



Join the discussion...

Sort by Newest ▾



4



Just the Facts • 19 hours ago

Human Resources responded to my question within the comments below that "departments may request salaries outside of the SPET range, or request salaries out of line with the SPET's equity recommendations. The justifications for these requests will be reviewed and evaluated by HR as part of the standard review process for the requested personnel action."

This justification information is clearly documented within Section 3.1 of the proposed policy that departments will have flexibility to pay outside of the SPET's recommended range by providing appropriate justification to support the request.

However, it is not clearly documented within Section 3.2 of the proposed policy that departments will have the flexibility to pay salaries out of line with the SPET's equity recommendations. IT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT THAT THE INFORMATION ALLOWING JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THESE REQUESTS WILL BE REVIEWED AND EVALUATED BY HR AS PART OF THE STANDARD REVIEW PROCESS OF THE REQUESTED PERSONNEL ACTION ALSO BE DOCUMENTED WITHIN SECTION 3.2 OF THE PROPOSED POLICY!

^ | ▾ • Reply • Share ›



anonymous • a day ago

I see this as creating an explosive demand for more differentiated job descriptions. I'm not confident HR can handle the additional demands, they are very slow.

^ | ▾ • Reply • Share ›



Anonymous • a day ago

The SPET is a valuable tool to provide managers with data points that they have not previously had (i.e. salaries of personnel in other departments with similar titles, etc), however, mandating that it be used in determining pay for employees will have several unintended consequences.

The primary unintended consequence will be the **erosion of the department chair's autonomy and ability to plan ahead**. By analyzing qualified personnel actions at the level 3 org instead of the level 5, we are providing level 5 managers (academic chairs, accounting managers, etc) the ability to impact each other's budgets in a detrimental way. When one department chooses to provide a career ladder to a staff member, there is now a potential impact upon other departments within the same level 3 org. This erodes the individual manager's ability to run their department effectively and efficiently. This will also place the negotiations of virtually all salary and qualified actions at the Dean level, as one department manager cannot make those decisions for another department. Given that salaries are typically 80% or more of a department's budget, this removes a tremendous amount of latitude from the chairs/managers and places it at the Dean/Director level. That is manageable when you have a small to medium sized college, but when you are at the College of Arts and Sciences, or within the School of Medicine, or at Institutional Support Services, it will significantly increase the administrative

burden on the Dean/Director offices as they continually place these actions in context of the level 3 org. This feels counter to UNM 2040 goal #5, "Sustainability", objective #3, which reads "Build a culture of multi-year budgeting and planning and ensure that all our business and academic processes are effective and efficient".

Another unintended consequence will be **increased difficulty in recruiting and retaining staff**. We are faced with historic difficulties in recruiting and retaining quality staff, as the institution is chronically understaffed in almost all functions, our positions are taking longer to fill, our turnover is increasing, and our workforce is aging and retiring. Adding any further operational steps, no matter how well-intentioned, no matter how well-researched, further hinders our work of recruiting and retaining staff. Managers need the latitude, and ability, to be agile and respond quickly to hire positions, provide professional development and paths forwards for staff and build that into their budgets so they are appropriately resourced. Bluntly put, I have lost 2 candidates over the past 3 months after verbal offers were extended as HR could not generate an offer letter within 2 weeks. HR is also chronically understaffed, and yet we are considering exacerbating this situation by enshrining HR as a gatekeeper to larger segments of departmental operations.

Finally, **diversity is our bedrock of strength**, and foundation of growth and innovation. We are not the same, and that's a good thing. Faculty disciplines are radically different from each other, each with their own place in the market, and salary levels acknowledge that. The staff that support these disparate disciplines are similarly differentiated. **Staff and faculty are not interchangeable parts** and should not be treated as such. By increasing centralized planning and attempting to simplify the complexity of salary discussions, we rob the candidate, the existing employee and the manager of the opportunity to recognize the diversity and strength we bring to the Lobo community. Salary discussions are complex, delicate and nuanced because we are attempting to estimate the value a person will bring to the organization. That is no easy task, nor should it be. I believe the SPET tool can assist in these conversations, but we need to retain the authority and autonomy to individually recognize the accomplishments and value that faculty and staff bring to the Lobo community at the department level 5.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Also in SPET Pilot • 3 days ago

The HR new hiring Background Checks process was recently and suddenly involuntary thrust onto all departments which has caused a significant delay of our staff employment procedures. We are also piloting the SPET and 3rd org equity and the added time it takes to negotiate these processes and the background checks has made it even more difficult to recruit staff to fill vacancies. Please let it be known that our primary and secondary candidates are not waiting around and readily accepting other offers outside UNM. If this lag time is how HR works when we have been told they are now fully staffed, HR needs to prioritize and understand how their initiatives adversely affect departments and to reconsider launching the SPET and 3rd org equity processes at another time down the road.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod ➔ **Also in SPET Pilot** • 3 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you very much for your comment and feedback.

