Faculty Welfare Committee
Meeting Minutes: April 16, 2018

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 1:01 PM in Maybank 209.

Committee Members in attendance: Emily Beck (Chair), Mary Jo Fairchild, Phyllis Jestice, Martin Jones, and Myra Whittemore
New member of the FWC 2018-2019: Xenia Mountroudou

Agenda:
1. Approve all FWC meeting minutes for AY 2017-2018.
2. Report on meeting with the Presidential Search Committee on April 4, 2018.
4. Recommend items for FWC for next year.

Discussion of Agenda Items:

1. Motion to approve all FWC meeting minutes for AY 2017-2018. All approved.

2. Report on meeting with the Presidential Search Committee on April 4, 2018 (Emily and Phyllis in attendance)


4. Recommend items for FWC for next year:
   *Smoking / vaping
   *Low morale issues:
     - Could FWC continue to participate with Presidential Search Committee?
   *Childcare issues - early childhood center only accommodates 12 children per year. Could the college work to provide a daycare facility for faculty/staff/and students?
   *Adequate resources for Professional Development for Adjuncts?
     - Research development?
     - Centrally planned money that could be applied for by adjuncts for conference travel, research funds, etc.

Meeting Adjourned: 1:52 pm
Faculty Welfare Committee
Meeting Minutes: March 26, 2018

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 1PM in JC Long 131.

We originally scheduled this meeting from 2-3 but then were asked to prepare a report concerning the current state of faculty morale and the campus climate to present to the Presidential Search Committee. We extended our meeting from 1-3pm to complete that task.

Committee Members in attendance: Emily Beck (Chair), Keonya Booker, Phyllis Jestice, Mary Jo Fairchild, Martin Jones, and Richard Lavrich

Guest John Morris, Executive VP

Agenda:
1. Prepare report of faculty and staff morale to share with members of the Presidential Search Committee.

Discussion of Agenda Items:

1. Prepare report of faculty and staff morale to share with members of the Presidential Search Committee

A. Next President should ideally have significant experience in higher education and higher education administration. Someone who has served as at least a dean.

   The reasons for this are:

   - More awareness of the assessment process and ways to bridge communication between faculty and higher administration.

   - The rationale given for hiring a president who had experience in politics did not result in better funding or amplified voices at the state level. It did not improve our standing or image in the state to have a president who came from politics.

B. Issue of Faculty Morale is Low:
   - The new president ideally should have some experience at a different institution responding to faculty morale issues specifically
     - The current faculty and staff morale can be characterized as disgruntled apathy
- Process of the previous search left faculty feeling that their voice is not valued or appreciated
- Salary is not competitive for cost of living; problems of salary compression; a new president should explore new forms of compensation, including livability issues (childcare, public transportation, tuition discounts for dependents, etc.)
- The upper administration has fallen into a habit of scolding/hazing/berating faculty and staff for generalized “You’re not getting things done”. Current operational practices are affected by micromanaging at the upper administrative level and an inability to delegate responsibility or trust lower administration to handle tasks.
- Lack of faculty and staff attendance at the meetings regarding the Presidential search committee is not reflective of lack of interest:
  - Holding meetings at 5pm affects family time
  - Faculty have repeatedly tried to work with upper administration and feel stymied and that their voices are not appreciated. There is a general sentiment that there is no reason to continue trying to work productively with upper administration.
- New approaches, new vision, alternate ways of articulating the mission of this institution and reaching out to parents, prospective students, faculty, community members.
  - Grounds are beautifully maintained but inside many of the buildings are falling apart (heating, cooling, leaks, rats, spaces that haven’t been cleaned)
  - President who is proud of faculty and champions their achievements

C. Questions to ask Search committee:
  a. Could we have some assurance that finalists will be brought to campus during the regular semester so faculty have the opportunity to provide feedback?
  b. Could we have some input on the prompts/instructions given to the candidates? Provide questions?
  c. Would you consider a survey process following each campus visit to allow faculty to provide detailed feedback? In the rare case of a finalist who prompts the majority of faculty to have a vote of no confidence, would you consider removing that finalist from the search process?

