

SALARY EQUITY COMMITTEE
Campus Commons 2200
December 1, 2025 | 3:00-4:00 p.m.
M I N U T E S

Present: Castro, Hepperle, Newman, Senbet, Shafie, Sileo
Zoom: Applegate, Fischer, Manshad, Vaughan
Absent: Henke

Call to Order 3:01pm

Approval of the Agenda approved without objection

Approval of November 17 Minutes approved without objection

Chair's Announcement – No report

Unfinished Business

- **Step-back policy revision**
 - **Senbet replaced any instances of “step-back” with “Administrator Moving or Returning to Faculty”**
 - **3-3-1301(3)**
 - Currently UNCO has practice, but no policy related to employee pay when transitioning back to faculty.
 - Suggestions from Sileo and Provost Fleming
 - Transition salary during any retooling semester will be identified in the initial LOI, based on the faculty salary when first offered to be in an administrative role.
 - Negotiation could be done at this time.
 - Retooling time will be identified in the initial LOI.
 - Indicate a minimum number of years that must occur in the administrative role for the retooling semester
 - They suggest a three-year minimum
 - Members would like that time to be negotiable
 - If pieces are included in LOI they can be negotiated.
 - Fischer asked if the “clock” would restart someone in an administrative position switch to another.
 - Sileo shared that this would be a question for the provost, however in her experience it does not.
 - Shafie asked whether they have a contract when they transition back to faculty roles.
 - Sileo clarified that faculty do not have contracts since they would be tenured.
 - There is no contract in place at the moment, but work is being done to determine what that process should look like moving forward.
 - Manshad asked what does 'prepare to return to the faculty' actually mean, (retooling semester) and shouldn't the policy define expected activities or require a written transition plan with the receiving academic unit.
 - Sileo was unsure about it but would defer to faculty regarding the

written transition, as they are still performing administrative duties while returning to faculty roles.

- Faculty are currently working with their chairs and units to prepare.
- It was suggested to insert language addressing Manshad's comment in 3-3-1301(5).
- To address the feedback from Sileo and Fleming, insert the following under 3-3-1301(3)(a),
 - "I) transition salary during any semester used to prepare to return to faculty (retooling) will be identified in the initial Letter of Intent (LOI), based on the faculty base salary
 - II) the retooling time will be identified in the initial LOI, shall not exceed 1 semester
 - III) a minimum of 3 consecutive years must occur in an administrative role or roles in order for the administrator to earn a retooling semester"
 - A definition of retooling will need to be included. The minimum will allow for negotiation, however, the provost most likely will not accept anything less than three years.
- Preparation for returning to faculty will be outlined in the initial LOI and should not exceed one semester.
- Members asked if they were to return to faculty in the middle of the semester.
 - Hepperle shared that in that scenario, the individual could have the remainder of the fall semester and part of the spring semester. It'll depend on the situation.
- 3-3-1301(4)
 - Replace "Administrator moving or returning to faculty" with "upon departure from administrator role" in the first sentence of the preamble.
 - (a)(i)
 - Replace "Step-back" with "the administrator moving to faculty"
 - (a)(ii)
 - Remove "or returning" in (i) – (iii)
 - Insert "pay for the administrator moving to faculty"
 - Sileo suggested that "90% of CUPA Doctoral All" should be general
 - Replace with "current parity floor"
 - (b)
 - Insert "the time when the" after "code upon" in the first sentence of section (b).
 - Remove "moving or returning to faculty"
 - Members asked if someone can be promoted while in administration role.
 - Sileo answered that they cannot, however there can be exceptions.
 - The committee will continue from 3-3-1301(4)(b) next semester.
- Faculty and staff compensation guidelines (waiting for the final documents from HR)
 - Guides and outcome reports will be ready for January meeting

New Business

- Distinguished Professor category rank (Welfare Committee working on criteria)
 - Suggested promotion stipend

Comments to the Good of the Order
Adjournment 3:59pm

SALARY EQUITY COMMITTEE
Campus Commons 2200
November 17, 2025 | 3:00-4:00 p.m.
M I N U T E S

Present: Applegate, Castro, Elkins, Fischer, Hepperle, Newman, Senbet, Shafie, Sileo (Fleming), Vaughan
Zoom: Henke, McCamey
Absent:

Call to Order 3:00pm

Approval of the Agenda approved without objection

Approval of November 3 Minutes approved objection

Chair's Announcement – Hepperle will have to reach out to Megan regarding the compensation outcome for this fiscal year.

