Meeting called to order at: 10:03 am

Attending: Emily Padgett, Erin Blevins, James Ravenel, Charles Bradley, Michelle Futrell, Sarah Loge, Ashleigh Parr, Seaton Brown, Maura Hogan, Susan Hallatt, President McConnell, Debbie Hammond; Karen Hauschild; Paul Patrick

Missing: Diane Cumbie, Joyce Wilson, Teena Ham, Melissa Thomas

Special Guest Speaker: Jim Posey
- Great Campuses to work for survey
  - Brief overview: Started in 2008 by Chronicle of Higher Education, idea is to identify great colleges to work at; 281 participant institutions in 2015; Two-part assessment: faculty staff survey and institutional audit (demographics, policies, practices); Administered by third party Modern Think, LLC. For privacy of data
  - Survey is 60 statement survey with a Likert scale with 18 item satisfaction component; two open-ended questions, 15 demographic questions
  - Measures 15 dimensions;
    - Collaborative Governance, Professional Career Development Programs, Teaching
  - 2013 Results Overview
    - Not recognized as high-achieving
    - College results were below most or all comparison groups
    - Faculty was less satisfied with college
    - Department chairs given high marks
  - 2015 Survey
    - 600 surveys sent and 213 total responses for a response rate of 35.5%
    - Comparative analysis are benchmarked against Carnegie Classification master-level peer institutions who also participated in the Great Colleges survey
    - Positive responses combine agree/good and strongly agree/very good to excellent responses
    - 17% were Administrations, 95 were faculty, 46% Exempt staff, 7% non-exempt
    - Strengths - Pride 71%, Job Satisfaction and Support 70%, Professional Development 70%,
    - Needs Improvement: no aggregate categories where the College ranked above
    - The college scored poor in senior leadership and faculty, administration and staff relations
    - Communication and policies, resources and efficiency were ranked poor
    - shared results from exempt and non-exempt ** need to get spread sheet from Jim**
    - The non-exempt sample size is very small in comparison to the size of non-exempt employees on campus
- Exempt Professional Staff Comments Positive:
  - Being in Charleston
  - Cross Collaborations and working with staff across campus
  - Common goal of helping students; academic environment
  - My department, supervisor, colleagues

- Exempt Professional Staff Comments Negative:
  - Better Pay, Better Benefits
  - Parking, Salaries, Insurance, Child Care, tuitions, professional development, maternity leave
  - True respect of staff by administration and faculty; Trust professionalism from faculty toward staff (this was a large group)
  - Work life balance
  - Better internal communication
  - More equitable and transparent policies and procedures
  - Address bullying in leadership positions

- Non-Exempt Positive:
  - Charleston
  - People
  - Sense of belonging
  - The opportunity to attend classes

- Non-Exempt Negative
  - Same as Exempt employees
  - One thing not understood is being able to cash in
  - Equality for Women
  - IT and Physical Plant needing improvement

Exempt Staff:
- Recognition and awards programs are meaningful to me
- Pay, staffing and recognition were ranked the lowest
- Communication, collaboration issues were ranked at 3 to 3.2

Non Exempt:
- Same as exempt, but they also feel they're not being consulted on major decisions
- Diversity and recognition were 3 to 3.2

Compared to Peer Institutions (where we are below 15%): ** See Slides sent out**
Peer Institutions include: Master’s Degree Granting Institution
- Paid fairly
- Benefits meet my needs
- Department has adequate faculty/staff
- Employees are meaningfully involved in institutional planning

Non-exempt staff was geared more towards faculty and teaching
Where we are ranking working well in our departments it is still low compared to our peer institutions

- Other surveys are available for benchmarking but will have to do more research to find
- These results will all be posted to my Charleston, and can be compared to other years
- Overview of Data
- Question/Comments/Discussion
- Institutions might not be great in all dimensions
- The second half is a survey that we complete with benefits, the things we do as a college, and all things are considered
- No overall score or ranking for colleges that are not rated as a great College
- Schools that did get that recognition will be sent to us
  - Francis Marion was on there for one
- The data is based on how someone self-selects so they might not technically be an exempt and non-exempt
  - For administrator there is the title of director; but might not be considered as an administrator
  - There could be some confusion with staff categories
  - There was no increase in participation from 2013 to 2015; and is still not a bad response rate
  - There is other demographic data that we can post at a later date
  - We are not going to participate this year, but down the road we might participate; most institutions don't participate every year
  - It would be nice to see if the things that we put in place as a SAC for measurable
  - With our awards recognition there would be a higher recognition and that was ranked low
  - The cash part of motivation in terms of rewards is not as much as a focus as receiving awards
  - One thing that comes up with this is silos; do we know where these people are coming from on campus in terms of respondents and the distribution across campus
  - There is the intention of not identifying what division is responding
  - The other part of this data sends a mixed message about silos, people enjoy collaboration and then there is people saying we stay in our silos. We see silos.
  - Jim available for follow up questions

Meeting notes approved from last meeting

Sub-Committee Reports
- Staff Liaison Committee (Chair: Erin Blevins)
  - Cougar Spirit Day update: Many people participated in the March 4th Cougar Spirit Day wearing CoC colors but not many social media postings with #CougarSpirit. TLT was awarded the most spirited office based on submissions using the hashtag. Please encourage your departments to post photos.

  - Our order of 1,000 buttons has arrived. Let Erin know if anyone needs any.

  - Maura advised that marketing organized Cougar Pride Day for April 1 to correspond with the next Cougar Spirit Day to not confuse people and get more participation. They'll have Social media promotions and some outreach to alumni related to the Bridge Run. Maura will send
some information to Karen so information can be included in the Cougar Spirit Day reminder she posts on Yammer.

- Communication and Concerns (Chair: Susan Hallatt)
  - Susan Hallatt reported that plans are in the works for the Staff Celebration in June. If anyone has any ideas for door prizes please pass on to Susan. In addition, for the Spirit awards, they may ask for supervisors to nominate in addition to the encouraging people to dress spirited for the staff celebration as some people that work in the Physical Plant and other areas can’t wear spirit type clothes.
  - They are also finalizing the dates for staff awards submissions and setting up and testing the Qualtrics forms. There will be 3 notification dates and May 1st will be the deadline for submissions.
  - They are also working on organizing a staff night at the theatre for Friday, April 16. It may include a tour. It is in the works.

- Membership (Co-Chairs: Sarah Loge and James Ravenel)
  - Divisional representatives have been selected.
  - At Large voting is taking place now.
  - Temporary elections will start on April 11.
  - A couple people contacted members of the SAC saying they submitted a nomination form but it did not get to Sara via the SAC email as designed. She will investigate to find out why.
  - In addition, she is putting together an outline for the next person that chairs the membership process so they know what to do and when.

- Ad-Hoc Wellness Committee (Chair: Melissa Thomas)
  - No update

Additional discussion

Karen Hauschild asked if the group would like to increase the length of the next scheduled meeting or add another meeting since we have a number of open items to discuss and the Great Colleges to work for survey results to discuss. The group decided that an additional meeting would be best. Karen advised she would check calendars and send out a meeting request soon.

Old Business:
  - Parking for adjuncts/temp employees
  - Ideas/Recommendations to the Diversity Review Committee
New Business:
  - Ideas/Concerns from the Campus
    - St. Phillip's Street/Parking Garage Crossing
    - Staff Training Opportunities at nearby schools
    - Student Benefits for Employees paying Tuition

Meeting closed at 11:07am.

Respectfully Submitted by Emily Padgett and Erin Blevins