There is a desire for more clarity of regarding processes.

Could there be a more clear responsibility chart?

When one reports an issue, we have an initial contact # but it’s difficult to know who to contact for specific issues and with whom to follow up

JM: We are working on revising and updating the work order management process: As you submit your work request and there should be an email with a work # to log in and check it yourself. Customer contact points that should be automated.

PP should be able to plan and schedule: e.g. we will be there to fix this Tuesday 2-4; At the moment there is not a process for letting people know that the process has been fixed.

JM would like to bring customer focus back into the process; better communication. Supervisors should have some sort of oversight regarding the process, put into the dispatch system so the call operators can give updates when one calls.

Is it possible to clarify a system of updates? (IT has open ticket system)

There is no a clear way to see where in the process a request is.

There is follow through but sometimes it can seem to take a long time; isn’t as quick as 3 years ago. If a part is missing it seems logical and appropriate that there might be a delay but it would be great if there were a way to follow up with ETA or feedback about the time required.

Not always clear work has been done.

Where in work flow are things in processing and how the priorities are determined?

Who has supervisory duty over various branches? If there is not a response, who should be contacted?

JM: Custodial still unclear: some buildings are PP, some are contracted out.

Sometimes it seems to take a long time to complete for tasks. Are you short staffed? Can we advocate on your behalf for increased staff? What sort of resources do you need?
JM: 1. Capital renewal, modernization; 2. Facilities gets initial budget cuts: we need more staff. Generally we want to aim for managed care (2\textsuperscript{nd} level, not pristine, not reactive)

Changes in process over the past years:

Before all requests went through Dept Admins but now the Faculty email the PP directly

JM: He came from an institution that used that system of an admin reporting issues. Proctors/liaisons trained with PP practices/priorities. It reduces the number of times one receives reports about the same problem.

Interested in hearing: plan and hierarchy in mind for repairs to most damaged buildings on campus.

JM: Buildings that are most important to student success or research success; faculty offices slightly lower than classrooms;

We mentioned classroom cleanliness, heating, materials issues, smoking signage and increased visibility of the smoking policy. Asked about how to flag certain issues as being priority but not necessarily emergencies (like ADA compliance issues).

He took notes and mentioned interest in adding these dimensions to the improved work order management process.

Questions that were answered as a result of his comments:

What are the priorities of PP?

How do they decide which tasks get priority?

What things incur charges and what things are free?

Have you considered implementing a system of customer feedback or allowing surveys to evaluate the job completed and incentivize service?

The FWC was very impressed and encouraged by Mr. Morris’ engaged discussion with us. We are hopeful that we will all see positive changes in the management of the Physical Plant in the coming months and years.
**Meeting Adjourned:** 2:50pm

**Next Meeting:** scheduled for April 16, 2018 from 1-2pm in Maybank 209
Faculty Welfare Committee  
Meeting Minutes: February 20, 2018

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 1PM in 209 Maybank

Committee Members in attendance: Emily Beck (Chair), Keonya Booker, Stephen Della Lana, Mary Jo Fairchild, Phyllis Jestice, Martin Jones, and Richard Lavrich

Agenda:
1. Continue to identify dimensions of faculty morale that FWC will work to improve
   a. Reports about faculty climate materials. Climate survey and data from Great Colleges to Work For 2013, 2015
   b. Suggestions/ideas from Conversations on Institutional Identity; Ad-Hoc Committee on Institutional Vision
   c. Other data sets to consult?
2. Plan for addressing dimensions of faculty morale?
3. Reports from Faculty Advisory Committee to the President (FACP)
4. Physical Plant
5. Other committee reports to consider?
6. Other old business(?)
7. Adjunct advocacy – continue to address concerns related to adjunct colleagues
8. New business

