intelligence application that allows the user to combine all data sources and to compare data across an infinite number of paradigms. It is generally used in a business context, but the College of Charleston is one of the few institutions of higher education that uses it in their Institutional Research office.
Soft benefits - These are non-monetary forms of compensation. Examples would include tuition breaks for faculty children, parking, sporting event tickets, discounts based on employment, etc.

Weighted averages - This is a method of computing a kind of mean or average of a group of numbers in which some elements of the group carry more importance (weight) than others.

Appendix II: College of Charleston Compensation Committee 2019-2020

Questions for President Hsu:

1. The College of Charleston habitually ranks in the lowest third or quarter of its peer institutions in terms of compensation. When the cost of living is factored in, our rank sinks more. The 2019-2020 Compensation Committee plans to conduct another detailed salary study across four groups of peers (CUPA-HR, CAA, aspirational, cross-application) that will produce varied permutations of our standing according to faculty rank, years of experience, and school. How will you use this study to address the compensation issues of your faculty? What data would be most useful to you in this study? How can it support the goals of the Strategic Plan? How can we best apprise the Board of Trustees and the SC Legislature of our concerns?

2. The Compensation Committee (under A. Perez-Nunez in the last two academic years) has produced comprehensive reports on faculty morale and the quantity of uncompensated work required, the latter factor naturally informing the former. This data is available as reports and graphs. What do you consider to be an appropriate level of uncompensated work, such as independent studies, bachelor's essays, etc.? How can the College regulate and reward these efforts across all schools in a systematic manner that will not require constant revisitation?

3. The principle forms of alternate compensation are health benefits and relatively affordable parking downtown. Health costs have risen, as have the parking rate, thus canceling out the recent merit raise. Is there any way to influence the state legislature when they make decisions about our coverage? Can the mayor of Charleston be prevailed upon to consider the positive economic impact of the College and stop raising parking rates?

Many thanks, President Hsu, for taking the time to read and consider these questions.

Commented [CDM1]: Colleagues, in the last data that I recall, we were in the middle, rather than in the lowest third or quarter. We want to be sure we are being accurate. The data I am recalling are not adjusted for cost of living.

Commented [CDM2]: Some of our campus parking is secured via contracts with the city, but some is owned by the College. The College of Charleston sets the rates that are charged to employees for campus parking. Of course, those rates are impacted by our agreements with the city, but to my knowledge, the city is not setting our parking rates.
Appendix

III:

Compensation Committee

History

As part of the College's strategic planning process and then-President Higdon's Fourth Century Initiative, in Fall 2002, a Strategic Plan Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Compensation was constituted. The committee, chaired by Lynne E. Ford, Department of Political Science (and comprised of tenured faculty Ford, Beverly Diamond, Mathematics, Edward Hart, Music, Peter McCandless, History, Tom Ross, Psychology, and Hugh Wilder, Philosophy), conducted a salary study, and presented their findings and recommendations to President Higdon and Provost Jorgens in December 2003. The committee's charge, as outlined in the College's Strategic Plan adopted by the Board of Trustees in April 2003 was:

"A comparative faculty compensation study will be conducted by an Ad Hoc Committee on Compensation consisting of representatives from the Faculty Welfare and Senate Budget committees as well as representatives from the Riley Policy Institute and the Institutional Offices. The study will identify appropriate peer institutions or groups, set benchmarks and goals appropriate for an institution whose vision is to become a nationally pre-eminent public liberal arts and sciences college, and establish a plan with a timeline for achieving the goals. Initial steps will be taken to implement the faculty compensation plan."

According to their report, "The Strategic Plan Salary Initiative is [was] a comprehensive plan to enhance faculty compensation in order to achieve the objectives of the Fourth Century Initiative. The short-term goal of the Strategic Plan Salary Initiative is [was] to achieve relative salary parity with peers at comparable institutions." One outcome of their work was a list of twenty institutions to use as our salary peer group.