^ | v • Edit • Reply • Share ›



Anonymous • 4 days ago

HR's SPET Pilot Website says it is essential for managers to carefully consider how an employee's salary aligns with their relative qualifications and ability to fulfill the University's business needs. The auto-calculations of the SPET seem to be very much in pace with some type of Salary-Step Structure, possessing a very Unionized characteristic. Can HR tell us what will happen if the staff Unions do not agree to incorporate the SPET and 3rd Level Org Equity into their Unit Agreements and also explain different processes that will be used for Union and Non-Union staff?

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Anonymous • 3 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your question. Following the public comment period, HR will bargain the changes as required by the CBA with each union. Changes, if any, will be communicated to the campus community.

^ | v • Edit • Reply • Share ›



Tucker Colvin • 5 days ago

In terms of equity and hiring, one thing that is a challenge for our organization because we are tangential to a trade field that offers relatively high salaries without a college degree, is that there are not equivalencies for having on-the-job experience in place of a degree requirement for job titles that have a grade level that would offer competitive pay. Does HR plan on creating a mechanism to account for experience in exchange for a degree requirement? Similar to a previous comment on giving credit to journeyman licenses or apprenticeships, how do you suggest our organization provide competitive pay to someone who may not have a BS degree, but is more qualified for a job than someone who has a degree but less experience?

In a broader sense and relation to equity in pay and who gets to work at UNM, HR not having equivalencies for on-the-job experience and degrees hurts the university's diversity, equity, and inclusion goals and contrasts with language in UNM 2040 Goal Three, Policy 2720, and Policy 3210. In the US, 35% of people who identify as white have a bachelor's degree, versus 21% of Black Americans, 15% of Hispanic Americans, and 15% percent of Native Americans (<https://nces.ed.gov/program...> Because of the degree requirement for higher grade job titles and no easy way to exchange experience or other licenses, these historically marginalized communities continue to be marginalized by UNM.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Tucker Colvin • 3 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your feedback and questions. UNM does have some job classifications where experience can be interchanged for education, although, that does not apply to all jobs. Your feedback on this topic will be taken into consideration.

^ | v • Edit • Reply • Share ›

Show Me the Money • 5 days ago



Human Resources says Huron was specifically hired because of their expertise which is “who” they contracted to work on this project. They have said “what”, when” and “where” the policy change and SPET will have affects. But Human Resources never exactly provides us with the detail as to “how” realistically the University was going to make the Level 3 equity policy work with minimal disruption to departments' budgets. They have mentioned that the new Salary Placement and Equity Methodology will assist managers to ensure University funds are allocated in a prudent manner that will yield the greatest benefit to UNM, but Human Resources really avoids the whole funding matter as demonstrated by their polished information and simplistic responses. This is a very significant matter because the UNM community and stakeholders are now trying to come together to assess info and data and provide meaningful input to make a “good policy.” I think we need more detail. Please show us the money!

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Show Me the Money • 3 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank your feedback.

^ | v • Edit • Reply • Share ›



Harpo Faust • 6 days ago

4.3.5. Grade Change Because of Career Ladder

The wording is vague and unclear. Will tiered career ladders be implemented for all staff?

4.5. In-Range Salary Adjustments

There is no clarification of the percentage. Across campus this ranges from 7-20%, and should be standardized for 20%.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Harpo Faust • 3 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your feedback and question. Regarding 4.3.5, we are not proposing any changes to current policy, and Career Ladders remain available as a planned progression when a department has identified a business need for a higher-level position. There is no set percentage increase for In-Range Salary Adjustments, as those are dependent on the nature of the additional duties that are being assumed.

^ | v • Edit • Reply • Share ›



Pilot Tested • 6 days ago

My department has been in the SPET pilot for a while now, and we have come to understand and appreciate is that departments within our Level 3 organization have some very different business needs, workloads, and budgets. There are many cases where staff have many years of experience but support smaller areas and workloads while other staff, who have less years of experience and support larger areas and workloads. Equity at the at Level 3 organization will make little sense if the SPET will allow those staff with smaller workloads to unfairly benefit from this possible change in policy and increase in salary without looking at more of these details.

... | ...

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Pilot Tested • 3 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your feedback. It will be taken into consideration.

^ | v • Edit • Reply • Share ›



Cynthia • 6 days ago

Will there be a limit on the Salary Placement Review requests, similar to the Retention/Counter offers where an employee can only receive one every 24 months? Or will it really be at the Department discretion? I foresee multiple requests in the beginning in an attempt to increase salary for position that may not typically have a qualifying action such as a new hire triggering equity.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Cynthia • 3 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your question. Salary Placement Review requests will be at the department's discretion and will need to be supported at the department leadership level before requests are submitted to HR and further considered. There is no limit to the number of Salary Placement Reviews that departments may request.

