

SALARY EQUITY COMMITTEE
Campus Commons 2200
March 31, 2025 | 3:00-4:00 p.m.
M I N U T E S

Present: Barkley, Elkins, Greene, Fischer, Hepperle, Kyle, Senbet, Shafie
Zoom: Applegate, Castro, Dong Saule, Henke, McCamey, Schaberl, Vaughan
Absent: Lovewell

Call to Order 3:01pm

Approval of the Agenda approved without objection

Approval of March 10 Minutes approved without objection

Chair's Announcement – Senbet and Kyle are scheduled to meet with Hanover this Friday and they will be attending the 4/28 meeting. Hanover is unavailable to meet with Faculty Senate this semester due to scheduling conflicts. Kyle is thinking of recording the meeting with Hanover or inviting members to attend 4/28 meeting.

Unfinished Business

- **Adjustments to the year in rank for full professors (from 10 to 6-7 years)**
 - The committee must decide whether to 1) pass the proposal and send it to the Faculty Senate or 2) Bring the issue up to Hanover and revisit it next year.
 - It has been made clear that the administration will not accept it.
 - The provost will not act on it, even if passed.
 - Barkley suggested giving the provost a heads up that it will be moving to Faculty Senate if passed by SEC.
 - The proposed model with full professors YIR at 7 years is more accurate and fairer.
 - It would be more effective to clearly communicate to Hanover that this remains a concern.
 - It was suggested that framing their thoughts on the salary and equity process would benefit Hanover's understanding.
 - There were concerns raised about whether SEC passing this, knowing the provost will likely reject it might enflame an already sensitive issue.
 - MOTION: Fischer motions to pause this proposal and communicate with Hanover regarding this issue, including a clear statement stating that we reviewed the data and highly recommend 7 years not 10 years, seconded by Shafie.
 - VOTE: Motion is approved – 10 in favor, 1 abstention.

New Business

- **FY26 Faculty salary distribution model**
 - This model is still in draft form and the data has not been fully reviewed yet.
 - Kyle and Senbet will work with HR to clean the data up
 - There were discrepancies in the data:
 - Rows 21, 22, 27: Parity is at 63.5%, which were alarming and could possibly be an error.
 - About 27 individuals have a parity below 80%.
 - Possible CIP code changes could have affected parity values.
 - Fischer noted that the History Department parity is approximately 87.8%, which

- is lower than last year.
- As a committee it is important to clarify:
 - What share will go to parity vs. non-parity?
 - For non-parity, will the distribution be: percentage-based or a flat rate?
- Schaberl feels strongly about how inflation should be considered in this model and should not be set aside for the future.
 - Senbet states that if inflation is to be considered a new model will need to be established and it can be difficult to implement
- The committee could make a recommendation, but more data is needed, and creating a new model may exceed the scope of what we can do.
- Schaberl proposes a parity holiday
 - 0% goes to parity, 3% goes to percentage increases.
- Question to consider:
 - Should we maintain some parity component, or move toward a flat rate or percentage-only approach?
 - It was that after years of using parity it may no longer be serving equity well and parity disadvantages those already at or above target parity levels.
- Kyle proposes, 2% across-the-board, 1% parity.
- Based on feedback received by Elkins, 3% across-the-board seems to be the fairest.
- Proposals:
 - 3% across (percent raise), 0% parity
 - 2.5% across (present raise), 0.5% parity – May be the fairest option
 - 2% across (percent raise), 1% parity
 - 0% across (percent raise), 3% parity
- Discussion will continue at the next meeting.
- Distinguished Professor category rank (Welfare Committee working on criteria)
 - **Suggested promotion stipend**
 - **How to calculate year in rank**
 - *There are 114 full professors with 4 YIR or above, 105 with 5 YIR or above, 97 with 6 YIR or above.*
- Step-back policy revision

Comments to the Good of the Order
Adjournment 4:01pm