According to the ad hoc committee's report, Michelle Smith, then Director of Institutional Research, provided a list of fifty-two institutions, drawn largely from natural groups of institutions that include the College such as COP LAC (the Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges), the top five public masters level institutions by region ranked by US News and World Report, member institutions in our athletic conference (the Southern Conference, at the time), South Carolina Public Senior Institutions, and the institutions then in the South Atlantic Region Carnegie IIA group. The committee agreed "generally to examine institutions with between 4,000 and 15,000 students, although three institutions with smaller student bodies appear on the [final] list of twenty (namely, the Citadel, St. Mary's College, and UNC Asheville)." The committee "further selected institutions for which at least 25% of SAT scores overlapped with each of the top 50% and the bottom 50% of SAT scores at the College of Charleston (i.e., the 75th percentile at the second institution was at least as large as the median SAT score at the College, and the 25th percentile was no larger than the median at the College). This rule was applied with a single exception, that of UNC Greensboro, an institution narrowly excluded by SAT scores lower than those at the College but similar to the College on other measures." The committee "subsequently..."
discussed in greater detail [for each institution on the list] the student/faculty ratio, the ratio of full-time faculty with terminal degrees, and the mission of the institution relative to the College of Charleston" and for some institutions, "investigated tenure and promotion requirements, commitment to graduate education, and the typical teaching load in an attempt to assess the balance in expectations for teaching and research." While not every institution that was ultimately included was universally viewed as being a "comparable" institution, the committee closed the summary of their analysis with, "While we realize that any single institution may not mirror the College on every measure, we believe that in the aggregate, the list provides comparability as well as a sufficient sample of faculty across departments to provide data for the detailed analysis. It is important to note that this list represents current rather than aspirational peers."

The final list agreed upon for the first salary study was comprised of:

- Appalachian State University
- College of New Jersey
- James Madison University
- Mary Washington University
- Miami University (Ohio)
- Millersville University of Pennsylvania
- Murray State University (who did not participate)
- Ramapo College of New Jersey
- Rowan University
- St. Mary's College of Maryland (who did not participate)
- SUNY College of Arts and Sciences – Geneseo
- The Citadel
- Truman State University
- UNC Asheville
- UNC Greensboro
- UNC Wilmington
- University of Vermont (who did not participate)
- University of Northern Iowa
- University of New Hampshire (who did not participate)
- Western Washington.

A subset of these institutions was used to study library faculty salaries.

The December 2003 report of this first A&H Faculty Compensation Committee noted the following: "At the core of both the Fourth Century Initiative and the Strategic Plan is the relationship between faculty and students. In order to achieve the goals to which we have committed ourselves, this relationship must be strengthened. Faculty are aware that more is already being expected and required of them as scholars, teachers and mentors, as more is expected of the College. Meeting these rising expectations will require an increased investment of resources." The report also noted that, "The Fourth Century Initiative dedicates considerable resources to hiring additional faculty in order to reduce average class size, improve the student-faculty ratio, and create more opportunities for students to work directly with faculty" and that the "2003 Strategic Plan calls [called] for a high quality and diverse [called] faculty, and mandates [mandated] a comparative Faculty..."
Compensation Study as well as initial implementation of a new Salary Initiative in support of this goal.

In reporting on outcomes of this first study, the committee wrote that "Over 85% of College of Charleston faculty in the study are making less than their predicted salary relative to faculty at peer institutions," and

• The College ranks next to last in average salary among the twenty schools identified as current peers in the 2003 salary study.
• The college ranks next to last in average faculty salary among schools in the Southern Conference.
• The 2002-2003 average faculty salary at the Citadel, in our own metropolitan area and in the same US News & World Report college category, is more than 10% higher than the 2002-2003 average salary at the College of Charleston.
• The College is 18th in average salary among the 21 schools ranked by US News & World Report as the Top Regional Public Masters Institutions in 2003.
• The College ranks 10th in average faculty salary among [the] 16 members of the [19-member] Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges [reporting data]."

Lastly, the report noted that the record is worse when cost of living is taken into account and that "the US News & World Report College Guide for 2003 ranks the College 16th overall and 17th in student selectivity among masters level institutions in the South, but 74th in the area of faculty resources," and points out that "faculty salary is the largest component of the category of faculty resources."

The proposed Strategic Plan Salary Initiative was designed to "reward and encourage continued meritorious performance," and the effort to bring faculty salaries to parity with peers was identified by the 2002-2003 Faculty Compensation Committee as costing over two million dollars. The ad hoc committee proposed a two-phase approach, with the first phase intended to reach parity with "current" peer institutions and the second phase intended to set benchmarks and pursue parity with a second, possibly overlapping set of aspirational peers, chosen to reflect the goal of national pre-eminence.