^ | v • Edit • Reply • Share ›



Anonymous • 7 days ago

HR has never really understood the funding and developed budget process for a given Fiscal/Academic Year for departments. HR can say they have worked with stakeholders, a pilot program and HR liaisons on feedback that created the proposed policy revisions, however HR has never told us where the funding is going to come from to accomplish their proposed Level 3 equity policy revision to improve pay consistency. It looks like HR will also be taking on more of a "gatekeeper" status and have not yet told us who exactly will be reviewing justifications to SPET and Level 3rd ORG Equity exceptions. If we can't convince HR that our justifications meet their standards, whatever they are, there doesn't seem to be a way to move forward with a hire if we cannot identify the appropriate level of funding without placing some kind of ceilings on our employment action salaries. This new process could wreak havoc on our difficult time to fill staff position and bottleneck our employment actions even worse than the recently launched background check process is doing.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Anonymous • 3 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your feedback.

^ | v • Edit • Reply • Share ›



Questioning Lobo • 10 days ago

A few questions concerning Draft Policy 3500:

In 3.2 Internal Equity, am I to understand that the qualifying actions are what is listed in section 4. For

example 4.8, Counter Offers and Retention Offers. Previously an individual employee could obtain "offers of hire" as a personal competitive market analysis and hope to gain a "Counter Offer" from UNM. But if this process now counts as a qualifying action for Level 3 org equity adjustment, managers and HR will have to consider if the organization budget can support retaining the employee.

Additionally, 3.2 includes the wording, "Managers should also consider an incumbent's relevant competencies and documented job-related performance." For those of us that wish to exceed our performance, can we hope that we may begin to see performance based raises again? Could this be included somewhere under section 4 - Annual Increases?

Next question, there doesn't appear to be differentiation between degrees, ie field specific degrees. In Policy 3700: Education Benefits, sections 3.1 Eligible Courses and 3.2 Time Off, both reference "courses that are job related or related to a UNM job that the employee may reasonably aspire" and 3.2 references "the course is taken for academic credit toward a degree program or for professional development." So where is the motivation to get education in the field which one works if the SPET does not recognize the difference between degrees as they relate to the UNM job is currently in or reasonably aspires to obtain?

Policy 3500 should include wording to recognize apprenticeship and journeyman licensing programs similar to what experience field specific degrees represent.

Last question, if the SPET is only available to HR and managers, how are staff and faculty able to review and request initiation 3.2 Internal Equity adjustment? The concern is regarding within an organization where management has removed all degree requirements for hiring and has completely leveled every grades' pay regardless of experience and degree or non-degree status. Will there be an external organization check to ensure that the Internal Equity Adjustment is triggered with the qualifying actions listed? It is my hope that the proposed policy will help account for checking and balancing organizations that attempt to circumvent the equity adjustment process.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Questioning Lobo • 3 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your questions. Qualifying personnel actions that require an Internal Equity Review are listed in Section 3.2. Counter and Retention offers are not considered qualifying personnel actions and will not result in an equity evaluation.

We appreciate your feedback and question related to performance-based increases and will take them into consideration.

UNM's practice regarding degrees has not changed. Credit is given for completed degrees from an accredited institution regardless of specialty when qualifying for a position. Completed degrees above the minimum education requirement may be substituted for experience and management should account for this information when requesting a salary. Additional qualifications such as certifications or licensures may be considered by the department when determining an appropriate salary level and may request a salary above the recommended range in order to acknowledge the individual's additional qualifications. The SPET output is

required as part of the submission of any qualifying actions and will be reviewed by HR to ensure compliance with policy.

^ | v • Edit • Reply • Share ›



Anonymous • 10 days ago

I'm afraid the SPET will be used as a Human Resources' guiding force towards UNM Units on how much to pay staff despite some very different individual Budgets. Human Resources says we can justify exceptions to the SPET and Level 3 ORG Equity, however this will make them more of a "gatekeeper" and could bottleneck our employment actions. As Human Resources has tried to get their SPET message out, they have also been asserting the grave need to avoid any potential risks of salary related lawsuits without providing us with any statistics or detail to back up their claims of urgency.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Anonymous • 3 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your feedback.

^ | v • Edit • Reply • Share ›



Adiel Sanchez • 10 days ago

Any reason why the the SPET doesn't evaluate apprenticeship and journeyman's licensing in addition to experience on par with education in addition to experience? I have team members with Journeyman licenses and those aren't account for anywhere. Will this change anytime soon?

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Adiel Sanchez • 3 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your question. The university values the licensing and certifications employees have obtained; however, it is difficult to quantify the specific value of each license and certification in a consistent manner due to the vast range of criteria required to obtain such credentials. To recognize such credentials when not a minimum requirement of the classification, a department would reference the license or certification and how it relates to the position in the justification section of the SPET, which allows the department to indicate the reasoning for requesting to pay outside of the recommended range.

^ | v • Edit • Reply • Share ›



Texanna Martin • 11 days ago

Upon reviewing this policy and the addition of the SPET tool there is a need (as others have addressed) to clearly identify what a "Level 3 Organization" is with tools to help employee's identify the organization that they are affiliated with. Throughout the policy the term "manager" is applied, however many departments use "supervisor" to help with questions related to the listed supervisor of record, so it might be a good idea to add "supervisor or manager".

