

SALARY EQUITY COMMITTEE  
UC Aspen A & B  
September 19, 2022 | 3:00-4:00 p.m.  
MINUTES

**Present:** Athanasiou, Greene, Kyle, Parks, Schaberl, Vaughan, Cobb, Clinefelter

**Absent:** Wiegand, Zukiewicz

**Guests:** Senbet, Haddad

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 3:00pm.

**Approval of the Agenda**

Amendment requested by Clinefelter; Approved as amended without objection.

**Approval of the August 9, 2022 Minutes**

Approved without objection.

**Chair's Announcements (Kyle):**

- **Re Meeting with Dale Pratt:** Kyle met with Pratt to discuss if salary equity should have more of a role in budget meetings to insure faculty involvement. She noted that the administration is discussing the idea of a creating a budget committee. Dale may come to some future salary equity meetings.
- In the Committee discussion that followed, it was noted that 2 of the 4 budget meetings have already taken place without faculty involvement, however Dawit is invited to the next two and has been involved to some extent. Marshall added that the budget process has not started formally, only informally, and Dale is interested in insuring faculty involvement.
- **Re Meeting with Kirsty Fleming, Parks and Jordan Barkley re Adjunct/Overload pay rates:** There is a February 2022 memo has with salary ranges and Fleming is interested in keeping those ranges; Barkley was to check to insure compliance. They do understand and agree to bring this forward when appropriate but for now the subject is tabled. Kyle noted that It looks like salary equity work was incorporated in the February memo. Parks added the new FLAC shell flags any adjunct pay over the maximum amount. This item will be removed from unfinished business.

**Unfinished Business**

- Adjunct/Overload pay rates; see above; tabled.
- Minimum wages/salaries
- **Evaluation of promotion raises – adding a distinguished professor category?**
  - Fleming and Barkley discussed with Parks and Kyle the possibility of tying promotion increases to inflation.
  - They also mentioned the possibility of creating a new category of distinguished professor that would offer a pay raise/stipend after 5 or 6 years in the rank of full professor. It would be an incentive to be active in research and would be reevaluated every 5-6 years; it could be taken away if no longer meeting whatever benchmark was set. This would need to be addressed by the committee because it has potential effects on parity adjustments. Parks added this is a

heavy lift because the departments would have to develop criteria. Greene added that there ought to be an equal opportunity to earn the distinguished promotion/stipend for teaching, which is 60% of most faculty loads. This may be coming forward but is a long term project.

- Administrative/educational salary distribution
- Medical premiums
- **Multi-year compensation plan:**
- Parks introduced a draft plan that offered five scenarios. Options #4 and 5 provide for getting all faculty up to 100% of parity in one or two years. That would mean faculty would get higher percentage increases in those years than staff. He will keep working on the numbers to account for salary savings, vacancies and staff turnover. In budget discussions so far, the administration has factored in a 3-3.5% salary increase.
  - Dawitt shared that over the last 3 years, aggregate staff salary has been increasing at a faster rate than the faculty raises. Head count for both is going down but exempt salary has gone up at an accelerated rate. Kyle added that the revelations of Dawitt's figures have led to discussions about salaries. Parks noted the gap between faculty and exempt positions is largely driven by the market for the exempt positions.
  - Marshall solicited other compensation ideas from the committee.

#### **Evaluation of the model of adjustment for years in rank (not discussed)**

##### New Business

- **NHS Dean Kamel Haddad spoke for the last 20 minutes of our meeting to talk to us about a proposal re salary ranges:**

He noted his College faces a problem of searches for faculty and staff that cannot be filled. He believes small pools are due to the uniqueness of the positions but also due to the fact that the University is wed to an equitable process so that salaries are set at a particular percentage of parity. He does not find this equitable. He proposes that we allow for a salary range when advertising and filling positions, and the possibility to offer a higher percentage of parity if the applicant pool is not sufficient. Clinefelter noted that the committee does not set salary ranges for hires; others noted this is a problem all Colleges face. Vaughn added that the process of aligning the academic portfolio may lead to a solution. Kamel seeks a recommendation from the committee be developed to address this issue.

**Meeting had to adjourn due to time, at 4:00 pm.**