The Faculty Manual states the following guidelines for the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC):

_This committee shall consider university policies and the enforcement of policies regarding the welfare of the faculty, such as faculty salaries, other compensation and benefits, and any matters affecting the workplace environment. The committee may recommend appropriate changes or the enforcement of existing policy, propose new policies, or comment upon proposed university action affecting faculty welfare. Major changes in policy should be forwarded with a recommendation to the Faculty Senate for its consideration and transmittal to the provost, president, or Board of Trustees. The vice president for finance and planning or designee shall serve ex officio._

**2011-2012 Membership:** The FWC members during 2011-2012 consisted of: Varsha Kulkarni (Committee Chair; Physics & Astronomy), Kate Boyd (Library), Erin Connolly (Biological Sciences), Tawanda Greer (Psychology), Amy Johnson (Education), Jihong Liu (Public Health), Nina Moreno (Languages, Literatures, & Cultures), David Mott (Medicine), and Christine Whitaker (Medicine Library).

The Faculty Welfare Committee’s goals are to promote the welfare of faculty in all aspects. The Committee’s activities cover a very broad spectrum, ranging from faculty salaries and compensation to health- and wellness-related issues to benefits and family-friendly policies.

The FWC meetings took place nearly once a month during the past academic year, and often included representatives from the Provost’s office, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and other members of the university. An interim report was presented by the FWC chair to the Faculty Senate in February 2012. Below is a summary of the main outcomes of the FWC’s efforts during the 2012-2013 year.

**Faculty Salaries and Compensation:**

Salary is a top welfare issue for most faculty. The Committee’s goal has been to compare faculty salaries at USC with those at our peer and peer-aspirant institutions and to help plan for future adjustments. To this end, the FWC conducted a salary study in collaboration with the Office of the Provost and the Office of Institutional Assessment and Compliance.

The comparison sample consisted of the following peer institutions and peer-aspirant institutions: Peer: University of Alabama, University of Kentucky, University of Alabama in Birmingham, University of Georgia, University of Tennessee at Knoxville; Peer-Aspirant: University of Virginia, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Louisiana State University,
University of Delaware, University of Maryland at College Park. Additionally, the Committee also compared USC data to those of Clemson University.

An initial pilot study focused on 6 departments at USC. For 4 out of 6 departments, mean salaries at USC were found to be lower than at peer/peer-aspirant institutions. For the other 2, salaries were equal or higher. The deficit ranged from about $4,000 to $24,000, depending on rank and department. An expanded, broader study was inspired by the pilot study. The data were compiled by using Oklahoma State University’s database. It compares all departments (68 total) at USC vs. those at the same peer/peer-aspirants utilized in the pilot study.

The study revealed mixed results—many departments have deficits compared to the peer and peer-aspirant institutions, while some do not. For assistant professors, the mean Fall 2010 salaries at USC were lower than the peer and peer-aspirant institutions for about 70% of the departments, with about 18% departments showing salaries lower by 10-18%. For associate professors, the mean salaries at USC were lower for over 75% of the departments, with about 40% departments showing salary deficits of 10-29%. For full professors, the mean salaries at USC were lower for about 75% of the departments, with about 50% departments showing salary deficits of 10-32%. The deficits were lowest for Assistant Professors and highest for full Professors, likely due to salary compression. These findings formed the background for the Faculty Budget Committee’s proposal adopted by the Faculty Senate, that urged the administration to secure a salary raise pool for the faculty. Copies of updated versions of the faculty salary study based on Fall 2011 data (which showed roughly similar trends) were sent by the Provost’s Office to the Academic Deans. The FWC hopes to continue working with the administration and the Faculty Budget Committee in future years to identify how salary adjustments can be implemented to reduce the deficits compared to the peer/peer-aspirant institutions.

**Health and Wellness:**

A total of 259 influenza vaccinations were administered to faculty by the Thomson Health Center at various locations on campus. The FWC paid for these shots from the Faculty Enrichment Fund.

The FWC helped to advertise several campus wellness initiatives in an earlier report to the Faculty Senate.

**Benefits/ Other Issues:**

Parking: The FWC succeeded in securing a new parking lot reserved for N1 decal holders in the student lot. This was necessitated by the demolition of the old N1 lot for the construction of the new Business School building.
**Partner benefits:** The FWC began working with the Provost’s office on identifying these and reviewing any additions to existing family-friendly policies.

**Improving Faculty Civility:** The FWC has started working with the Ombudsman’s Office on developing an academic code of conduct, and hopes to work extensively on this issue in the coming year.

**Childcare:** The FWC met with Russ Meekins, director of the USC Educational Foundation that owns the USC Children's Center to discuss the possibility of reducing childcare costs for faculty. Mr. Meekins explained that the center is non-profit, and no USC funds are used in the operation of the center. He explained that owing to the costs involved in the operation, it will be difficult for the USC Children’s Center to give a discount to USC faculty.

**Tuition Benefits:** The FWC met with the University Registrar and representatives of the Office of Undergraduate Admissions and the Division of Human Resources to discuss how the faculty benefit of free tuition can be made clearer and easier to use. The registrar pointed out that faculty requests could be facilitated with notification in advance of the intent to register. It was noted that the departments involved will be moving records to the Banner system in Fall 2013, which should simplify the requirements. The registrar’s Office, Undergraduate Admissions, and Human Resources will collaborate on a creation of a document outlining the process for Faculty, and requested that the FWC act as reviewers.

**Travel per diem Rates:** The FWC discussed with members of the administration and of the Division of Business and Finance the possibility of allowing faculty to use federal per-diem rates for university-related business travel (e.g. conferences), when such travel is related to and charged to federal grants. This is a concern for many faculty as the current state-mandated per diem rate has remained unchanged in many years and is too low compared to current subsistence expenses in most US cities. It was hoped that it should be possible to apply the federal per diem rates when federal funds, rather than state funds, are used for the travel. It was pointed out, however, that such a change would nevertheless need approval from the state legislature. The FWC hopes to pursue this issue again in the future.

**New Membership:**
The 2012-2013 FWC members are: David Mott (Committee Chair; Medicine), Erin Connolly (Biological Sciences), John Grego (Statistics), April Hiscox (Geography), Janet Hudson (Extended University), Nina Moreno (Languages, Literatures, & Cultures), David Mott (Medicine), Christine Whitaker (Medicine Library), and Jan Yow (Education).

Respectfully submitted,

Varsha P. Kulkarni, Chair