

## **Faculty Senate Faculty Welfare Committee Report 2017-2018**

Committee members: Tavakoli Abbas, Drucilla Barker; Roozbeh Behroozmand; Subra Bulusu (Chair); Samuel McQuillin; Shanna Schaffer; Shelley Jones (recorder); Traci Testerman; Morris Williams; Kelly Epting (ex-officio)

### **Meeting outcome on 9/25/2017**

Guests: Dean Thomas F. McNally Dean of Libraries, and Miranda Bennett, Associate Dean for Collections

We have invited Dean Thomas F. McNally, Dean of Libraries, and Miranda Bennett, Associate Dean for Collections, to discuss access to library resources for Palmetto College and retired faculty. For Palmetto College, Dean McNally stated that the libraries' responsibility is to serve the Columbia campus and students, but given that the relationship with the campuses is strong, he discussed two ideas for Palmetto College faculty that he has worked on with Chancellor Susan Elkins: renegotiation of contracts with vendors and surveying the faculty to press the Provost (or others) for more funds to meet faculty need. In consultation with Miranda Bennett, Dean McNally determined that they will not pursue renegotiating contracts as this would require changing from renewing contracts for the Columbia campus, which would maintain lower rates, to starting new contracts. Dean McNally will pursue the second idea, with Dr. Bennett meeting with campus librarians during Fall Break to discuss administering the survey. Once they have a list of common databases/journals requested and have contacted vendors for pricing, they, along with Dr. Elkins, will approach the Provost about increasing the recurring funds that are set aside for campus electronic resources to cover these new purchases, finding other funding options if necessary. Dean McNally suggested repeating this process yearly or every other year. A point for clarification that Dean McNally will pursue is whether this existing Provost fund has an inflation factor built in. Dean McNally and Dr. Bennet agreed to check on whether inflation was built in and, if not, to advocate for 8%.

Dean McNally let the committee know that retired faculty have access to all library resources, including electronic resources, if they have their credentials (email address for electronic resources). He suggested we speak with Chief Information Officer Doug Foster regarding retaining email addresses for retired faculty. The committee acknowledged that this was an action item from last academic year that FWC will follow up on.

### **Meeting Outcome on 10/30/2017**

Guest: Doug Foster, Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer

The committee welcomed guest Doug Foster, Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer, to discuss faculty concerns, including: Concerns about communication to faculty about and faculty access to high performance computing, specifically the super computer. Doug Foster responded that there have been communications sent out on the Research Cyberinfrastructure (RCI) website and through the daily UofSC updates and that there are no restrictions on access to the super computer. The committee informed Mr. Foster that there are no

instructions for how to access the supercomputer on the RCI website. He acknowledged that communication may need to be sent through different channels and that they would update the RCI website. He also explained that though there is no restriction on using the supercomputer, there are issues with competing for the space/resources that are available. He suggested buying a node, which would ensure that the faculty member who had purchased a node had priority. Concerns regarding increasing access to high performance computing: Mr. Foster revealed he would like input from faculty governance and from a central authoritative group, rather than the three or four advisory committees currently independently providing suggestions, on faculty need. He suggested connecting to the libraries to find the highest-level needs but conceded that he cannot financially obtain the level of storage requested by the IT committee report. He also suggested that faculty consider submitting interdisciplinary research proposals to the Strategic Initiatives Committee that has been charged with distributing the Provost's Excellence funds specifically for high performance computing storage.