Discussion of Agenda Items:
   a. Reports about faculty climate materials. Climate survey and data from Great Colleges to Work For 2013, 2015, Campus Climate Survey (2014)

      o Surveys identified these dimensions consistently:
      o Poor communication between upper administration and faculty (Great Colleges 2015, 2013)
      o Poor relations between administration, faculty, and staff (Great Colleges 2015)
      o Lack of shared governance (Great Colleges 2015)
      o Lack of administrative transparency (Great Colleges 2015, 2013, Campus Climate)

      o Surveys identified dissatisfaction with:
      o Senior leadership shows a genuine interest in the well-being of faculty, administration and staff. (2013 Great Colleges, 17% strongly disagreed)
      o Lack of tuition reimbursement/discount for dependents of faculty or staff (Great Colleges 2013, high % very dissatisfied)
      o Lack of family-based services for employees and faculty (Campus Climate Survey 2013)
      o Disparities that prevent equal pay for equal work (Great Colleges 2013, Campus Climate Survey 2013)
According to the Campus Climate Survey, People seriously considering leaving the college (p. 6) due to unwelcome climate, tension in department with supervisor/manager, financial reasons (ppt slides 65, 67)

Could there be a Campus Welfare Committee that included Staff as representatives?

More adjunct representation on FWC in future years?

The Council of Chairs is administering a survey about Assessment - many chairs and program directors are dissatisfied with the time commitment, usefulness of the data, lack of compensation, etc., etc.

**Meeting Adjourned:** 2:03pm

**Next Meeting:** scheduled for March 26, 2018 from 2-3pm in JC Long 131
Faculty Welfare Committee  
Meeting Minutes: January 19, 2018

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 2PM in 209 Maybank

Committee Members in attendance: Emily Beck (Chair), Keonya Booker, Phyllis Jestice, Martin Jones, Stephen Della Lana, Myra Whittemore, and Jen Wright

Agenda:  
1. Faculty Morale Issues  
2. Update regarding Smoking on Campus  
3. Physical Plant  
4. Update from the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President (FACP), Emily Beck  
5. Other old business?  
6. New business?

Discussion of Agenda Items:  
1. Faculty Morale Issues  
   A. Update from Ad Hoc Committee on Institutional Identity and Vision (Jen Wright)  
      Surveys are back and committee is trying to analyze the data  
      B. Discussion of the documents related to the Campus Climate Survey (2013) and the data from the Great Colleges to Work for Survey (2013, 2015). Committee members decided to divide the surveys into teams and report back to the committee at the next meeting.  
       Climate Survey Jen, Emily, Phyllis  
       Great Colleges 2013 Keonya, Stephen, Richard  
       Great Colleges 2015 Martin, Myra, Mary Jo  
      Identify key morale issues, difficulties, 3-5 key take-aways to determine the primary issues that impact faculty and staff.  
      Jen resent link to the reports to all committee members

2. Smoking  
   Officer Reese has sent Emily several reports to document smoking infractions on campus.

3. Issues related to Physical Plant  
   a. FWC has received numerous complaints regarding timeline to completion of tickets, lack of transparency about the priorities of Physical Plant, Lack of clear authority at Physical Plant (messages coming from John Cordray; no current Director of Physical Plant.)  
   b. There will be a new VP for Grounds on Feb. 1, 2018.
1. We agreed to send a letter from FWC asking for clarification regarding:
   
   a. clear responsibility chart

   1. There is no a clear way to see where in the process a request is. Where in work flow are things in processing and how the priorities are determined?

   2. Who has supervisory duty over various branches? If there is not a response, who should be contacted?

   b. What are the priorities of PP? How do they decide which tasks get priority? What things incur charges and what things are free? There is a desire for more clarity of regarding processes.

To do: Set up a meeting between director of Physical Plant and FWC

   Explain that the goal is to facilitate communication between faculty and PP; clarify and streamline; PP gets blamed for problems and we want to allow for open communication between our groups.

