

SALARY EQUITY COMMITTEE
Campus Commons 2200
January 26, 2026 | 3:00-4:00 p.m.
M I N U T E S

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

Call to Order 3:03pm

Approval of the Agenda approved without objection

Approval of January 12, 2026 Minutes approved without objection

Chair's Announcement – The Budget Priority Guidelines were passed last semester and returned with revisions from General Counsel. The subcommittee will review the document, and it will be brought back to the committee. The compensation guidelines have been received and are available in SharePoint, discussion will take place at the next meeting.

Unfinished Business

- **Step-back policy revision**
 - Comments made by General Counsel English will be addressed after Codification reviews the document.
 - Comment by Manshad: What does 'prepare to return to the faculty' actually mean, and shouldn't the policy define expected activities or require a written transition plan with the receiving academic unit?
 - Sileo suggested a transition plan that is developed through the unit leader that is very general.
 - It was agreed that committee should not be making a decision on what that role should be. It should be discussed between the administrator moving or returning and their unit leader.
 - It was asked if pay shall be negotiated with the President, Sileo clarified that negotiation is done with the Provost and is stated in the LOI.
 - Replace current (b) with new language,
 - “The expectations for responsibilities to be completed during the transitional semester will be negotiated between the administrator moving or returning to faculty, their supervisor during their administrative role, and their unit leader.”
 - It was clarified that transition salaries would be determined at the time of hire, while workload arrangements would be negotiated with department chairs.
 - **MOTION:** Fischer moves to approve the revisions and send the document to Codification, seconded by Elkins.
 - **VOTE:** Motion approved unanimously
- Faculty and staff compensation guidelines (waiting for the final documents from HR)

New Business

- **FY26 Compensation Outcome**
 - Since the data shown was frozen as of November 1st, it does not reflect the 3% increase that was implemented on January 1st, and parity can be seen to decrease. Senbet raised the question of whether the freezing point be changed to January 1st or keep it at

November 1st.

- Hepperle clarified that data is frozen on November 1st to be sent to CUPA.
- Sileo shared that we do not know if the institutions UNC is compared to do their salary increases in the fiscal year, academic year, or calendar year.
- She suggested that the committee can work with HR to determine a better date and for this particular year make an exception to determining parity.
- Fischer suggested that the committee should stick with the November 1st freeze date because that is when data is collected and it does not make sense to have Hepperle and his team collect the data twice with a new date.
 - Since it is unknown what other institutions are doing, he suggested selecting a date and staying with it.
- Since parity is low, Fischer suggests a 3% increase across the board.
 - It was agreed that the November 1st date should remain, however there were concerns about applying for another 3% increase across the board 2 years in a row. Parity should be reassessed in the meantime.
- Shafie shared that lines 138 and 139 indicate a contract renewable in ASRM, however there is no contract renewable in that department.
 - Sileo shared that it may have been listed under the wrong college.
- Fischer asked whether the CUPA data is available for the medical school.
 - Bauer noted that the sample is currently small, but they are working with an external partner and hope to receive a more accurate peer group by March.
- Newman proposed raises be applied on August 1, January 1, October 1, or 1% in one month with the remainder in another.
 - The rationale behind January 1st is that the budget is known by then, which informs us what is financially possible.
 - Elkins emphasized that faculty are working in August and that a January raise results in half an academic year of suppressed wages and is in favor of August 1.
 - With a date different from August 1 an equity issue will arise, since classified staff receive raises in August.
 - The concept of a bonus was addressed.
 - Approximately \$1.5M was saved from the changes that occurred this year, and from a faculty perspective, the academic year matters more than the fiscal year.
 - The committee agreed to stick with the August 1 raise date instead of January 1.
- There are concerns regarding the reporting institutions and the faculty's YIR (Column E) compared to the CUPA YIR Adj Median (Column S)
 - Hepperle suggested waiting for the Hanover report to determine a peer group.
- Discussion will continue at the next meeting.
- FY27 Faculty Salary Distribution Model
- Hannover Research Report
- Distinguished Professor category rank (Welfare Committee working on criteria)
 - Suggested promotion stipend

Comments to the Good of the Order
Adjournment 4:00pm