For the 2003 compensation study, the following data were requested for all faculty in professorial ranks at the twenty peer institutions: individual nine-month salary equivalent for each faculty member, departmental affiliation, rank, and years in rank. Sixteen of the twenty institutions participated; of those participating, six were used for the library faculty salary analyses. College of Charleston faculty salaries were received from our Office of Institutional Research and provided to department chairs for validation and any necessary requests for correction. Regression analyses were conducted using years in rank as the independent variable and salary as the dependent variable, controlling for both department and rank. This analysis yielded two data points, namely the "calculated entering salary for each rank in each department" and "the value of each year in rank for each rank in each department," allowing for "the calculation of an estimated salary for each College of Charleston faculty member by rank and department," along with a comparison to the faculty member's actual salary. Lastly, as requested by then-President Higdon, the first ad hoc salary committee also made recommendations regarding the distribution of funds, recognizing that "The Committee did not know how much money will be available at any given time for distribution, nor does the Committee know how frequently distributions may occur." The committee also made recommendations regarding: (1) adjustments to the College's increments for tenure and promotion, and (2) competitive starting salaries.

In particular, an upward adjustment to the increment for promotion to Professor was recommended given that data from the study indicated that compression, demonstrated at every rank, was "most acute at the rank of professor." The recommendation was to increase that increment immediately to $4500. It is now $7500 and was last adjusted for promotions effective August 16, 2017.
The committee also recommended that an exit interview protocol be established for use with faculty leaving the College, with the goal of determining "whether salary plays a larger role in retaining faculty in some departments or schools than in others" and "whether there was any pattern to faculty departures by rank, department or school relative to salary issues." An exit interview protocol is now in place for permanent faculty leaving the College, as of Summer 2018, and the Office of the Provost is also compiling and studying faculty separations data more generally.

A new 2004-2005 Faculty Compensation Committee (comprised of Beverly Diamond, Chair, Lynne Ford, Tom Gilson, Tom Kent, Glen Lesses, Peter McCandless, and Valerie Porcello) continued the work of the original ad hoc committee, conducting and reporting on a second salary study that collected data from peer institutions, using disciplinary reports on salary averages available from the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR), and using institutional level data on salary averages made available by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), associated with IPEDS reporting. They reported progress on "several measures," while also providing evidence that the "College has [had] not yet achieved parity with current peers." They made the following recommendations:

• "that steps be taken to ensure starting salaries are competitive with those of current peers;"
• "that the merit increment for promotion to Professor be raised immediately to $4500;"
• "that as long as the current post-tenure review process remains in place, the salary increment for those receiving a Superior rating in post-tenure review be raised to $2500;"
• "that current inequities and compression at the rank of Professor be addressed; and"
• "that peer estimates of salaries for individuals based on the 2004 regression analysis be distributed to chairs."

The increment for promotion to Professor was reviewed each year from 2013 through 2017 and is now set at $7500. The increment for a superior rating in post-tenure review is now set at $3000. The 2004-2005 committee also recommended that CUPA-HR salary data be made available to department chairs, and that is being done on an annual basis.

Under then-President Benson and acknowledging his "commitment to secure additional funds to invest in College faculty and his proposal for a new merit-market pay plan," the 2007-2008 standing Faculty Compensation Committee (chaired by Hugh Wilder, Philosophy, and comprised of Wilder, Calvin Blackwell, Economics and Finance, William Danaher, Sociology and Anthropology, Michelle Futrell (Senior Instructor), Health and Human Performance, Tony Harold, Biology, Laura Turner, Theatre, and Katherine White, Psychology), requested that "a new comparative study be conducted, similar to the studies done in 2003 and 2005." In addition to the results of this third study, the Faculty Compensation Committee "also used data reported in the 2008 national faculty salary study conducted by the American Association of University Professors (published in the March-April, 2008 issue of the Association's journal, Academe)" and included in their report "recommendations concerning the implementation of the new merit-based pay system." Based on the 2007-2008 study, the Committee reported that the "overall difference between average salaries at the College and at our peers is $3 million, 11.4% of the total College of Charleston [tenured and tenure-track faculty] salary pool." The committee reported that "relative to our peers, College faculty are substantially underpaid at all ranks studied [which included all tenure-stream ranks], in all academic schools, and in most of our academic departments." They reiterated the two prior committees' position that our faculty compensation problems are substantial, and in their words, "requiring sustained rather than episodic attention" and also regular monitoring and evaluation of progress.
The 2007-2008 committee also added two institutions to the above salary peer list, namely Humboldt State University and the University of Wisconsin Eau Claire, and even so, recommended that "A new general-purpose set of institutional peers should be developed as part of the [then] current strategic planning process." No new list has been used by subsequent Faculty Compensation Committees. The 2007-2008 committee also recommended that "a renewed effort be made to include a cost of living factor in future studies." Since at least XXXXX, IPEDS-based reports produced by our Office of Institutional Research (formerly known as the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Information Management) have included cost of living adjustments. Lastly, the 2007-2008 committee gave attention to some items not considered as substantially by past ad hoc faculty compensation committees. In particular, they:

• Included instructors and senior instructors in their compensation study and looked at AAUP data for those ranks, while also recommending "that attempts be made to include Instructors and Senior Instructors in future salary studies.

• Recommended that further attempts be made to include faculty librarians in future salary studies, as "they are members of the faculty and will be considered for annual merit salary increases.

• Recommended "that gender be included on a regular basis (e.g., every five years) in future salary studies.

• Recommended that "Standard pay for adjunct faculty should be regularly reviewed and increased when appropriate.

• Recommended that "merit rewards for promotion in rank (from Assistant to Associate, Associate to Professor, and Instructor to Senior Instructor) be regularly reviewed and increased when appropriate," acknowledging that "these awards serve to reward excellent performance; … [and] also contribute to the relief of problems of salary compression." In particular, the 2007-2008 committee recommended that these salary increases "be maintained at least at the levels used by our peer institutions.

Since the work of the 2007-2008 Faculty Compensation Committee, the increments for tenure, promotion to Associate Professor, and promotion to Professor have been fairly regularly increased. An attached document outlines these increases since 2013. Additionally, the increment for earning a superior post-tenure rating was increased to $3000 and is currently (as of YEAR 2012-2013???) available for each earned superior post-tenure rating, as opposed to only the first such rating earned.

The 2007-2008 committee also reported that "with the strong support of Provost Elise Jorgens," the 2004-2005 committee's recommendation to improve starting salaries, bringing them closer in line with salaries offered by our peers, "has [had] been implemented with good effect" and recommended that "this attention to starting salaries be maintained," enabling "the College to recruit the talented faculty it needs" and providing "the basis for an overall salary structure that is more in line with our peers and appropriate for the College's aspirations.

The two original ad hoc Faculty Compensation Committees led to the introduction of a standing Faculty Compensation Committee, effective XXXXX. Since the work of 2007-2008, the standing committee has used CUPA-HR and IPEDS data to study faculty compensation. They have also continued attention on promotion and post-tenure review increments and adjunct faculty salaries, facilitated a conversation about department chair compensation, expressed an interest in broader conversations about supplementary faculty compensation, expressed an interest in reconsidering our salary peer group, and argued for regular inclusion of cost-of-living adjustments in our faculty compensation work. In Spring 2013, they developed and introduced a resolution that was adopted by the Faculty Senate and...
subsequently presented (along with annual updates) to the Academic Affairs Committee of the College's Board of Trustees. That resolution called for the following:

College of Charleston faculty salaries will meet or exceed the mean salaries of the CUPA-HR salary peers institutionally and at each rank. The College will make every effort to achieve this goal by September, 2018.

The Compensation Committee, in cooperation with all relevant administrative offices, will assess the progress being made in its annual report each spring to the Senate.

