

SALARY EQUITY COMMITTEE
UC Aspen A & B
November 14, 2022 | 3:00-4:00 p.m.
Minutes

Present: Athanasiou, Greene, Kyle, Parks, Schaberl, Vaughan, Cobb, Clinefelter, Weingard, Barkley

Absent: Zukiewicz

Guests: Senbet

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 pm

Approval of the Agenda

Approved without objection.

Approval of the October 31, 2022 Minutes

Approved without objection.

Chair's Announcements

- **Proposal to increase promotional amounts passed in Senate.**
- **There are questions about the possible creation of inversions with pay increases;** Parks explained that there would be only a minimal effect. Inversions will be addressed by the Equal Pay Act. Committee members asked if inversions be adjusted at the time that pay increases for the next AY begin or will they be delayed until the following semester. Parks explained that in the typical order of operations, inversions would be adjusted in the spring semester. However, it would be possible, in theory to set a fall date instead of spring. Kyle recommended a fall date so the inversion increases can be done sooner. Parks noted that we could move the adjustments for faculty inversions to the fall and then do the staff adjustments in the spring to manage the workload for HR. Parks needs to think about the order of operations. Right now Equal Pay Act adjustments all take place in April. Parks is willing to look at a fall date for faculty inversions. Parks will bring the order of operations back to the Committee.

Unfinished Business

- **Kyle led a discussion about which of the following need to remain in unfinished business:**
- **Administrative/educational salary distribution**
Senbet explained that there is an ongoing discussion about a \$1500 salary adjustment (increase) in January and a 4% salary pool for next year. The Committee decided to keep this item for now until we get more data in March; Parks anticipates that vacancy savings will help but the market is driving administrative salaries higher.
- **Adding a distinguished/super professor category?** The Committee agreed to keep this here for now.
- **Medical premiums are done so this will be deleted from unfinished business.**
- **Multi-year compensation plan**

Kyle: Dale is trying to model a move to 100% parity by 2023 or 24 not 25. These discussions will be more meaningful after the CUPA data is released. Parks assumes that we will see other schools raising peer salaries by more than 1.5%. We will have that data in Feb. or March. This year's \$1500 January increase and proposed 4% salary pool will mean a roughly 5-6% salary increase, which means we will

make progress towards 100% parity. Parks thinks we can for sure get the median to 100%, and the floor to 100% by the following year. The Committee should get a recommendation ready for the June BOT meeting. Kyle wants a recommendation to come from the Committee to Senate in the spring. Senbet: University Board Policy states that the University aims for 55% of the budget to go to instruction and 44% to administration/staff. How does this fit in with our planning? Does the market issue on the staff side move us away from this 55% instruction? Parks thinks it probably does. We do have staff vacancies and there may be faculty vacancies if the proposed buy out goes through. Reasonable question to ask said Parks but this never really gets discussed.

Note that Clinefelter added the policy at the end here as an FYI.

The Committee then discussed possible models for next year and how to distribute the salary pool; however, the spread sheet projected on the screen did not include adjustments made for this year (no annual raises are included but the spreadsheet does include last year's midyear \$1500 increases). So it's old data. Parks thinks that the floor is currently 88% parity. Committee noted that the spreadsheet we have does not include new CUPA data, or the summer raise, or the proposed Jan. 2023 increase. With these caveats, we can use this as a model to play around with models.

Parks explained the various models projected. Last year had a roughly 50-50 split between the flat rate dollar amounts and parity.

What would it cost to get our parity floor to 95% of NCEMS? Discussion about a number of issues followed including cost of living. Once we get to 100% parity, at that point we might want to look at the cost of living at the other institutions and use that to make an argument for future raises.

How high can we set the flat rates and what will that take us to in terms of parity? That question led to a desire for more data, which Kyle agreed to push for.

Before adjournment, there was a brief discussion, off topic, of the proposed new course schedule design, but that appears to have been dropped as unworkable.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

From University Board Policy:

1-1-201(5) University Funding Priorities Guidelines. The fiscal year budget shall conform to the following guidelines. Variations may be approved by the BOT pursuant to 1-1-201(4).

Instruction 55.00%
Research 1.25%
Public Service 0.10%
Academic Support 14.75%
Student Services 7.00%
Institutional Support 10.25%
Operation & Maintenance of Plant 8.25%
Scholarships & Fellowships 3.30%
Transfers 0.10%