College of Charleston
Faculty Compensation Committee
2020-2021 Annual Report

- Deanna Caveny (ex oficio)- Academic Affairs
- Wes Dudgeon- Health and Human Performance
- Barbara Duval- Studio Art
- Anne Gutshall- Teacher education (Spring 2021)
- Devon Hanahan- (Chair/Secretary) Hispanic Studies
- Grace Hubel- Psychology
- Courtney Murren- Biology
- Chris Starr- Supply Chain and Info Management (Fall 2020)
- Teddy Them- Geology
- Kelly Anne Wiechmann- French

The committee met 6 times between September 2020 and May 2021. The primary goals of the committee were:

- to revisit the committee's March 2013 resolution and to advocate for the salary increases necessary to achieve the five-year goal of reaching the salary mean of our peer institutions by 2018.
- to work with the President on compensation data as needed during the COVID pandemic.
- to explore the improvement of non-financial compensation and expand their accessibility.
- to investigate the circumstances that lead faculty members to leave the College or to work additional jobs.

September 2020

The FCC reviewed the history of the committee (v. Appendix I) to inform its future endeavors. Goals for the year were established:

- Work with ad hoc committee charged by President Hsu with establishing a compensation paradigm that balances faculty pay with workload. The members of the committee are:
  - Alan Shao, Dean of Business
  - Weishen Wang, Finance
  - Iris Junglas, Supply Chain and Info Management
  - Mark Witte, Economics
  - Liz Jurisich, Math
• Coordinate with the Budget Committee to explore how we can continue to advocate for higher pay through the pandemic.
• Select a standard cost-of-living calculator.
• Continue to advocate for long-term adjuncts. In March of 2020, the Provost and all deans approved our proposal to encourage all deans to confer the title of Senior Adjunct Lecturer on long-term adjuncts.

December 2020

The committee unanimously approved the proposal to create a Compensation Guideline Manual similar to the one in use at Clemson (v. Appendix II).

Prior to sharing the news of his departure from the College, C. Starr shared several suggestions about the direction of the committee:

- The 20 -year+ ad-hoc approach to hiring and salary specification is outdated and inefficient. A consistent merit-based structure is required.
- Why are there no pay-bands for years of experience?
- The FAM has not been thoroughly revisited since 1971 - it needs to be updated.
- Salary compression and inversion are ongoing problems that are never addressed and that affect morale and retention.
- People don’t complain because they assume it is hopeless.
- Data alone does not help one understand the system of inequity.
- The policy of receiving raises based on the presentation of external offers is demeaning and demoralizing to say the least.
- There is an erosion of the culture of gratitude: many faculty members feel unrecognized and unappreciated.
- We need to use data analysis to predict (and presumably prevent) faculty departure. Thus far our only measures have been reactive rather than proactive.

The committee agreed that in the spring the following goals would be addressed:

- the consumption and analysis of the ad-hoc committee’s report.
- the creation and approval of a College of Charleston Compensation Guidelines Manual.
- the selection of a COL calculator.
- increased cooperation with the Faculty Welfare Committees and the Budget Committee.
- the use of data analysis to improve faculty retention.

January 2021

D. Hanahan shared the report from President Hsu’s ad hoc committee on compensation paradigms. The report thoroughly explored comparisons between the College and its peer
institutions but did not offer an equation for a reasonable balance between compensation and workload.

D. Caveny explained how our peer institution list was created in 2003. It would be a massive and possibly unproductive endeavor at this point to try to recreate the list when all of the factors included are considered.

The Clemson Faculty Compensation Manual was created and released by Clemson's BOT, begging the question of whether our BOT has a Faculty Compensation Committee or not. It does not, a fact which confirms the importance of this committee's existence. S. Lewis remarked that he was planning to suggest the merger of this committee with the Budget Committee; however, this union is precluded by the fact that Budget is a Senate committee and FCC is not. He also suggested that the FCC report to the Senate each year in September or October. C. Murren pointed out that the FCC has liaised in the past with the Faculty Welfare Committee. As President Hsu approves and applauds the idea of producing a similar manual at the College, the committee agreed to take this project on.

The committee in general was chary of investigating departing faculty's movements for predictive analysis. A. Gutshall suggested three public data points that might shed insight on their decisions to leave: (1) the number of offers they receive from other institutions; (2) reasons for departure given in exit interviews; and (3) the number of people moonlighting to make a living wage. D. Caveny emphasized the need for merit to be recognized and rewarded.

February 2021

The committee approved the use of BestPlaces.net as our cost-of-living analysis tool, which is the same one used by Institutional Research.

