

SALARY EQUITY COMMITTEE
Campus Commons 2200
September 8, 2026 | 3:00-4:00 p.m.
M I N U T E S

Present: Brown, Gregory, Hepperle, McMamey, Newman, Senbet
Zoom: Shafie, Manshad
Absent: Hall, Kyle

Call to Order 3:06pm

Approval of the Agenda approved without objection

Approval of August 24, 2026 Minutes approved without objection

Chair's Announcement – At the Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting, questions were raised about whether the current NCHEMS 51 peer group remains relevant. It was noted that the data available on the HR website did not include medical colleges. There was interest in including aspirational institutions in the peer group, since UNC is primarily compared to like institutions. A group with aspirational institution could be used as a separate benchmark.

Unfinished Business

- Hanover Research Salary Equity and Parity Analysis (Power BI Demonstration)
 - *Brief refresher of the dashboard and discussion of new questions and data needs.*
 - *Update on the Hanover model/dashboard and SEC access to the Power BI tool.*
- Follow-up
 - *Follow-up on professional staff salary-equity findings identified in the Hanover report.*

New Business

- Purpose and End Goal of the Salary Model Review
 - *What should SEC seek to accomplish through this year's review of UNC's salary parity and compensation framework?*
 - *It was emphasized that defining a peer group will shape future compensation decisions and that the current administration's aspirational approach is worth considering.*
 - *A peer group of 51 institutions is fairly large, a size of 10-15 is most common.*
 - *In her experience, Gregory shared that her previous institution had a peer group of 15 institutions, 10 similar and 5 aspirational.*
 - *A question was raised about whether Hanover has a net too wide for developing the peer group in their report?*
 - *The exclusion of medical schools in the current peer group is an important factor that will need to be considered.*
 - *Members were interested in seeing a model that both did and did not include medical schools.*
 - *Clear criteria will need to be established when determining this peer group, while keeping note of institutional rankings and levels of state funding.*
 - *In addition to a clear definition of parity and what it means in the compensation model.*
 - *It was suggested working with the current compensation model and making necessary adjustments.*
 - *As for data reporting, members asked if other sources other than CUPA would be better.*

It was clarified that CUPA is the most reliable source and that all data reporting is voluntary.

- *A three-tier model based on different levels of comparison was suggested. The model would begin with the main peer group; if comparable institutions are unavailable, R2 institutions would be considered, followed by DOC-ALL if no suitable comparables are identified in the R2 group.*
 - *A model that breaks things down to a per-credit basis to allow for comparisons across colleges and faculty ranks was suggested as well.*
 - *It was emphasized that whatever methodology is used, it should be standardized and codified to avoid this later in the future.*
 - *Members expressed their frustrations with the compensation they receive within the colleges.*
 - *It was clarified that different disciplines face different market demands and CIP codes could help account for differences among academic fields.*
 - *Members think creating an index to identify and evaluate potential peer institutions, with consideration given to a smaller, more focused peer group is a good idea to consider.*
 - *The question was raised about whether there are alternatives to CIP codes for categorizing disciplines and identifying appropriate market comparisons.*
 - *At the moment that is unknown.*
 - *Once an appropriate peer group is identified, the committee can look into the compensation practices of those institutions.*
 - *UNC could then adopt or adapt successful compensation models from institutions with similar characteristics.*
 - *With an informed recommendation from SEC, the new president will need to determine institutional compensation goals.*
 - *A three-year rolling average or having a minimum between two ranks was suggested to provide a more accurate picture of compensation trends.*
 - *With members in support of a three-year rolling average to allow an idea where things are heading.*
 - *The question about whether current salary comparisons should be adjusted using the Employment Cost Index rather than relying on prior-year CUPA-HR data.*
 - *It was clarified that if UNC's data is adjusted, data from other institutions will need to be adjusted as well.*
 - *The time of pulling the data is an important factor*
- **Refining the Salary Parity Model: Sustainable Annual Methodology**
 - *Peer comparison group: reassess the NCHEMS-51 in light of UNC's R2 status, the College of Osteopathic Medicine, and its relationship to Hanover's 453 research-university CUPA universe.*
 - *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.*
 - *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.*
 - *Cost-of-living/geographic adjustment: appropriate source, geography, and role in the*

parity calculation.

Comments to the Good of the Order
Adjournment 3:58pm