For 4.1.1 Increase Cost of Benefits it is not clear how the funds necessary are allocated. For example, a question that I received was do these costs come from the Annual Increases before the salary

increases are decided.

4.3.3 and 4.5 does not include information on the need to complete the Position Review Questionnaire or PRQ by departments for this request and the necessary approvals. It may be nice to include the language from the HR website "It is the responsibility of department management to request a review and evaluation of the job duties of an employee under these circumstances. HR will not accept requests originating directly from an employee."

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Texanna Martin • 10 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Hi Texanna, thank you for your feedback and suggestions. We will publish a list of level 3 organizations on the HR website so that it can be easily identified by employees and supervisors/managers. For the purpose of this policy, supervisor/managers/hiring officials are used interchangeably depending on the hiring unit/dept/org, which we can further clarify in our communications.

Regarding section 4.1.1, if the cost of benefits increases, the funds necessary to meet these increases are allocated before other increases in compensation are considered. This section of the policy has not changed from the current policy.

Regarding sections 4.3.3 and 4.5, specific process-related guidance will remain in the Compensation Guidelines, similar to the current state. Guidance and processes related to the qualifying actions referred to in this policy will be further outlined in the Recruitment Process Guide and Compensation Guidelines and posted on the Human Resources webpage.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Concerned • 11 days ago

We are seeing a job market that is extremely competitive right now. How often will the market studies be performed and the SPET updated? My department competes for applicants with other universities nationally. I have seen the SPET salaries and it currently is not comparable to what they are offering for the same duties we handle. In surveys to our UNM "customers", it is mentioned in comments that we should be paying our employees more in order to hire and retain good employees. The SPET salaries would have us paying less.

Also, as mentioned by others, having to have equity at Level 3 may not work as the same position across departments can have vastly different knowledge bases.

I am seeing a lot of extra work for department managers in having to do frequent justifications just to be able to hire employees or working to form new position titles in order to be competitive with other universities for the duties we currently handle.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Concerned • 10 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your comments and questions. We agree that maintaining a competitive salary structure is critical in this competitive environment. The grade minimums and midpoints of the current salary structure increased on July 1, 2022, and HR will continue to evaluate the structure on an annual basis and recommend changes as needed. The SPET updates automatically to reflect any changes made to job classifications and/or salary grades. As outlined in Section 3.1 of the proposed policy, departments have the flexibility to pay outside of the recommended range by providing appropriate justification to support the request.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Concerned Lobo • 12 days ago • edited

Well done, *****! You may have indeed found an alternative way to move UNM toward the goal of equity at a level 3 org and avoid the issue of persistent disparity between level 5 orgs over time. It is also a much better thought-out idea than Human Resources' plan which comes across as a careless and callous way to finally achieve their SPET Project as a part of their HR Strategic Plan Goal 3:

Technology shown at:

<https://hr.unm.edu/docs/hr/...>

Human Resources, did you even think about meeting with your stakeholders to come up with a gradual way of funding the goal of equity at a level 3 org?...because ***** just blew it out of the ballpark!

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Concerned Lobo • 10 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your comments and question. HR has worked extensively with various stakeholders throughout this process, including a comprehensive pilot program over the last year and a half and numerous meetings with unit leadership and HR liaisons, feedback from all of which informed the proposed policy revisions.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Concerned Lobo • 11 days ago

Please note that the moderator edited the above comment to hide the name of an employee. Hiding the employee name did not change the substance of the comment, and no other edits were made.

Please contact the Policy Office if you have questions or concerns regarding the moderator edit. Thank you.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Concerned Lobo • 12 days ago

Per the UNM Staff Pay Practice Study at: <https://hr.unm.edu/staff-pa...>, it looks like HR has been working on the SPET for a long period of time and it is also included within the HR Strategic Plan 2018-23 as Goal 3: Technology at: <https://hr.unm.edu/docs/hr/...> Also, it seems to have had some setbacks due to COVID and Remote Learning A/Y 2020-21. HR first introduced pilot Depts to the SPET during the Fall 2020. The pilot program was to have occurred from January 2021 – early 2022, with the intent

of implementing the new practice across the entire campus should have been launched during Spring 2022. It is worth noting that originally it seems the pilot program was to occur between January – fall 2021, with an anticipated roll out to the entire University in fall 2021. With the Depts now facing the new and sudden HR requirement for Background Checks, HR may want to consider having the SPET pilot continue and to include more Depts. HR needs to do a better job considering their clients needs and the hardships the Depts are now facing.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Concerned Lobo • 10 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your comments. You're correct that reforming staff pay practices has been a priority of HR for several years, and that the impact of the pandemic and associated competing priorities delayed the start of the pilot program and recommendations for campus-wide implementation. The pilot program has been active with broad participation for more than a full year and has been a valuable source of feedback that informed the proposed policy revisions. We believe the proposed revisions are important tools in improving UNM's ability to recruit and retain staff and want to make them available to departments campus-wide.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Concerned Lobo → unmpolicy • 10 days ago

HR did not address a thing about my concerns with the Depts now facing the new and sudden HR requirement for Background Checks, and their need to do a better job considering their clients' needs and the hardships the Depts are now facing. This appears to be just another HR deflection-tactic as they pivot to a belief that the SPET and proposed policy revisions are important tools in improving UNM's ability to recruit and retain staff. HR answers a question I did not ask but comes more across as just another opportunity for their campaign message!

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Anonymous • 12 days ago

There is no transparency and equity in Section 4.1 "Annual Increases". How does it work? Per cent or fixed amount? For example, 3% increase for Staff with \$50k is 3 times lower than 3% increase for Faculty with \$150k. So, Staff if in worse position to cover the rising living costs comparing to Faculty.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Anonymous • 10 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your question. Guidelines for annual staff salary increases are developed each year based on the amount of salary increase approved by the Board of Regents. For reference, the details of the FY22-23 increase guidelines are available here: <https://hr.unm.edu/mass-sal...>

^ | v • Reply • Share ›

Just the Facts • 14 days ago



HR has told us that if we identify a need to pay outside of the recommended SPET range in order to acknowledge the additional qualifications, we may submit a justification for a salary outside of the recommended SPET range. If we identify a need to pay outside of the proposed Level 3 equity policy in order to acknowledge the special circumstances of some highly paid employees, will we also be able to submit a justification for a salary not keeping within the Level 3 equity?

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Just the Facts • 10 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your questions. It's hard to answer with certainty without knowing the special circumstances you reference. But, in general, yes – departments may request salaries outside of the SPET range, or request salaries out of line with the SPET's equity recommendations. The justifications for these requests will be reviewed and evaluated by HR as part of the standard review process for the requested personnel action.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Just the Facts → unmpolicy • 19 hours ago

Thank you for your response, Human Resources, and letting us know that "departments may request salaries outside of the SPET range, or request salaries out of line with the SPET's equity recommendations. The justifications for these requests will be reviewed and evaluated by HR as part of the standard review process for the requested personnel action."

This justification information is clearly documented within Section 3.1 of the proposed policy that departments will have flexibility to pay outside of the SPET's recommended range by providing appropriate justification to support the request.

However, it is not clearly documented within Section 3.2 of the proposed policy that departments will have the flexibility to pay salaries out of line with the SPET's equity recommendations. IT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT THAT THE INFORMATION ALLOWING JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THESE REQUESTS WILL BE REVIEWED AND EVALUATED BY HR AS PART OF THE STANDARD REVIEW PROCESS OF THE REQUESTED PERSONNEL ACTION ALSO BE DOCUMENTED WITHIN SECTION 3.2 OF THE PROPOSED POLICY!

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



All About Statistics • 14 days ago

We understand that the SPET considers an employee's education and job-related experience in comparison to the minimum qualifications of the position. Because Hiring Managers currently determine the above information to calculate their employees' salaries, and they would give this very significant process-up, it is important that we all plainly understand the numbers behind the SPET's calculations. I am therefore again asking HR to be transparent and provide us all with the numbers behind the SPET's progression calculation (minimum qualifications, education, and years of related experience) that will automatically identify (for the Hiring Managers) a recommended range based on the position's salary grade within the UNM Salary Structure.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → All About Statistics • 10 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your comments. With the proposed process, hiring managers will continue to evaluate an employee's education and job-related experience. The primary change is that departments/hiring managers will enter this information into the SPET, which will provide a more tailored salary recommendation based on the evaluated qualifications.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



All About Statistics → unmpolicy • 10 days ago

I have asked twice for HR to be transparent and provide us all with the numbers behind the SPET's progression calculation (minimum qualifications, education, and years of related experience) that will automatically identify (for the Hiring Managers) a recommended range based on the position's salary grade within the UNM Salary Structure and once again HR has refused to do so by again attempting to using a common deflecting-tactic. I will let HR's vague responses to my questions stand as Exhibits A and B to the UNM Community.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Anna • 14 days ago

As the SPET data and methodology are opaque to employees, this policy change should be accompanied by robust documentation of how SPET functions and access for employees to review their compensation using SPET.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Anna • 10 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Hi Anna, thanks for your feedback. The SPET is designed as a tool to assist managers and hiring departments in setting appropriate salary levels and recommends a salary range based on the employee's years of education and job-related experience (as determined by the hiring department) and the minimum qualifications of the position.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Grace Faustino • 17 days ago

In relation to SPET tool, does the tool assign values to discipline based certifications the way it assigns values for traditional degrees?

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Grace Faustino • 17 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Hi Grace, thanks for your question. The SPET does not assign values for certifications or licensures. However, departments that identify a need to pay outside of the recommended

SPET range in order to acknowledge the additional qualifications may submit a request and justification for a salary outside of the recommended SPET range.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Patrick Bridges → unmpolicy • 17 days ago

Wouldn't this make it more time consuming and difficult to hire highly-qualified personnel, therefore making it harder to succeed in filling critical technical positions?

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Grace Faustino • 17 days ago

Section 5 of the policy that speaks to work hours. Can the policy provide additional guidance on how to manage hourly employees who are remote and out of state when it comes to tracking over time, breaks and extra comp? Section 3.1 of UAP 3305 does not provide clear guidelines around this.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Grace Faustino • 17 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Hi Grace, thanks for the question. While outside the scope of this policy, this issue will be addressed in more detail in the new Remote Work policy that is currently under development and will hopefully move to the comment phases of the policy process soon.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Megan Chibanga • 18 days ago

My department has been a part of the SPET pilot and I believe the SPET tool is a great strategy for improving equity and salaries for staff. I am in support of this policy change on the whole for the good I believe it does in changing pay practices on campus.

I also think it would be incredibly beneficial to reconsider using the level 3 orgs for equity comparisons at the time of hire. As I've been thinking about the prior responses we've received as we've shared this specific feedback, I have an additional suggestion to the level 3 v. level 5 question that has been posed.

Within a given fiscal year, equity adjustments are required at the level 5 org, and highly recommended, but not required, at the level 3 org within the fiscal year of the hire which triggered the equity adjustment. Then, during salary planning for the next fiscal year, any equity adjustments not already made within the level 3 org would have to be accounted for and completed as a part of budget development/salary planner process.

This would achieve the goal of equity at a level 3 org and avoid the issue of persistent disparity between level 5 orgs over time, but would allow for level 5 orgs to be able to function within their developed budgets for a given year and make the appropriate budget adjustments for the next year.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Concerned Lobo → Megan Chibanga • 11 days ago

Well done, Megan! You may have indeed found an alternative way to move UNM toward the goal of equity at a level 3 org and avoid the issue of persistent disparity between level 5 orgs over time. It is also a much better thought-out idea than Human Resources' plan which comes across as a careless and callus way to finally achieve their SPET Project as a part of their HR Strategic Plan Goal 3: Technology shown at:

<https://hr.unm.edu/docs/hr/...>

Human Resources, did you even think about meeting with your stakeholders to come up with a gradual way of funding the goal of equity at a level 3 org?...because Megan just blew it out of the ballpark!

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Concerned Lobo • 10 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by Human Resources:

Thank you for your comments and question. HR has worked extensively with various stakeholders throughout this process, including a comprehensive pilot program over the last year and a half and numerous meetings with unit leadership and HR liaisons, feedback from all of which informed the proposed policy revisions.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Megan Chibanga • 17 days ago

Please see response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Hi Megan, thanks so much for your feedback and suggestion. We'll take this into consideration as we evaluate all of the input we've received regarding the proposed change to the scope of equity reviews.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Patrick Bridges • 18 days ago

We have been using the SPET as part of the initial test and have, for some positions, found it to be quite troublesome and to complicate and delay hiring, particularly from some technical positions. These positions (e.g. Research Scientist positions) have large market variation in pay based on the specific discipline or subarea in which the staff member specializes. Enforcing SPET at level 3 groups equity checking across a very diverse set of departments, and ends up comparing salaries for staff who share titles but for technical responsibilities are in fact very different and for whom market pay rates are also very different. Without additional considerations, the only ways to address this (1) are submitting a SPET exception with every hire, (2) requiring departments to hire either well above or below market rate, or (3) creating a proliferation of new staff positions. All of these are likely undesirable outcomes

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Patrick Bridges • 17 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Hi Professor Bridges, thank you for your feedback. We agree that there is additional complexity for technical positions that share titles but work in different disciplines. Our recommendation in

these cases is in line with your first point, to provide a justification that supports the requested salary, both in cases where the requested salary may be outside the recommended range based on discipline-specific market variation, and in cases where internal equity adjustments may be inappropriate based on those same market variations. As part of formalizing and finalizing these new processes, we will be partnering with department and college administrators to review and improve processes to ensure we are providing appropriate support and to avoid delays in hiring.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Karen Roberts • 18 days ago

Suggested edits to policy 3500:

4.3.5. Grade Change Because of Career Ladder

A career ladder is a planned progression to a new job, usually at a higher grade, that is negotiated between an employee and ~~his or her~~ **their** manager...

(Above change suggested for inclusivity)

4.4. Acting or Interim Appointments

Employees designated as **having** Acting or Interim Appointments pursuant to UAP 3210 ("Staff Recruitment and Hiring") Section 5.6...

Thank you for providing this opportunity for comments.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod ➔ Karen Roberts • 17 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Hi Karen, thanks for your suggestions, we'll make these changes.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Lynn Judkins • 18 days ago

Is there a link to access the SPET?

