

SALARY EQUITY COMMITTEE
Campus Commons 2200
August 25, 2025 | 3:00-4:00 p.m.
M I N U T E S

Present: Applegate, Fischer, Kyle, Newman, Senbet, Shafie, Sileo, Vaughan

Absent: Bauer, Henke

Zoom: Elkins, McCamey

Call to Order 3:00pm

Approval of the Agenda approved without objection

Approval of April 28 Minutes

Chair's Announcement

- Welcome back! Hope everyone had a great summer!
- Hannover Research update
 - Hanover is working in three phases
 - First phase – completed
 - Literature review was conducted, where initial questions were developed
 - Findings can be shared with the committee.
 - They did internal work to help set the tone for upcoming case studies
 - Goal: Provide a “buffet” of recommendations with rationale, pros, and cons tailored to UNC.
 - Second phase
 - They will conduct interviews with other institutions to explore methods and next steps.
 - Possibly reviewing practices across 139 peers
 - focusing on 16 comparable to UNC based on size, shape, and structure.
 - HR has a meeting scheduled for Wednesday to discuss internal perspective.
 - This phase of the project is planned for Sept to mid Oct.
 - Third phase
 - In this phase internal UNC data collection and interviews (via HR) will be conducted to document UNC's current practices and ensure alignment.
 - Phases 2 and 3 will continue throughout the semester, with recommendations expected in January.
- Plans about raises – January raises or July raises
 - Raises are planned to be implemented in January this academic year, tied to the current budget.
 - Depending on whether raises should align with the academic year or the calendar year, it will affect some faculty.

New Business

- BPM of Funding Priorities Guidelines
 - A proposal from the President's Office removes the Quantitative benchmarks of 55% of the budget going to instruction and replaces it with broader language with no quantitative benchmark.
 - Faculty wants to see a clear benchmark; it was suggested that administrators

- either
 - Agree to the 55% or some value as the benchmark, or
 - Determine a numerical value to achieve, such as a floor
 - There were concerns about the limited faculty input and the broadness of the policy.
 - Concerns from the committee:
 - Members felt the document uses a passive voice and lacks clear parameters.
 - Priorities and a clear mission are not clearly defined
 - It was thought that phrases like “to the extent possible” weaken accountability
 - It was suggested to list out their priorities
 - Members felt more comfortable seeing a list of priorities followed by a vision
 - Without a clear benchmark, how will success be assessed?
 - Language must be written in a way that future administration can follow.
 - The committee cautioned against setting quantitative benchmarks too low, as future presidents may see them as the limit.
 - It was agreed that this document needs some revisions. Two options for revising this were discussed
 - Option 1: The committee itself will work on revisions and bring them forth to the Faculty Senate.
 - Option 2: Salary Equity will create a sub-committee that will work together with the president to make revisions and bring them back to the committee before the Faculty Senate.
 - Since the president is working on getting this to the December BOT meeting, it was decided that a smaller sub-committee would work on the revisions with the president’s office.
- Update to stipends for faculty promotions
- Faculty and staff compensation guidelines (we have the draft faculty compensation guideline)
- Step-back policy revision
- Distinguished Professor category rank (Welfare Committee working on criteria)
 - **Suggested promotion stipend**

Comments to the Good of the Order

Adjournment 3:59pm