There was no consensus on sending a letter about administrators teaching to the President’s Office and the Provost, so the letter was tabled. D. Caveny reported that the percentage of faculty members/administrators who don't teach is very low, about 3%.

The committee discussed the potential usefulness of presenting factors leading to the loss of good faculty or the failure to hire excellent candidates and agreed that even an anecdotal collection of data would impress the importance of the compensation component in faculty retention in support of the Strategic Plan. Discussion:

- There is an imbalance between schools in terms of compensation.
- There is a gender bias nationally in job offers to faculty, especially for women in certain disciplines and at higher ranked positions.
- Committee acknowledged that there is an inherent structural bias in retention offers, especially in certain disciplines.
• Proposal: could there could be a cap on the difference in salaries across disciplines since we all engage in the same academic responsibilities and share risks and potential for market value outside of the academy?
• Years of experience should be factored in as well.
• We want to have this anecdotal report on compensation recommendations ready for President Hsu before the end of the academic year.

March 2021
The Faculty Compensation Manual project was put on hold pending guidance from Legal Affairs and HR on how much can be used from Clemson's manual as we create our own.

The sub-committee on data analysis met and prepared a survey designed to find out what methods faculty use to improve their compensation. (v. Appendix III)

April 2021
The Committee established goals for the 2021-2022 AY, with the hope that the pandemic will have receded and will allow more options for compensation improvement.

• Attend all Faculty Senate meetings with brief reports.
• Use Great Places to Work data to shore up our reports showing that we are undercompensated.
• Enhance non-monetary compensation options: wellness programs, EC-DC expansion, parking, tuition breaks for faculty – this works with the Strategic Plan for making this a better place to work.
• Pursue tuition reduction for faculty offspring.
• Work with the Strategic Plan Pillar III committee.
• Investigate the relatively new scholarship available to children of faculty, pursue its expansion, and improve its visibility.
• Create a central and highly visible portal for non-monetary faculty benefits and keep it updated. There is a link under hr.cofc.edu, but many faculty are unaware of its existence.
• Analyze survey results on alternative compensation and non-monetary benefits.
May 2021

The committee members for 2021-2022 are:

- Charlie Calvert
- Deanna Caveny, ex oficio
- Wes Dudgeon
- Kris Ghosh
- Devon Hanahan
- Ariel Hartwig
- Carlos Lavin
- Deborah McGee
- Courtney Murren

Until I can convince someone to be chair, I will continue to serve in that role.

Respectfully submitted,

13 May 2021

Appendix I:

**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, initiated during the spring of 2003, 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 Planning and Budget 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 COPLAC (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)
Ranapo 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 Ad Hoc 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 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 [ranked] 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 does [did] not know how much money will [would] be available at any given time for distribution, nor does [did] 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, Glenn 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 a 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 Instuctor), 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 [was] $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.” Now 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 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. 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>CofC 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,742,016</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>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Charleston</strong></td>
<td>$76,664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Iowa</td>
<td>$74,922</td>
<td>-30.6%</td>
<td>$97,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire</td>
<td>$69,968</td>
<td>-28.6%</td>
<td>$89,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State University</td>
<td>$69,510</td>
<td>-42.4%</td>
<td>$98,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY College at Geneseo</td>
<td>$68,685</td>
<td>-24.9%</td>
<td>$85,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s College of Maryland</td>
<td>$65,203</td>
<td>-12.2%</td>
<td>$73,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman State University</td>
<td>$63,972</td>
<td>-41.5%</td>
<td>$90,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II:

Clemson’s Compensation Guidelines Manual:


Appendix III:

Anonymous survey for faculty to report on alternative compensation:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1TYG0PoqE8TRHDMe5CZ1GycZ0JzOyqEW6YpxBaJN5p6g/edit
Mission: Founded in 1770, the College of Charleston is a public university grounded in the principles of the liberal arts and committed to developing ethically centered, intellectually versatile, and globally fluent citizens who create innovative solutions to social, economic, and environmental challenges.

Vision: The College of Charleston will be a transformative national university redefining liberal arts education through innovation.

- Student Experience & Success
- Academic Distinction
- Employee Experience & Success

- Foster a Culture of Innovation to Create Sustainable Solutions
- Advance our Commitment to Diversity, Equity & Inclusion
- Cultivate Impactful Strategic Partnerships

Values: Integrity, Academic Excellence, Liberal Arts Education, Diversity, Equity & Inclusion, Student-Centeredness, Innovation, Public Mission