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod ➔ Lynn Judkins • 17 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Hi Lynn, thanks for your question. Currently, access to the SPET is limited to the departments participating in the pilot program. Once it is finalized, then HR will develop the training and request process for appropriate departmental personnel to request access.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Anonymous ➔ Lynn Judkins • 18 days ago

I agree that it is a very good idea we be given an opportunity to see the SPET in order to provide practical and applicable comments as it takes a "properly informed" campus community to make good policy.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Anonymous • 17 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for this suggestion. While access to the SPET is limited to departments participating in the pilot program, we are in the process of developing a short demo of the tool that we will provide here shortly so that the campus community can see how it works and get a clearer sense of what is being proposed.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Anonymous → unmpolicy • 17 days ago

Thank you for letting us know that HR is preparing a short demo of the SPET tool so the campus community can see how it works and get a clearer sense of what is being proposed. Can you tell us if this demo be available before or after the end of this comment period on Oct. 23, 2022?

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



All About Statistics • 19 days ago

Thank you, HR for reiterating the Huron Consulting group is an industry leader in understanding of best practices and that Huron did not provide your unit with individual assessments of peer institutions' pay practices but only shared the information with your unit in aggregate form.

Because revising the UNM's Wage and Salary Administration Policy this is a large undertaking that has not occurred in recent memory, why did HR think it was not necessary to contact at least one or some of these peer institutions listed below to ask them the following: When did the peer institution begin their pay consistency & equity practices? How have these practices transformed their pay consistency and equity as of today? What practices worked out well and what did the peer institution have to change or what would the peer to differently (after all nothing is perfect the first time around)?

Additionally, is HR going to answer my other question and let us know what figures does the SPET uses to calculate fair and competitive salaries for staff? Right now, Departments determine staffs' salaries in accordance the job specifics and position budgets within their particular units and it's important that we all plainly and transparently understand the calculations behind the scenes that HR is proposing to reach pay consistency & equity.

Texas Tech
University of Utah
University of Tennessee
University of Kansas
University of Missouri
Texas A&M
University of Washington
Virginia Commonwealth University
Penn State University
University of Virginia
University of Florida
University of Michigan

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → All About Statistics • 17 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your questions and your feedback. Huron was specifically hired to conduct the review and assessment of peer practices because of their expertise, and HR relied upon Huron's findings along with their expertise from working with numerous universities across the nation to formulate proposed revisions to UAP 3500. In addition, the proposed revisions are based on our experiences over the past year working directly with units across campus that participated in our pilot program.

The SPET considers an employee's education and job-related experience in comparison to the minimum qualifications of the position. A progression calculation then uses these inputs (minimum qualifications, education, and years of related experience) to identify a recommended range based on the position's salary grade within the UNM Salary Structure.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Anonymous • 21 days ago

Human Resources has stated that it is essential for managers to consider how an employee's salary aligns with their relative qualifications and ability to fulfill the University's business needs and to ensure University funds are allocated in a prudent manner that will yield the greatest benefit to UNM. It is therefore essential Human Resources share with us on how the SPET Pilot reached these serious goals.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Anonymous • 17 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your feedback. With the support of UNM Leadership, HR engaged Huron Consulting to conduct a comprehensive review of our pay practices and compensation strategies. HR articulated two overarching goals for this review: To identify approaches to enhance flexibility in determining employee salary levels, and to ensure consistency in administering pay equity across the university. The Pilot process undertaken in 2021, which included updated compensation guidelines and the utilization of the Salary Placement and Equity Tool, reflects UNM's implementation of Huron's recommendations to achieve the identified goals. Our experience with the pilot process and feedback received from participating departments informed the development of the proposed revisions to UAP 3500 and modifications to the Salary Placement and Equity Tool. This approach offers greater flexibility and consistency in offering competitive salaries, improving our ability to attract, hire, and retain employees.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



I'd Rather post as guest • 24 days ago

In reference to section 4.6, unless the transfer is the result of an OEO investigation and the "transfer" is an intervention to protect the staff, and the transfer is no fault or wish of the staff then section 3.2 should apply.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → I'd Rather post as guest • 17 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your feedback. Transfers as defined in Section 4.6 of the proposed revisions, are subject to an equity review as provided in Section 3.2.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



I'd Rather post as guest • 24 days ago

In reference to section 4.6 - there should be an exception when the lateral transfer is made forceful as part of the intervention due to an OEO investigation is not a totally up to the employee, and the transfer is for the "protection" of the employee. in this case then section 3.2 should apply.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → I'd Rather post as guest • 17 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your feedback. Based on the proposed revisions, Transfers as defined in Section 4.6 are subject to an equity review as provided in Section 3.2.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



All About Statistics • 25 days ago

Right now, Departments determine staffs' salaries, using the Equity Grid form if necessary. Can HR tell us what figures does the SPET use to calculate fair and competitive salaries for staff?