CUPA-HR data outlining the College's current position relative to this expired resolution were presented at the President's February 10 meeting with academic leadership and are included here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUPA-HR Code/Title Category</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>College of Charleston Average</th>
<th>Peers Average</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Cost to Peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$94,898</td>
<td>$102,872</td>
<td>$(7,974)</td>
<td>$1,172,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>$75,362</td>
<td>$82,833</td>
<td>$(7,471)</td>
<td>$1,299,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor (incl New)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>$72,890</td>
<td>$75,366</td>
<td>$(2,476)</td>
<td>$269,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor/Lecturer/Scientist</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$58,124</td>
<td>$50,857</td>
<td>$7,267</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IPEDS data, outlining the College's current standing relative to peer institutions, were also presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>2018-19 Salary</th>
<th>Cost of Living Compared to Charleston</th>
<th>Salary to Maintain Equal Standard of Living in Charleston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of New Hampshire - Main Campus</td>
<td>$108,543</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>$103,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University - Oxford</td>
<td>$97,177</td>
<td>-26.8%</td>
<td>$123,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt State University</td>
<td>$90,507</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
<td>$93,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramapo College of New Jersey</td>
<td>$90,200</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>$70,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College of New Jersey</td>
<td>$89,376</td>
<td>-14.9%</td>
<td>$102,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan University</td>
<td>$88,955</td>
<td>-15.2%</td>
<td>$102,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Washington University</td>
<td>$88,150</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>$80,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Greensboro</td>
<td>$86,160</td>
<td>-32.9%</td>
<td>$114,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millersville University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$85,992</td>
<td>-18.7%</td>
<td>$102,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina Wilmington</td>
<td>$81,656</td>
<td>-14.4%</td>
<td>$93,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State University</td>
<td>$79,959</td>
<td>-16.9%</td>
<td>$93,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison University</td>
<td>$78,125</td>
<td>-24.6%</td>
<td>$97,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Asheville</td>
<td>$77,639</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
<td>$81,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citadel Military College of South Carolina</td>
<td>$77,133</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$77,133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
College of Charleston: $76,664

University of Northern Iowa:
- 30.6%
- $97,848

University of Wisconsin - Eau Claire:
- 28.6%
- $89,979

Murray State University:
- 42.4%
- $98,982

SUNY College at Geneseo:
- 24.9%
- $85,788

St. Mary's College of Maryland:
- 12.2%
- $73,158

Truman State University:
- 41.5%
- $90,520

ADD note about how CUPA-HR group does not exactly match the salary peer list, given that some of the institutions on the salary peer list have not reported faculty salaries to CUPA-HR or only rarely do so.

ADD section thanking President Hsu again for his attention to faculty salaries and making any preliminary recommendations that the committee would like to make and/or suggesting what the committee would like to work on for the remainder of this academic year (and potentially into 2020-2021).

Appendix IV:
Appendix A - Cost of Living Indices
https://smartasset.com/mortgage/cost-of-living-calculator
Dear Provost Welch:

On behalf of the 2019-2020 Faculty Compensation Committee, I am writing to ask your support of our proposal to encourage the implementation of the title Senior Adjunct Lecturer for those who merit the distinction. This title has long existed in the Faculty/Administration Manual, as quoted here: “Adjunct faculty members are initially assigned the special faculty rank of Adjunct Lecturer. A Dean may confer the rank of Adjunct Senior Lecturer when a member of the adjunct faculty at the College of Charleston has taught 30 or more course sections at the College, has worked at the College for at least eight separate semesters or summer terms, has been responsible...”

Elon - 2% higher $76,621
Columbia - 2% lower $73,462
https://www.bestplaces.net/cost-of-living/

Elon - 21.3% lower $59,815
Columbia - 24.4% lower $55,309

Elon - NA
Columbia - 5.84% lower $70,682
https://www.payscale.com/cost-of-living-calculator

Elon NC - 6.3% lower $70,275
Columbia SC - 6.4% lower $70,200

Appendix V:
From: Hannah, Devon Wray
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2020 4:33 PM
To: Welch, Frances C <WelchF@cofc.edu>
Cc: Streit, Jessica <streitj@cofc.edu>; Craig, Jacob W <craigjw1@cofc.edu>; Boucher, Dave <boucherds@cofc.edu>; Abuhakema, Ghazi M <AbuhakemaG@cofc.edu>
Subject: Letter from the Compensation Committee
for at least 5,000 student enrollments, and continues to serve as a member of the College's adjunct faculty.

(FAM, III.A.2.b.(4)). However, none of us on the committee is aware of its use on campus in the last twenty years.

While this title distinction is not tied to any direct form of compensation, we would like our deans to use it for two reasons: one, to show some form of appreciation for the long-term adjuncts that are vital to the operation of many of our departments, and two, to have the distinction in place in the event of any future bonuses that should rightfully be shared with long-time adjuncts.

With your support we will share this proposal with the deans of the College. I look forward to hearing from you at your convenience. Thank you for your time and attention.

Appendix VI: