

SALARY EQUITY COMMITTEE
Campus Commons 2200
September 8, 2025 | 3:00-4:00 p.m.
M I N U T E S

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

Call to Order 3:01pm

Approval of the Agenda approved without objection

Approval of August 25 Minutes approved without objection

Chair's Announcement

- Hannover Research update
 - Sileo shared the phase 1 report
 - Phases 2 and 3 are underway, with a final report expected in January.
 - There were concerns about why associate professors were missing on page 4.
 - It was clarified that it was an oversight, and all ranks will be reviewed.
 - The case studies that were selected by Hanover focused on both different and similar areas that may be aligned with UNC.
 - 139 institutions were reviewed with 16 potential peers.
 - Senbet shared his concerns about how the peer institutions are identified and stated that faculty engagement is needed in selecting the institutions.
 - Sileo stated that it may be too early for that information and suggested starting with the 16 peers and 139 list
 - Adjustments will need to be made for the College of Osteopathic Medicine (COM)
 - It was stated that the COM developed a system on how they are looking at those comparisons.
 - Fischer suggests inviting a COM representative to a meeting to share more on their system.
 - Another question asked was if we can use current data since we typically have a one-year lag with the data?
 - For example, adjust the one-year lagged CUPA data by the inflation rate during the year.

Unfinished Business

- BPM of Funding Priorities Guidelines – formation of sub-committee
 - The committee decided to form a sub-committee to work with administration on revisions to the BPM of Funding Priorities Guidelines, with the intent to bring revisions first to SEC and then to Faculty Senate.
 - There are concerns that academics are not a priority in this policy.
 - Administration indicated that the BPM is an administrative policy and may not follow the regular Senate process.
 - There is uncertainty about creating the subcommittee if this policy proposal from the administration doesn't follow the regular Senate process.
 - Members are under the impression that the administration will not participate in the subcommittee.
 - There are concerns regarding the current 55% benchmark, which does not align with

- current practice (approximately 35%).
 - It was stated that the policy should serve as a guide with limits, and if changes are detrimental to the faculty, the committee should not support the revisions.
- MOTION: Fischer moves to reject the proposed revisions of the Funding Priorities Guidelines and a motion against forming the subcommittee, seconded by Elkins
- DISCUSSION:
- There was confusion on how the administration would welcome input. Generally, faculty give their input, and, in this case, it does not seem like it will be considered.
 - It is believed that proposed revisions from the faculty will be rejected when they reach the President's Office.
- It was clarified that administration is seeking feedback; however, due to time constraints, it won't follow the regular senate process.
 - It was shared that the provost is open to discussion with the Faculty Senate, so senators are informed about the policy and its changes.
- There has been interest in the subcommittee.
 - Since the policy covers different groups across the university, the subcommittee should include Admin, PASC, and CSC.
- It was perceived that if usual procedures are not followed, the Faculty Senate will have no voice in this.
- Reasonable arguments
 - While UNC's mission emphasizes students first, in reality, moving from 34% to 50% requires trade-offs; someone loses.
 - It's not just about hitting the 50% mark but ensuring students remain the top priority.
- Another suggestion was to ask the administration directly about their involvement.
- Senbet moved, and it is agreed to make this a major motion so that the discussion will continue at the next meeting, followed by a vote. It will give the committee time to get more information from the administration.

New Business

- Hanover "Best Practices -Salary Equity Best Policy and Processes Review" (discussed above).
- Update to stipends for faculty promotions
 - Senbet checked the cumulative and national inflation rates, which are at 15% and 16.2%. They have increased in the past three years.
 - There are parity dips for those who receive promotions
 - Is there anything that can be done?
 - Will this be part of Hanover?
- Faculty and staff compensation guidelines (we have the draft faculty compensation guidelines)
- Step-back policy revision
- Distinguished Professor category rank (Welfare Committee working on criteria)
 - **Suggested promotion stipend**

Comments to the Good of the Order

Adjournment 3:58pm