- Concerns regarding faculty forced to buy storage using grants when faculty already give 46-48% of grant funds for indirect costs to the University.
  - Mr. Foster is not aware of how these indirect costs funds are distributed, but they are not in his unit's budget.
- Need for an FTP site for researchers.
  - Mr. Foster was unaware that there was not an FTP site and stated that the University needs to have one.
- Questions regarding the IBM/UofSC partnership, specifically how IBM might help teaching.
  - Mr. Foster stated that IBM would be willing to host workshops and professional development if faculty supplied topics. He offered to act as a liaison if faculty provide him with clear topics of interest.
- Concerns regarding EAB Pathfinder usability.
  - Pathfinder is not under his office. Mr. Foster suggested contacting Dennis Pruitt in Student Affairs.
- Concerns for Palmetto College faculty, including Sumter's access to technology to aid teaching online, particularly access to laptops and recording studios; access to Pathfinder for two-year campuses (which was brought to him as a concern by FWC last year); reinstating access to the virtual classroom on Blackboard so that professors teaching online classes can have virtual office hours; and ways for online professors to back up their Blackboard modules.
  - Mr. Foster said he would look into these issues.
- Concerns for Medical School faculty, including complaints about PeopleSoft, particularly for travel, and wifi.
  - Mr. Foster has not heard any specific concerns regarding PeopleSoft, but his conjecture is that it is not a software problem but a support problem. He added that wifi at the Medical School was not under his office.
- Concerns for behavioral science and medical school faculty, including cloud storage for protected health information.
  - Mr. Foster responded that it is sometimes better to handle protected health data internally for legal reasons but that the system would need to include multi-layer classifications to account for different types of data.
- Mr. Foster ended by agreeing to email a list of topics for him to follow-up on and to return next semester to speak with FWC regarding progress on these items.

## Meeting Outcome on 11/27/2017

**Guest:** Provost Joan Gabel, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, and Dean Steve Cutler, College of Pharmacy. Dr. Cheryl Addy, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

The committee welcomed guests Joan Gabel, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, and Dean Steve Cutler, College of Pharmacy who is managing the Excellence Initiative committee, to discuss the Excellence Initiative.

- Structure: Provost Gabel began by explaining that this initiative should not be labeled the “Provost’s” Excellence Initiative since it was mandated by the Board of Trustees as a way to spark excellence despite having no new money for investment. Provost Gabel is advisory to the President; the committee is advisory to her; and all are advisory to the Board of Trustees, with the Board of Trustees having final say on budgetary matters. It is a recurring initiative with a set amount of money, \$17 million, half of which came from the service side of the University.
- Goals: The priority for these funds is to increase research impact. Provost Gabel stated that the University’s focus has been on student enrollment growth for ten years (to make up for budget cuts from the state legislature); this initiative will shift the focus to academic affairs. The types of projects funded will not support or supplant regular growth. For example, regular hiring or replacement of TERE faculty retirees would not be covered. “Excellence” is intentionally vaguely defined so as not to stifle certain voices or potential ideas.
- Committee Selection: Dean Cutler is managing the committee. In an effort to create shared governance, the committee includes faculty representation that is diverse across rank, disciplines, gender, and race, along with the Vice President of Research. The faculty chosen are all highly productive in their fields.
- Application Process: The committee will be releasing the application in a few days, according to Provost Gabel. The application is a two-step process, beginning with a two-page proposal including innovation, feasibility, budget, and impact on the University. Those making it through the first round will be invited to complete a longer proposal (6 or 10 pages, the committee had not decided yet) outlining the same criteria. The second phase will be scored and ranked. To encourage creativity and cross-collaborations, any applicant can submit for the first round of proposals without dean approval. Phase two requires dean approval if any funding will be needed from that department. The proposed timeline is February 1 for the first phase; second phase TBD.

The committee welcomed guest Dr. Cheryl Addy, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School, to advise on summer teaching salaries.

- Background: Faculty concerns include pay inequity across and sometimes within departments; the desire to teach graduate courses during summer terms given a higher need to teach undergraduate courses in the regular academic terms; fully grant-funded faculty wanting to teach during summer; misunderstandings of the current policy at the departmental level; and, specifically in Palmetto College, having protection so that a minimum percentage or dollar amount of salary paid during the summer exceeds the adjunct rate. The Faculty Advisory

Committee, after surveying departments for policies, asked FWC to draft a University-wide policy.

- Discussion: Dr. Addy advised that faculty can be paid in one of two ways, as a daily rate or a fixed amount per course. Current HR policy caps faculty additional salary at 33% of the faculty's regular salary, while state law caps faculty additional salary at 40%, except by exception. Historically, most units adopt 7.5% of faculty's regular salary per three-hour course. From our discussion, Dr. Addy synthesized these questions:
  1. Should the policy allow for a 40% cap to be standard instead of the current 33%?
  2. What is the standard for pay for summer teaching, for example, 7.5% or a standard dollar amount unless that is lower than the adjunct rate?
  3. Should pay be different based on the level of the course and enrollments?