4. Update from the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President (FACP), Emily Beck

Questions to bring to the FACP from FWC?

   When will the search open for a new Graduate Dean?

   Several members discussed the lack of honest interest of upper administration in the concerns of the faculty. We have brought up issues and they have been consistently politically dodged or ignored.

   What is the goal of FACP? Can we clarify the goals of what we hope to achieve?

5. *Post and Courier* interview with Speaker of the Faculty regarding faculty response to McConnell presidency. Curious about motivation?

**Meeting Adjourned:** 2:48pm

**Next Meeting:** scheduled for February 20, 2018 from 1-2pm in Maybank 209
Faculty Welfare Committee
Meeting Minutes: December 1, 2017

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 12:00PM in Maybank 209

Committee Members in attendance: Emily Beck (Chair), Keonya Booker, Phyllis Jestice, Richard Lavrich, Martin Jones, and Jen Wright

Agenda:

1. Faculty Morale
2. Report from the FACP (Emily)
3. New Business

Discussion of agenda items:

Faculty Morale Issues:

Related to the lack of communication between Upper Administration and Faculty

When the FACP mentioned to the President that a big problem on campus is the lack of communication between Upper Administration and Faculty Group he said that there has “never been such transparency” at this institution. Committee members were surprised and disheartened at this response.

FWC considered proposing that the FACP send a letter to the president about why we were flummoxed and sat there in open-mouth silence(?)

More than a transparency issue, it is a problem of being condescending and treating us like we are babies who need to be constantly reprimanded.

Institutional Effectiveness Office is a big part of the problem.

Compensation is also a problem

Peer institutions do not reflect the onerous cost of living

Food security and housing security

Jen mentioned that she is part of the new committee on the institutional mission (Ad Hoc Committee for Identity and Vision)

We discussed structural problems at the college that are wearing everyone down:

There are too many levels of bureaucracy, forms to fill out;

AA is over worked too – Deanna, Lynne, and Brian work long hours.
The sense that this institution is bloated is in how many forms and issues have to pass through their desks rather than having deans or chairs handle certain issues.

Offices understaffed; unintelligible use of resources:

The institution is bloated in the sense that things take too long to be approved.

Smoking:
Could we post more signs at the building entrances?
What spaces in particular should we recommend for increased signage?

Any courtyards
Liberty Dining Hall, ECTR entrances, JC Long/Tate entrances
Maybank, Cougar Mall
YWCA / Parking Garage / Side of Bell Building
SSMB building and courtyard

More ideas about ways to improve faculty morale on campus?

Change summer session to allow faculty to count it toward regular semester credit hours
More focus on high impact experiences - Study Abroad
Carnegie Classification for an Engaged Faculty

Makes community research a primary focus of the institution; could count community engagement toward T&P

New Business:

FWC was asked by AAUP representative to observe the Adjunct Appeal Process by Oksana Ingle (Russian Studies).

The meeting went on all day but FWC Member Martin Jones was able to observe part of the hearing.

Ongoing Facilities Issues:

Consistent complaints about lack of facility maintenance; lack of cleanliness, unclear administration of Physical Plant: when you make a request, how to follow up? What to do / Who to contact if work isn’t completed?
Could we schedule a meeting with the head of Physical Plant (perhaps at our Feb meeting) maybe wait until after survey results?

**Meeting Adjourned:** 12:58 pm

**Next Meeting:** A doodle poll will be sent out in early January once everyone is aware of spring schedules
Faculty Welfare Committee

Meeting Minutes: October 24, 2017

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 3PM in 209 Maybank

Committee Members in attendance: Emily Beck (Chair), Keonya Booker, Richard Lavrich, Phyllis Jestice, Martin Jones, Stephen Della Lana, Myra Whittemore, Mary Jo Fairchild, and Jen Wright

Agenda:
1. Bridge Program
2. Flagging Statement
3. Campus Smoking Policy
4. Adjunct Advocacy
5. Campus Restrooms

Discussion of Agenda Items:

1. Bridge Program
   A. Lack of transparency
      Who is in charge of the program?
      Which departments are participating?
      How it works?
   B. Expectations
      College of Charleston vs Trident
      Adjunct Staffing and pay scale
   C. Impact
      Is the program good for the student, adjuncts, and CofC?

To do: Contact Clemson for information about transparency of their program
Search Faculty Senate Minutes for details of the program and committees consulted in the development of the bridge program.

2. Flagging Statement
   A. FWC has agreed that it should release its own statement
3. Campus Smoking Policy

There is a lack of signage across campus indicating that we are a no tobacco campus.

4. Adjunct Advocacy (Report from Phyllis, our representative on the Ad Hoc Adjunct Oversight Committee)

FWC will look into what AAUP is doing nationally on this issue

Resolution of adjunct pay issues likely not to move forward until the finances of the college of the whole are addressed

Discussion involving possible things to make life better for adjuncts

(a) quicker scheduling of courses taught

(b) job stability for long term adjuncts

(c) decrease time elapsed between start date and first paycheck

5. Campus Restrooms

FWC has received numerous complaints about

(a) the general cleanliness of restrooms across campus

(b) the lack of ones dedicated to faculty use only

FWC agrees to work with Physical Plant on the problem of general cleanliness and facility maintenance. Although there was support for the idea of faculty-only restrooms, it was felt unlikely that that proposal would be widely accepted.

Meeting Adjourned: 3:50 pm

Next Meeting: scheduled for December 1, 2017
Faculty Welfare Committee  
Meeting Minutes: September 28, 2017

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 3:00PM in Maybank 209

Committee Members in attendance: Emily Beck (Chair), Keonya Booker, Stephen Della Lana, Mary Jo Fairchild, Phyllis Jestice, Martin Jones, Myra Whittemore, and Jen Wright

Agenda:

1. Secretary/Minutes from last meeting
2. Review minutes from Faculty Advisory Committee to the President (FACP) on 9/19/17
3. FWC representative for the Adjunct oversight committee
4. Assessment at CofC – problems and solutions?
5. Bridge program
6. Flagging statement (and other potential statements)
7. Smoking enforcement on campus
8. Adjunct advocacy
9. FWC email address: create an initial survey, maintenance, and where to announce?
10. Next meeting date and time: will Thursday, 10/26 from 3-4 work for you?
11. Faculty Bathrooms
12. Other old business?
13. Other New business?

Discussion of agenda items:

1. Secretary/Minutes from last meeting

   Since this meeting time conflicted with Richard’s teaching schedule, we will postpone approval of minutes until next meeting.

2. Report about and review minutes from Faculty Advisory Committee to the President (FACP) on 9/19/17

   We used those minutes as a jumping off point to discuss issues that concerned committee members and as a basis by which to consider responses to the President’s comments:

   The President mentioned a push for online courses:
   There are consistent problems with OAKS that do not make it an ideal delivery system.
   Not enough spaces in the DE certification program for all interested faculty.
   Not enough lecture capture rooms.
We can’t compete with Stanford and other online courses. Does online actually save us money? It would be helpful if upper administration could communicate the actual numbers of students and the economic impact to the College and explain why Distance Education is the way the institution is going.

President mentioned the possibility for Doctoral Programs with local need. If making sure we do not miss out on local niches is our concern, then one niche we should be concerned with is Clemson and USC nipping at our heels.

When will they appoint a new Graduate school Dean?

President expressed strong interest in the creation of new Interdisciplinary Programs. Several committee members pointed out that there are too many Interdisciplinary Programs already; many of which have low enrollments or no consistent student participation.

Perhaps we could consider including a sunset clause to new interdisciplinary programs, to require that they must demonstrate value and consistent student interest within 5 years.

Several pointed out that a serious problem with the idea to create new programs is the lack of assistance and encouragement with the creation of new programs and modification of existing programs.

