

SALARY EQUITY COMMITTEE  
UC Spruce A  
February 21, 2022 | 3:00-4:00 p.m.  
MINUTES

**Present:** Athanasiou, Clinefelter, de la Torre, Greene, Kyle, Parks, Trask

**Absent:** Cobb, Fischer

**Guest:** Levin

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 3:06pm.

**Approval of the Agenda**

Approved without objection.

**Approval of the February 7, 2022 Minutes**

Approved without objection.

**Chair's Announcements** (Greene)

- The President announced a potential 2-3% salary distribution pool during the recent townhall.

**Unfinished Business**

- **Adjunct/Overload pay rates**
- **Salary pool distribution**
- **Minimum wages/salaries**
- **Effects of promotion on parity**
  - Parks reported on how a change in the order of how monies are applied would affect raises and parity increases.
    - If the new rank (instead of the old rank) was used to calculate the parity of the nearly 30 faculty members promoted last year, it would have meant about 100k in parity dollars spent on those people.
    - If this had happened, about 80 other faculty members would not have received parity increases that year.
    - In turn, the overall parity floor would not have gone up as high.
  - Peer data is likely to be relatively flat this year, and the mid-year increases will likely have a benign impact on parity.
  - Parks hopes to have new CUPA data on 2/28 and will share salary data with the committee so we can start modeling next time.

**DISCUSSION:**

- While we have been able to bring the parity floor up, many faculty are 'stuck' at the mid-80's of parity, since they miss the threshold for parity increases.
- Perhaps consider a linear model for parity adjustments.
- Levin asked whether the committee could study whether the new peer group really is more stable/less volatile than previous smaller peer groups.
- Parks mentioned that the NCHEMS 51 group appears to be less volatile than previous smaller peer groups; however, there are still difficulties in finding matches for some units (e.g., ASL) and still some volatility among some disciplines depending on how they are coded (e.g., Earth Sciences v Meteorology).
- Parks meets with college deans to manage CIP codes and can plan to bring any outliers to Salary Equity to see if there are any concerns.



- **Senate/Salary Equity bylaws**

- The committee continued discussion regarding Salary Equity bylaws and Faculty Senate bylaws.

MOTION: Clinefelter – It is moved to keep Duties E & F in the Salary Equity bylaws (and the corresponding clauses in Article VI, H. 5 & 6 in the Faculty Senate bylaws) and ask Faculty Welfare to consider striking the “employee benefits policies” from their section of the Faculty Senate bylaws.

VOTE: Approved by voice vote.

MOTION: Clinefelter – It is moved to approve giving FSEC, rather than the full Senate, the power to approve Salary Equity bylaws.

VOTE: Approved by voice vote.

- The committee will communicate these requests to Codification and ask Codification to update Faculty Senate bylaws Article VI to be consistent with the current Salary Equity bylaws.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: *Educating faculty about retirement*

- Clinefelter recommended running educational sessions for faculty regarding retirement saving strategies.
- Clinefelter will be rotating off the Salary Equity committee next year but would be willing to help organize educational sessions in Fall.
- Parks suggested vendors would be willing to participate in such sessions, and Christine McClatchey in Finance Instruction might also be a good resource to help explain retirement funding.

## **New Business**

- **Administrative/educational salary distribution**

## **Comments to the Good of the Order**

## **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:57pm.

David Greene  
Chair

Betsy Kienitz  
Recording Secretary