Action Item: Based on the discussions with Dr. Cheryl Addy we wrote a letter to the Provost. Please see **Appendix-I**

### **Meeting outcome on 01/29/2018**

The committee, in consultation with guest Dr. Cheryl Addy, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate School, continued work on the summer salary policy. FWC submitted a memo regarding fully grant-funded faculty and summer teaching to the Provost December 19, 2017 (Appendix-I). Dr. Addy presented this memo at a deans committee meeting, but the Provost was absent. According to Dr. Addy and the Deans, the memo's argument is well justified from a faculty welfare perspective, but the Provost will need to consider HR, Academic Affairs, and budget as well. Dr. Addy has set an internal deadline for a response to this memo of March 1, 2018 so that faculty will have an answer by March 15, 2018 in time to make decisions on summer 2018 teaching.

The summer salary compensation subcommittee, chaired by Traci and including Roozbeh, Abbas, and Shelley, will have a draft of the proposed policy for review and approval at the February 26, 2018 FWC meeting. After approval, it will be submitted to the Faculty Advisory Committee who will present to the Faculty Senate. It then moves to the general faculty and to the Board. If there is a policy change, then the process is different: the policy will need to be reviewed by the Policy Advisory Committee, followed by a two-week comment period. To have an answer by the end of the semester, the Policy Advisory Committee would need to review by April 15, 2018.

The committee discussed the second subcommittee's work on the use of faculty enrichment funds, subcommittee chaired by William and including Shanna, Drue, and Sam.

- Background: When FWC no longer needed to provide funds for flu shots, the committee decided to use those funds toward promoting collegiality. The committee revisited the idea of reopening a faculty club, but the funds would not be sufficient. The committee then decided to pilot a faculty collegiality lunch program, with groups of faculty meeting at Preston for lunches on set days. The committee held two pilot lunches open only to faculty senators and four more open to any faculty member. All received positive feedback.
- The subcommittee will draft procedures for continuing weekly faculty collegiality lunches for five faculty members and one FWC representative at \$1000 per semester. These procedures,

including an appointed FWC member to act as organizer/lead, will be sent via email to FWC by Friday, February 2, 2018, and then announced at the February 7, 2018 Faculty Senate meeting.

### **Meeting Outcome of 02/26/2018**

- Faculty Lunch Update: William Morris reported that the plan to resume faculty collegiality lunches was announced at Faculty Senate with no feedback or discussion from senators. There are two planned this semester, one in April and one in May.

Action: The subcommittee (Shanna, Drue, Sam, and William) will write a small paragraph for inclusion in UofSC news emails with dates staggered to accommodate to faculty schedules.

- Summer Pay Policy: The committee again welcomed Dr. Cheryl Addy, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate School, to discuss the summer salary policy. Dr. Addy noted the following:

- The memo FWC submitted regarding fully grant-funded faculty and summer teaching to the Provost December 19, 2017, was discussed by the Council of Academic Deans and Tommy Coggins, Director of the Office of Research Compliance. The answer will be no as there are concerns from an audit perspective that there would be conflict of commitment issues.

- Dr. Addy also explained that permitting faculty to earn 40% of their base salary during the summer which is allowed at the state level (versus the 33.85% at an internal HR level) is for extreme circumstances only, with no support for 40% becoming a general rule. The percentages historically were based on a precedent of 7.5% pay per 3-hour course, which, at 2.5% per hour would equal 10% per 4-hour course. (The 7.5% figure has been precedent for 30+ years, though Dr. Addy is not sure where it originated.) Extreme circumstances would thus include allowing faculty to teach 4 4-hour courses. Another example of an extreme circumstance would be a faculty member taking over an administrative position in the middle of teaching; the faculty member could be approved to be paid for finishing teaching and the administrative duties. Dr. Addy also explained that dual employment allows for exceptions where faculty could be paid beyond their salary and during the 9-month contract.

- Dr. Addy made the point that planning at the departmental level may allay the issues with staffing graduate classes. One possibility is allowing grant-funded faculty a course release in the spring for research so that these faculty might teach needed graduate classes in the summer.

- Dr. Addy expressed that the type of detail presented in FWC's draft would not be suitable for policy. She advises that these be considered guiding principles, but not formal policy, reminding that the Faculty Manual gives a level of flexibility to units as long as the faculty agrees to this flexibility.