Unfinished Business

- **Update to stipends for faculty promotions (Document back from Codification)**
 - Revisions were kept language consistent with current language
 - Codification changed all the “will” to “shall”.
 - It was noted that the assumption that individuals in Year-in-Rank (YIR) of 3+ years would be eligible to apply and receive the adjustment is very aggressive.
 - There were concerns regarding implementation due to the current state of the university.
 - Sending it now may appear insensitive given the current layoffs.
 - These changes are significant to faculty but can also wait until January.
 - The question of whether the adjustment is accounted for in the current revised budget was asked.
 - Members agreed that the committee should wait to send the proposal to the Faculty Senate until January.
 - Noted that Provost Fleming and Sileo expressed concerns about the analysis, specifically that fringe was not included.
 - A full budget analysis will be required before administration can consider the proposal.
 - Fischer emphasized that the President is determined to continue to give raises
 - MOTION: Fischer moves to approve the revision and send the proposal to the Senate in January, seconded by Elkins
 - VOTE: Motion approved unanimously
- **BPM of Funding Priorities Guidelines (Document back from Codification)**
 - 1-1201(4)
 - Members prefer the second option with the removal of “e.g.” and insertion of “as defined by”
 - 1-1-201(5)
 - (a)
 - It was asked whether “shared governance partners” and “stakeholders” were the same groups.
 - It was clarified that they are not the same.
 - (f)

- Fischer questioned whether “well-being” and “quality of life” were different
 - It was clarified that some Codification members expressed concerns about the term “well-being”.
 - SEC members agreed to revert it back to “well-being.”
- Fischer supports keeping the final sentence of the preamble, noting that similar language is not universally accepted in all parts of the country.
 - Provost Fleming indicated the document would have a higher chance of approval at the provost level if that sentence were relocated into the list of items below rather than kept in the preamble.
- The following sentence will be added to the beginning of (I).
 - “Investment in faculty is investment in students; therefore, annual budgets must demonstrate sustained commitment to faculty compensation, the quality of academic programs, and student success.”
 - Remove “learning, well-being, and success” at the end of section (I) and end the sentence with “students”.
- In Section (II), Provost Fleming suggested adding an analogous sentence to acknowledge all groups.
 - Fischer noted that not all staff directly contribute to student well-being.
 - The committee agreed to inserting “and support staff” after “prioritize activities”
- For the College of Osteopathic Medicine (COM) reference, Provost Fleming recommends relocating it because it appears as a priority but is related to reporting.
 - The committee agreed to add this to the end of 1-1-201(4)(b).
- Elkins requested clarification on the rationale behind the changes and asked how members felt about the implications. He noted the document does not indicate a departure from current practices.
 - Fischer shared that administration is trying to move away from percentage-based approaches and that this language provides the best opportunity for accountability. He also added that proposed numbers are far from current values.
 - Fischer noted that past presidents did not meet with shared governance organizations, whereas President Feinstein does.
 - These revisions will require future presidents to discuss the budget with shared governance organizations.
- MOTION: Fischer moves to approve the revisions to BPM of Funding Priorities Guidelines, seconded by Shafie
- DISCUSSION:
 - Although the document is not perfect, given current constraints, the changes provide a workable framework for accountability.
- VOTE: Motion approved unanimously
- **Step-back policy revision**
- Faculty and staff compensation guidelines (waiting for the final documents from HR)

New Business

- Distinguished Professor category rank (Welfare Committee working on criteria)
 - Suggested promotion stipend

Comments to the Good of the Order

Thank you Dawit for shepherding this complicated issue!

Adjournment 3:56pm