

SALARY EQUITY COMMITTEE
Campus Commons 2200
September 21, 2026 | 3:00-4:00 p.m.
M I N U T E S

Present: Brown, Elkins, Gregory, Hepperle, Kyle, McCamey, Newman, Senbet, Shafie
Zoom: Hall, Lindillo
Absent: Manshad

Call to Order 3:03pm

Approval of the Agenda approved without objection

Approval of September 8, 2026 Minutes approved without objection

Chair's Announcement – No report

Unfinished Business

- Update on SEC's request for de-identified analytical data/model access.
 - No updates
 - Tool is interactive and allows data to be broken down
- Hanover Research Salary Equity and Parity Analysis (Power BI Demonstration)
 - *Brief refresher of the dashboard and discussion of new questions and data needs.*
 - The committee spent time working with the dashboard and reviewing different scenarios.
 - Members were able to see how faculty with longer tenure at UNC appeared to have lower parity.
 - The committee discussed capturing screenshots of various scenarios, including comparisons by academic rank, faculty, staff, combined faculty and staff, and position type.
 - Gregory and Brown will work together to capture screenshots of different scenarios and share them with the committee.
 - It was noted that the COM comparison was based on 14 faculty members at the time and may look different now given recent hiring.
 - It was suggested that the stipend amounts should have a greater difference between ranks while maintaining the minimum promotion amount.
 - However, increases would depend on available funding.
 - It was noted that the increase should not require new funding, although parity adjustments could create additional costs. Senbet will look into this further.

Refining the Salary Parity Model: Sustainable Annual Methodology

- CUPA data lag: *consider a transparent annual adjustment to bring prior-year salary data forward to the target academic year (e.g., using Employment Cost Index).*
- CUPA stability: *changing reporting institutions and sample sizes; consider three-year smoothing and treatment of small reporting samples.*
 - Once the data is received, additional work will be needed, but the analysis is

manageable.

- Rank consistency: *address cases where CUPA medians invert rank order; consider the UNC promotion differential as a minimum floor between rank benchmarks.*
- Years-in-rank: *review reference YIR assumptions and annual adjustment rates.*
 - Senbet shared that the YIR is still 7 years and reminded everyone that in previous years, YIR was 10 years, which was not based on any data.
 - The main concern is, with this adjustment the parity for full professors will drop by 3%.
 - It was suggested that having a staggered approach might be appropriate, recognizing that the issue cannot be addressed in a single year.
 - Based on an initial proposal for higher promotion rates the question of whether the proposed \$3,000 amount would be separately funded was asked.
 - It was clarified that the proposal was supported by former administration, the current rate of \$3,000 for full professors upon successful comprehensive evaluation was not codified.
 - Potential approaches will need to be considered to avoid any inversion issues.
 - Gregory shared that she would need to understand the guardrails before making decisions and requested to see the model that was adapted from Metro state.
- Cost-of-living/geographic adjustment: *appropriate source, geography, and role in the parity calculation.*
 - The committee discussed different inflation measures, such as comparing nationwide cost of living adjustments with regional indices for Colorado.
- *How we compare it to old peer groups*
 - Hanover suggested a new peer group that includes R1, R2, and R3 institutions, with the goal of ensuring comparable CIP codes across institutions.
 - This approach would not have differed substantially from using DOC-ALL.
 - The committee discussed the aging between when data are published and when they are available for use.
 - The typical data lag is 4–6 months, though a longer lag may be necessary depending on when the data are pulled.

New Business

Interim Benchmark for Model Development

- Determine whether SEC should use Hanover's 453-institution CUPA benchmark and the current parity formula as the provisional baseline while the revised peer group and methodology are developed.

Peer Group Construction: Initial Framework

- Define the candidate universe for the primary peer group.
- Identify the variables SEC will use to measure institutional similarity.
- Determine which criteria, if any, should be hard filters versus scored dimensions.
- Establish a standardized scoring/index approach and assign work for producing an initial ranked peer list.

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