Action: Traci, as head of the subcommittee, will revise based on this conversation and send to Dr. Addy, who will revise by February 27 for submission to FAC.

### **Meeting Outcome of 03/26/2018**

Guests: Chris Byrd (Vice President for Human Resources); Sandra Kelly (Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies); Clifford Scott (Director of Office of Equal Opportunity Programs)

The March meeting was a joint meeting between FWC and FAC with guests Chris Byrd, Vice President of Human Resources, Sandra Kelly, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies (who attended for Dr. Addy), and Clifford Scott, Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity Programs. FAC completed a survey, which revealed faculty concerns regarding the appointment of administrative positions using internal searches. Specifically, faculty were concerned that there are often no job postings, interviews, or even announcements to faculty when administrative appointments are made. Faculty also raised concerns about administrators serving on hiring committees. The guests made clear that there are no policy violations given that HR policies 1.00 and 1.01 do not require advertising for internal searches or specify whether administrators can or cannot serve on hiring committees with that decision made at the unit level. Also, no claims of questions of diversity in recent internal administrative hirings have been reported to EOP. There was agreement that the University wants to have a policy that is clear and results in the confidence of the faculty.

Action: Bill Suddeth, co-chair of FAC, will forward the research he has completed regarding vague or possibly contradictory wording in these HR policies to Dr. Addy and FWC and FAC will consider drafting changes to the policy. The committees will keep in mind the following issues raised during this meeting when considering policy changes:

- Input should come from both faculty and the Council of Academic Deans.
- Not all deans and directors are faculty; some are staff. The procedures for hiring faculty and staff are different.
- What the current policy's wording of a "fair and open" hiring process that is "in consultation with faculty" means in practice.
- How to ensure auditability in searches when Academic Affairs is listed as having ultimate oversight but hiring is usually on the unit level.
- Avoid becoming rigid in writing policy since this rigidity results in a loss of faculty governance at the unit level.
- How/if to involve EOP in internal searches that are not advertised.
- Whether the policy should include recourse for faculty who feel the process has not been fair.

Action: A second concern outside the scope of this meeting was raised regarding the climate for nontenure-track faculty. Marco is appointing a new committee in Faculty Senate to handle this issue.

Summer Pay Policy Update: FWC voted to approve sending the draft of the summer pay guidelines to FAC for voting it its March 28th meeting and then introduction to Faculty Senate on April 4th with one correction, changing the use of the word "policy" to "guidelines" or a similar term in the title.

**June 6, 2018 Faculty senate meeting the Faculty Advisory Committee presented the Summer Salary Compensation Guidelines to adopt. Please see Appendix-II**

December 19, 2017

Provost Joan Gabel  
Office of the Provost  
University of South Carolina  
Columbia, SC 29208

Dear Provost Gabel,

Subject: Summer salary compensation - A recommendation is made to allow for compensation of up to 40% of faculty salary in all cases in which undergraduate/graduate courses are taught by faculty "fully grant funded or fully funded" for research activities. This would be a change in procedure only, because the existing policy on summer compensation for faculty (HR 1.81; I.B) allows such compensation.

On December 11<sup>th</sup>, 2017 the Faculty Welfare Committee met to review and make suggestions for how to best address the restrictions currently in existence which limit both faculty and non-tenure track faculty maximum salary levels. Based on the Provost's memo dated March 1, 2017, it appears that receipt of a 3-month grant-funded salary will prohibit any additional salary being paid by USC if the total of the grant reaches 33.85% of the faculty's salary. Under these circumstances no fully grant-funded faculty will be able to provide summer or additional teaching and receive compensation. Ideally, this would not be a problem if sufficient qualified instructors were available both during the summer and during the academic year to meet teaching needs, but this will not be the case for at least the next several years. Qualified faculty members exist who would be willing to assume an extra load, particularly if the quality and even existence of their Departments were at stake. They would, however, expect some reasonable level of compensation for this extra effort. The university must incentivize teaching from these faculty if we are to solve this problem and its consequences. The primary barriers to solving this problem are the cap and policies that prevent dual employment or supplements during the summer.

