

SALARY EQUITY COMMITTEE
Campus Commons 2200
March 30, 2026 | 3:00-4:00 p.m.
MINUTES

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

Call to Order 3:02pm

Approval of the Agenda approved without objection

Approval of March 9, 2026 Minutes approved objection

Chair's Announcement – No report

Unfinished Business

- **FY26 Compensation Outcome**
 - It was clarified that the concerns regarding CIP 2609 data have been addressed based on the new CUPA data used.
 - Hepperle stated that Bauer is compiling the materials, and he will share them with the committee once finalized.
 - The updated outcome report will allow for more precise determination of CIP code specificity.
 - It was noted that the Joint Budget Committee is continuing to work on the budget. With the possibility of increased tuition percentage (potentially doubled) to fund raises, along with other budget priorities.
 - Members asked if this would be a reduction from last year's budget or from the originally proposed increase?
 - It was clarified that it represents a cut relative to both.
 - Members emphasized that support for staff and faculty raises must be maintained.
 - It was recommended to maintain the current approach for now, with the expectation that adjustments next year will help correct imbalances over time.
 - **FACULTY:**
 - Row 413: Individual was not working during the relevant period.
 - It was clarified if they were active in Spring 2025, their data may still appear.
 - Row 26: Individual is no longer employed but was present during the reporting timeframe, which was identified as a calculation error.
 - Rows 108 and 104: Corrections were not clearly reflected.
 - Payroll may have implemented adjustments.
 - Row 224: No peer data available.
 - DOC ALL should be applied.
 - Row 225: Classified as "Other."
 - Rows 224 and 225 represent different ranks; Row 224 may not have comparable peers within DOC ALL.
 - Hepperle and his team will make the necessary adjustments.
 - Hepperle will review outstanding concerns and present an updated report at the

next meeting.

- **STAFF:** Professional Administrative Staff
 - Duplication was addressed
- **STAFF:** Classified Staff
 - It was noted that duplicate entries may be related to the STEP program.
- A vote will take place at the next meeting.
- **Step-back policy revision (back from Codification)**
 - **3-3-1301(2)**
 - **Comment from Admin: What about a new employee who is recommended for a faculty position with rank but not tenure? This same question applies to all instances where status is tied to tenure or tenure-track designation. For example, the College of Medicine hires administrators whose faculty status is CR but who hold the rank of assistant or associate professor.**

What, if any, retreat rights would be appropriate for a CR faculty member serving in

- It was clarified those individuals would not receive a new contract.

- **3-3-1301(3)**

- **Comment from Admin: Agreed - but I don't think this is consistent with the length of the transition period language earlier in the document.**

Could this be overridden in the original appointment letter. A leave of one year is sometimes granted? I think yes...Again what if the admin is not a direct report of the CAO - suppose the admin is the CAO...

Additionally, what happens if the administrator is not a direct report to the CAO, for example, if the administrator is the CAO?

Suggested language: reference the CAO, or the President if the CAO is the administrator returning to faculty.

- Rewrite part (V) as to be consistent with the transition period language.
 - "The expected retooling time shall not exceed the completion of the current semester plus one (1) full semester. semester unless otherwise specified in the LOI. In order for the administrator to earn a Retooling Semester the administrator must be in an administrative role a minimum of three (3) consecutive years, except as approved by the CAO or President if the CAO is the returning or moving faculty."

- **3-3-1301(4)**

- **Comment from Admin: It concerns me that parity floor is referenced. What happens if the comp model changes?**

Could we say instead: relative to the compensation model employed by UNC at the time the faculty return/moves to faculty

Sections VI and VII appear to reference different pathways into administrative

roles—(VI) for new employees and (VII) for existing faculty transitioning into administration—but this distinction is not explicit or clear.

- It was noted that using both “parity” and this suggested language may imply negotiability.
- Begin (VI) with “For new employees” and insert “or the compensation model employed by UNC” after “parity floor”
- Replace “Their salary” with “For an administrator returning to faculty, the salary” in part (VII).
- Fischer noted that the suggested language may be too vague and recommends retaining the parity floor language.
- **3-3-1301(4)(b)(iii)**
 - **Comment from Admin: The dean needs to be part of this decision.**

Agree - we need to add Dean to the decision tree processes throughout the document

- Senbet will add language about the dean in appropriate sections before sending the proposal to Faculty Senate.
- **MOTION:** Elkins moves to approve the revisions to Administrators Moving to or Returning to Faculty policy, seconded by Fischer
- **VOTE:** Motion approved unanimously

New Business

- **FY27 Faculty Salary Distribution Model**
 - **Further discussion will take place at next meeting**
- **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