

SALARY EQUITY COMMITTEE
UC Aspen A & B and on Zoom
October 31, 2022 | 3:00-4:00 p.m.
MINUTES

Athanasίου, Greene, Kyle, Schaberl, Vaughan, Cobb, Clinefelter, Weingard, Barkley
Zukiewicz, Parks
Senbet

The meeting was called to order at 3:00pm.

Approved without objection.

Approved without objection.

Unfinished Business

Kyle had sent out a document providing the rationale to increase promotion salary pay bumps by 25%, with the current University Regulations language and new language proposed by Parks. The committee discussed the new dollar amounts. The committee then discussed whether the new University Regulations should indicate that the amounts will be reviewed every 2 or 3 years. After discussing various views, the Committee supported the 3 year periods and the removal of the last line of the proposed language.

The Committee then voted on the proposed language:

3-3-901 Faculty Salary Increase for Promotion. The following faculty salary increases will apply beginning fall 2023. The faculty salary increase for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer shall be \$2,500. The faculty salary increase for promotion from instructor to assistant professor shall be \$2,500. The faculty salary increase for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor shall be \$3,750. The faculty salary increase for promotion from associate professor to full professor shall be \$6,250. The University will review the promotional amounts every 3 years.

By voice vote, the proposal was approved unanimously. The rationale, current University Regulations language and the proposed change will be presented at the Executive Committee so that it can be passed on to Faculty Senate and Codification. Clinefelter will attend the Executive Committee and report on the Committee's work.

New Business

Kyle presented the document she sent out before the meeting from Haddad. He proposed a change to the Salary Equity Bylaws that would acknowledge the need to adjust individual salaries due to the market at time of hire and for retention. The proposed language was:

Acknowledge that to remain competitive in hiring and retaining personnel, the market climate may necessitate hiring personnel at salaries above the target average CUPA proportion. In such cases, which

shall be documented, parity adjustments in rank and discipline are expected at the time of hiring. For retention purposes, the difference away from the average CUPA proportion is expected to be maintained in future salary analyses.

The Committee discussed the proposal at length, noting that we had already rejected a similar suggestion. The Committee noted that the proposal contradicts other sections of the Bylaws and the concept of equity, and that there is a means to adjust salaries through the Provost's office. We also discussed that policy shouldn't necessarily be written for the exceptions. By voice vote the Committee unanimously rejected the proposed changes to our Bylaws.

The work completed, Kyle explained that a \$7 million budget shortfall is likely for next year. Budget meetings she has attended with Senbet and upper administration have discussed different proposals to address the deficit. She then asked the Committee how we might proceed. Should we continue our work with salary models for a pay increase? It was noted that there will be a mid-year salary adjustment and that a 3-4% placeholder for next years' salaries is still in the budget, although it is unclear what that means for exempt staff salaries. The Committee decided that it would continue to act as if salary increases were likely and have Parks run models for a 3% and 4% salary pool. Schaberl raised the issue of cost of living adjustments, seeking information about where to find the data. The Committee explained that CUPA collects salary information but is unsure about COL. Kyle and the Committee discussed that increasing disparity in the percentage of parity for faculty and staff might necessitate the need to focus on faculty salaries in order to strive for internal parity between faculty and staff. However, we don't want to dismiss the potential for problems with parity among exempt staff, especially for lower paid staff members. If the University does decide that exempt staff raises for next year should be less than faculty raises, we want to do this consciously with the goal of improving internal parity as outlined re141 g0BT71re0Zsh