For many years now, faculty have been teaching additional courses both in the summer and during the academic year to meet departmental needs. The funding formula, coupled with the loss of TERI faculty, will create a major shortage of highly qualified instructors as early as July 1, 2018. This loss will be most evident at the upper division undergraduate and graduate level of instruction.

In addition, salary levels at USC are not fully comparable at all levels with other universities. This already makes it difficult for USC to recruit and retain talented faculty. Denying an opportunity to obtain additional compensation eliminates a potential way for faculty to adjust for pay discrepancies and encourage retention. State and federal agencies have made it clear that the expectation of summer supported research faculty does not exceed 37.5 hours per week. Thus, any teaching outside of this time is not an issue with state and federal law. Any hours beyond the 37.5 hour dedicated to research should be at the discretion of the faculty member,

yet current State and University regulations or procedures do not, as a matter of course, allow for this.

By allowing additional compensation for summer or academic year instruction, the University will expand its pool of highly trained instructors from which departments can draw to meet enhanced enrollment and loss of faculty rather than searching each year in the Columbia community for less experienced instructors. Many programs have already reached the point where there are no tenure track faculty teaching in the 100 and 200 level classes and with upcoming TERA losses (and limited resources to hire new faculty, particularly in the STEM areas), the problem will become one of which classes can be taught, not who can teach them. This problem become even more serious when we look at the pool of instructors required to adequately staff the Honors College. Currently we are highly ranked by many standards but upcoming losses and the lack of replacements will make it extremely difficult to continue to maintain this ranking.

The lack of graduate level courses makes it difficult to attract graduate students and for students to graduate on time. Furthermore, the mandatory 3 credit hours of tuition in the summer is viewed as unfair, since there are few courses in which these students can enroll. Graduate students need courses taught by successful researchers who are fully funded if we want to achieve the excellence in both research and instruction that the President set as a goal in this year's state of the university address. For that purpose, even a 40% cap in salary is not enough to allow top research faculty to be more than partially compensated for assumption of additional teaching responsibilities. The already small number of summer graduate courses available will be further diminished as TERA retirements force units to ask senior faculty to teach undergraduate courses. A direct consequence is that graduate programs are less able to attract students due, in part, to a lack of graduate courses that meet their academic and career needs. The competition for well-qualified students, particularly graduate students, exists on a national level. Students look carefully at all factors including number of faculty and range of course offerings in making their decisions. National ranking of universities includes both the number and status of graduate programs. Fewer courses (both undergraduate and graduate) will also have a negative impact on "On Your Time Graduation." While the number of temporary faculty ("T-Fac") can continue to be increased, there is a very limited pool of SACS-level qualified instructors for upper division and graduate instruction. Thus, the lack of graduate courses is both reducing tuition income due to inability to recruit students and diminishing USC's national ranking.

Addressing the compensation issue will also bring financial benefits to the university. Utilizing existing faculty members is more cost effective than hiring temporary faculty and increasing the course offerings will increase enrollment. Recruiting new faculty to replace those who seek better pay and opportunities elsewhere is extremely expensive. The inability to recruit graduate students reduces research productivity, thus reducing the likelihood that faculty will be able to compete for grant funding. These lost opportunities will only increase over time.

The Faculty Welfare Committee proposes one immediate remedy and one long term effort to address these issues. The first is to shift the upper limit of compensation for faculty who teach extra academic year and summer courses from the de facto limit of 33.85% to the policy prescribed limit of 40% of base salary. The mechanism could be similar to that used for administrative "supplements" for faculty with administrative duties. Although this would only result in a 6.15% pay increase and would not fully compensate the extra work load, it would be

a step in the right direction. Second, we recommend the Administration internally consider alternative mechanisms for compensating teaching activities that address critical needs. With this should come the onset of a dialog with the Legislature about how modifications or exceptions might be made in current state law to meet these challenges.

Sincerely,

/sig/

Subrahmanyam (Subra) Bulusu

Chair, Faculty Senate Faculty Welfare Committee

Faculty Summer Compensation  
Draft April 10, 2018

**Background Information**

**HR 1.81 Summer Compensation for Faculty**

Remuneration for Regular Summer School Teaching: Compensation for teaching during the summer may not exceed 40 percent of the faculty member's annualized base salary for the preceding academic year subject to the teaching load as defined in the faculty manual and any further limitations defined by the Chief Academic Officer for each campus.

