SALARY EQUITY COMMITTEE
UC Aspen A & B
October 17, 2022 | 3:00-4:00 p.m.
Minutes

Present: Athanasiou, Greene, Kyle, Parks, Barkley, Schaberl, Vaughan, Cobb, Clinefelter, Weingard, Barkley
Absent: Zukiewicz
Guests: Senbet

Call to Order 3:00

Approval of the Agenda without objections

Approval of the October 3, 2022 Minutes without objection

Chair's Announcements

- **President Feinstein officially appointed Marshall Parks and Jordan Barkley to serve on the Salary Equity Committee this year.**
- **Kyle brought up NHS Dean Kamel Haddad's proposal at Senate Exec.** Haddad asked the Committee for support so Deans can adjust starting salaries for new hires if the applicant pool were small. Kyle, with Committee support discussed the issue and decided that it is not an issue for the Committee; instead the Provost's office should develop proposal and bring it to us to review.
- **Provost Fleming mentioned to Kyle in the last Executive Committee that our committee may want to identify priorities for where we should deploy resources** (parity, distinguished professor rank funds, promotional increases, or to allocate extra resources to specific positions like Kamel mentioned, etc.). However, Kyle believes, and the Committee agreed, that parity and existing promotional increases remain our priority. The Committee then noted in discussion that any decision and process to establish a distinguished professor rank and new promotional increases will take at least 2-3 years to develop. If the new rank is created, the Committee agreed that it should not be at the cost of parity or the existing promotional increases or come out of any salary increase pool. A separate pool for that purpose would have to be identified, or it could come out of a larger promotional increase pool.

Unfinished Business

- **Evaluation of promotion raises**
  Parks recommended and that the Committee review a draft recommendation to increase the size of salary increases for promotions of existing faculty ranks. Such increases will likely result in a minimal cost to the University (about 50K). He will bring the University Regulations language that describes the current increases to the next meeting. The Committee can then develop a narrative for rationale. The goal would be to get it through the governance process so that they can go into effect for the next academic year. Parks and the Committee discussed that each promotional amount might be increased by 20-25% . Kyle asked if the new increases would create inversions or inequity. Marshall said that was possible, but that could be dealt with since we do pay equity adjustments every year anyway. $125,000 is typically set aside in a separate pool for promotions and in the last 3 years we have not used the full amount. The new Equal Pay law also ensures adjustments to pay for existing employees, and the University has to fund

that legal mandate. Currently, funds to address inversions are taken out of the salary increase pool before any raises are allocated; typically, inversions cost c. 200K. Now with the Equal Pay act we will not need to do that, because inversions can be financed through this new fund.

Parks will do a quick analysis for both a 20 and 25% increase to estimate the effects of such an increase would have on current faculty parity. The Committee then noted that we might want to add language to University Regulations that explains the dollar amount for promotions will be revisited every few years. Parks will try to send all this out by the end of the week or at least before the next meeting. In the meantime, Kyle will work on a draft rationale.

Parks then noted that there is a new paid family medical leave act that is coming out that will likely cost the University 1 million. All employers will have to pay into this state fund. In future we could likely draw from this fund when we cover one semester paid leave medical for faculty.

- **Multi-year compensation plan**

Senbet, Kyle and Barkley are part of the budget subcommittee to prep for the November Board of Trustees meeting. There is a placeholder for a 3% increase in salaries; that is the floor. This subcommittee is discussing a number of issues: Should there be another mid-year salary adjustment/increase? How can that be paid for? Should there be a larger mid-year amount than last year? Parks feels confident there is board, administrative and presidential support for either midyear adjustment or more for the salary increase pool. In part, such support is driven by inflation. They need to find a source for such increases.

Parks noted that for next year's salary pool, there are only three possible sources: Students, paying higher tuition or fees; or the State budget; or decrease in expenses. Parks has the sense that salaries are a high priority. Barkley agreed. Parks is in the process of modeling different scenarios. Tuition increases, fee increases, and more state funding may be likely. There is optimism about next year's enrollment. By November, the Board of Trustees may make a recommendation about these increases but there will certainly be a recommendation by the time of the January preliminary budget for next year. The Committee discussed the State's role in setting tuition caps and the university's ability to leverage an amount over the cap. The State does define the caps on tuition and fees (with less focus on fees) and there is room for universities to negotiate with the State. The typical cap window on tuition is 3-6%. In HR math, roughly 1% increase in tuition = 1% increase in salaries.

With the agenda business concluded the Committee discussed other pending issues as information items.

Kyle asked Parks about **medical premium increases** for next year. Parks explained that information will be going out soon to faculty and staff. Premiums will increase by 7%. However, the University may absorb all of the increase instead of a 60-40 University/employee spilt. There will be plan design changes for higher out of pocket costs for things like hospitalization and copays. But the critical issue is caps on the total out of pocket cost, which will remain at around $2,500 for individuals or $5,000 a year for families. However, Parks noted that we will not have a premium holiday this December for the first time in about 11 years.

Clinefelter asked about plans to bring **childcare services** to campus for staff, faculty, and students. Parks explained that there is a public/private partnership in the works between Bright ABC child care and UNC. The childcare center, to be built between the César Chavez Cultural Center and the Judy Farr Center, may be in the preliminary budget in November. It is anticipated that both State funds and donor funds will pay for the building. Ground could be broken for the center as early as spring.

Kyle ended the meeting by noting the next meeting is on Halloween and she will need to Zoom in. There is a Zoom link she has for this. Committee members have the option to Zoom or to meet face-to-face in the usual Aspen room.

Adjournment was at 3:57 pm.