Faculty Advisory Committee to the President
Meeting Agenda
February 16, 2022

I. President’s topics for the committee
   - Knudt Flor Appointment
   - EHHP and SBUS Dean Searches – feedback/input?
   - REI/Core Value Discussion

II. Committee’s topics for the President
   - Continuing concerns about housekeeping/cleanliness/safety
     - Better consultation with department chairs and facilities managers
     - Physical Plant email—“Moderate Dinginess,” PR fallout
     - Can contract include additional attention in target areas?
     - Hygiene and safety issues—involve EHS?
     - How resources are being allocated to maintenance vs. infrastructure devt.
   - School of Health Sciences announcement
     - Uncertainty about process—more systematical involvement of committees and stakeholders
       - Budget committee—discussions suspended
       - Academic Planning—process incomplete
       - Buy-in from departments affected by changes
     - Concerns about rollout
       - Press conference, MUSC planning a surprise
       - Name choice potentially confusing to students
       - What determined timing of announcement?
       - Are relatively small donations driving decisions?
   - Housing affordability in the news
     - Student recruitment and retention, economic inequities
     - What is the College’s long-term plan?
   - SC Legislative Action
     - Freedom from ideological coercion and indoctrination act (H. 4605)
       - Update on College’s approach
       - Any connection to race-related initiatives on campus?
   - Future change to College Reads program?
     - Need for greater consultation with faculty
     - Impact on College community and loss of shared intellectual experience
   - EXPO event
     - Loss of fall opportunity for presentation of summer research
     - Need for greater consultation with faculty

III. Continuing discussion
   - Merit vs. COLA pay, merit process
     - Competitive wages vs. incentives
- Best practices in an academic setting
- Process: transparency and uniformity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Merit</td>
<td>• High Performers rewarded</td>
<td>• May violate overall goal to make wages competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• High performers are likely to be correlated over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Performers get merit; rest get COLA</td>
<td>• High Performers rewarded</td>
<td>• May violate overall goal to make wages competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some attention to uncompetitive wages</td>
<td>• High performers are likely to be correlated over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What happens to faculty just below the cutoff?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Money for Merit at Chairs’ discretion; rest COLA</td>
<td>• Chairs have greater discretion over raises</td>
<td>• Individual faculty members may receive a small pay increase (so what’s the point?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Greater attention to uncompetitive wages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All COLA</td>
<td>• Attention to uncompetitive wages</td>
<td>• Dis-incentives for productivity?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: optimal approach may change over time, e.g., shift from COLA to merit as wages become more competitive, merit pay assessed periodically