Remuneration for Sponsored Research and Other Duties Not Related to Teaching in Summer Sessions: Academic personnel will be compensated at the same rate of pay as the immediately preceding academic year for sponsored research or other activities performed during the summer months (between academic years) which are not related to teaching summer sessions.

Remuneration for Summer Thesis and Dissertation Supervision

Faculty are expected to assist students who need research, internship or field study supervision at any time during the calendar year. Deans and, where appropriate, department chairs may pay faculty who supervise an unusually large number of theses, dissertations, internships or field study during the summer months. Such remuneration will only be approved by the Chief Academic Officer on a case-by-case basis and will be compensated at the same rate of pay as the immediately preceding academic year.

**Faculty Manual (Page 45)**

Faculty members may teach during summer (May – August) subject to the teaching load, as defined, and any further limitations determined by the Chief Academic Officer. Faculty members must advise the department chair or dean before December 1 of their summer school intentions and at that time may be assigned to teach in a summer session, as conditions warrant; but on the recommendation of the dean and the provost and with the approval of the president, faculty members may be assigned special duties for this period. Summer school teaching in the case of faculty hired after September 1, 1973, for employment beginning September 1974 or later, may depend on the availability of funds or the size of enrollment.

**Procedures for Summer 2018**

For faculty with a nine-month pay basis, total compensation for Summer 2017 from all sources cannot exceed 33.85% of the faculty member's preceding academic year salary (based on 66 workdays).

## **Guiding Principles**

1. Each academic unit (e.g., college, school, or department) should develop a fair and consistent policy for summer pay according to these principles. The examples refer to faculty with nine-month contracts. Percentages may be adjusted accordingly for faculty with ten- or eleven-month contracts. Individual units may choose to exceed the minimum standards.
2. Faculty are normally not compensated for individual supervision for activities such as internship, thesis and dissertation supervision. Exceptions can be made for unusually large numbers of such supervision.
3. A full-time faculty member teaching during the summer (i.e., outside of pay basis) should receive at minimum the same compensation paid to a similarly credentialed adjunct faculty or graduate assistant for a comparable teaching assignment.
4. To allow for differential base salary, a common standard for summer compensation is 2.5% of the 9-month equivalent base salary per credit hour (i.e., 7.5% for the typical three credit hour course). If a faculty member is teaching four summer courses (i.e., 12 credit hours), the academic unit is encouraged to offer the maximum compensation based on daily rate.
5. Summer compensation for any combination of teaching, research and other activities is limited to the maximum defined by the daily rate calculation (usually 33.85% based on 66 workdays). Exceptions to this maximum are based on provost approval of individual extenuating circumstances. Under no circumstances will compensation beyond 40% of base salary be approved.
6. Faculty who receive full summer compensation from external sources cannot be paid for summer teaching beyond the maximum daily rate. From the perspective of federal compliance, this would be a conflict of commitment. If faculty with external funding wish to be compensated for summer teaching, they should work with the unit head to use some of this funding to release base salary in order to receive a summer compensation that is a combination of research funding and unit funding.
7. **If any portion of summer compensation is paid from unit funds, the unit administrator and faculty member should have a signed agreement describing the compensation, work expected and conditions under which the compensation might be changed. A written agreement is not required if the faculty member is paid only from external grant funds.**
8. Because academic units need to be self-supporting, the academic unit has the right to reduce compensation or to cancel a class for insufficient enrollment. **Any reduced compensation due to low enrollment should be commensurate with the reduction in effort and should be no less than half the rate paid for the same course with higher enrollment.** The academic unit should specify that any such change is made at least one business day before the first day of the intended summer session.

9. Departments should use one or more strategies to minimize last minute course cancellations. For example, new courses should typically not be offered during the summer term because considerable time and effort must be devoted to curriculum development prior to the start of classes, leading to considerable uncompensated effort if the class is cancelled. When deciding which courses to offer during the summer, departments should consider historical enrollment numbers and not offer courses that are unlikely to meet the required enrollment. In the event that particular courses are required for timely advancement of students, departments should consider offering high enrollment courses in order to offset deficits incurred by low enrollment courses.