Several mentioned their positive experiences in proposing new programs to CHE versus the unsupportive reaction they received from Upper Administration at Randolph Hall.

For example, the QEP – is an interdisciplinary initiative that is stifled with red tape. $500 compensation takes 10 months to receive. Mired down in bureaucracy that is not imposed elsewhere (CHE wants to work with us and is helpful).

We discussed the issue of low morale and possible ways to respond to that dimension. Low morale is related to compensation but is also due to lack of support from Randolph Hall.

Listserv?? We want it back
Censorship
Yammer is not effective

Assessment burden on program directors and chairs
Punitive/condescending directives sent from Upper administration with unrealistic timelines to completion. Has created undue stress and unfair labor conditions.

Assessment provides no useful data
Makes faculty feel like there is an inimical relationship with Randolph Hall

Suggested questions to propose to FACP for next meeting in November:

What steps will you take and what timeline will you adopt to implement greater enforcement of the no smoking policy on campus?
Emily invited committee members to suggest additional questions via email

3. FWC representative for the new Ad hoc Adjunct Oversight Committee

Phyllis Jestice will serve

Due to time constraints, we did not get to these agenda issues:
4. Assessment at CofC – problems and solutions?
5. Bridge program
6. Flagging statement (and other potential statements)
7. Smoking enforcement on campus
8. Adjunct advocacy
9. FWC email address: create an initial survey, maintenance, and where to announce?
10. Faculty Bathrooms
11. Other old business?
12. Other New business?

Meeting Adjourned: 3:58 pm

Next Meeting: scheduled for October 24, 2017 from 3-4pm in Maybank 209
Faculty Welfare Committee  
Meeting Minutes: August 24, 2017

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 2:04PM in JC Long 131

Committee Members in attendance: Emily Beck (Chair), Keonya Booker, Stephen Della Lana, Mary Jo Fairchild, Phyllis Jestice, Richard Lavrich, and Jen Wright

Agenda:
1. Introductions  
2. Elect a secretary for committee  
3. Summary of agenda items covered/researched during previous academic year (2016-2017)  
4. What new agenda items do we want to tackle this year?  
   4a. How to best assess Faculty Morale Issues?  
5. Other new business?

Discussion of Agenda Items:

2. Richard Lavrich was unanimously elected secretary of the FWC.

3. Summary of last year’s agenda available on the Senate page Annual Year report.

4. What agenda items to cover this year?

   A. We need a place to collect detailed information, what’s impacting the most people and prioritize based on concerns expressed.

      Could we be a repository for complaints and problems? How to solicit feedback from a large percentage of the faculty?

      Perhaps create a Google form (to allow FWC to respond to concerns without using campus email?)

      A concern was expressed that such an account might become quite negative; a possible solution would be to include a statement to guide the goal as a productive resource for the committee over time.

      Form could include an optional space to be contacted or discuss in further detailed

      Form could include a space to write in: What would have been a reasonable solution in your opinion?

      Distribute an initial survey: and then create various documents based
B. Lack of smoking enforcement
C. Course evaluations
D. Adjunct advocacy
E. Diversity on campus (faculty and students)
F. Communication Issues between Upper Administration and Faculty:
   Try to get the administration to be a little more considerate with regard to communication:
   Information is expressed in a punitive manner and in a way that isn’t timely
   Contact Department chairs as a useful resource for what ails the college
G. What is the status of the Bridge Program?
   Are the faculty in the bridge program our faculty?
   Is there a director?  Is there office space?

5. We discussed the possibility of issuing a statement on behalf of the Faculty Welfare Committee regarding the possibility of a White Supremacist Rally near campus to be held in September. We discussed drafting language condemning hate speech and the disruption and unsafe environment it would create for faculty, staff, and students on campus.

Meeting Adjourned: 3:00 pm
Next Meeting: scheduled for September 28, 2017 from 3-4pm in Maybank 209