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → All About Statistics • 17 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your question. The SPET considers an employee's education and job-related experience in comparison to the minimum qualifications of the position. A progression calculation then uses these inputs (minimum qualifications, education, and years of related experience) to identify a recommended range based on the position's salary grade within the UNM Salary Structure.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



All About Statistics • 25 days ago

HR mentions that back in December 2019, UNM hired the Huron Consulting group and in collaboration with HR, looked at how to best achieve consistency and equity in pay across UNM and then the UNM Core Team identified a set of 12 benchmark peer institutions through a review of applicable Office of Institutional Analytics peers. My questions are: When did these peer institutions begin their pay consistency & equity practices? How have these practices transformed their pay consistency and equity as of today? What practices worked out well and what did the peers have to change or what would the peers do differently (after all nothing is perfect the first time around)?

Texas Tech

University of Utah

University of Tennessee

University of Kansas
University of Missouri
Texas A&M
University of Washington
Virginia Commonwealth University
Penn State University
University of Virginia
University of Florida
University of Michigan

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → All About Statistics • 21 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your questions. Huron is an industry leader in this area and was selected for their expertise and thorough understanding of best practices. Huron's assessment of peer institutions' pay practices were incorporated into their recommendations, but only shared with UNM in aggregate, so we do not have the specific details you mention.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Anonymous • a month ago

Regarding 4.7 Salary Placement Review: "Departments may request salary placement review when there are concerns that a current employee's salary level is inconsistent with the salary placement parameters identified by the Salary Placement and Equity Tool..." and "If the salary placement review results in a recommended salary increase... the hiring department must consult with Level 3 organization management and HR to determine appropriate salary adjustments for existing employees or if a subsequent review is needed."

- What happens if a salary placement review determines that an existing employee's salary is higher than the range that SPET identifies? Do other employees in the level 3 org with the same job title, education, and quals get pay increases to the same salary that is above the SPET recommended range? Does the employee whose salary was reviewed and found to be above the SPET recommended range get a decrease in pay? The policy language "appropriate salary adjustments" is vague.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Anonymous • 21 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your questions. Salaries will not be reduced based on a Salary Placement Review or due to equity adjustments. Based on the scenario you described, this request would not result in a qualifying personnel action (since their salary is not being changed) and therefore would not require a review of the salaries of the other employees. Thank you for your feedback regarding the policy language.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›

Debbie Montoya → Anonymous • 25 days ago



What if it is requested to reporting manager and follow up is not completed by management?
What grounds does an employee have to get this reviewed?

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod ➔ Debbie Montoya • 21 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your question. Requests for salary reviews or adjustments are at management's discretion and must be submitted to HR by departments. Employees should discuss salary requests or concerns with their supervisor and department.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Let's Get It Right • a month ago

HR needs to also make some kind of effort on describing and explaining what a "Level 3 organization" is, and where departments may easily access this information if HR wants their proposed equity at the at Level 3 organization to have a better chance at a successful and effective outcome.

Here is a sample of Level 3 organizations:

AAA President Admin Indpnt Office
AAB Information Technology Services
AAC UNM West and Branch Initiatives
AAD VP for Equity and Inclusion
ABA Provost Administrative Units
ABB University College UC
ABC School of Public Administration
ABD VP for Equity & Inclusion
ABE VP Division of Enrollment Mgmt
ABG College of Fine Arts CFA
ABH College of Arts & Sciences A&S
ABI Anderson Schools of Management ASM
ABJ College of Ed & Human Science COEHS

[see more](#)

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod ➔ Let's Get It Right • 21 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your feedback and suggestion. We will publish a list of level 3 organizations on the HR website so that it is clear the scope of applying internal equity across individual colleges/schools/divisions.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Grace Faustino ➔ Let's Get It Right • a month ago

So, based on the policy as drafted, there could still be variance for the same position/grade between School of Engineering and College of Arts and Sciences.

. | . . • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Grace Faustino • 21 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your question. Yes, you are correct. The proposed change broadens the scope of equity from the individual department (current state) to the college/school/division. The proposed revisions do not implement a university-wide equity review process.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Let's Get It Right → Grace Faustino • a month ago

You are correct. HR's "equity at the Level 3 organization" simple wording does not translate very well within the proposed drafted policy; which is why HR need to communicate this message to the UNM community.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Debbie Montoya • a month ago

Policy 3500 should detail employees who are UNM employees while supporting other divisions under the umbrella of HSC, UNMMG & UNM Hospital. Employees are hired/transferred and paid under UNM policy/pay scale, but support other divisions while employees (UNM Hospital) are paid a significant amount of higher wages as equal jobs but not given same job title. Although, UNM has more benefits like retirement & etc, the pay scale is not equal with UH Hospital employees receiving bonus payouts per calendar year that are not considered as their benefits. HR should be more accountable to review employee wages in these settings because offsite management will not assist employees and only take advantage.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Debbie Montoya • 21 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your feedback. We will take them under consideration.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



anonymous • a month ago

If benefits have monetary value, as stated in the beginning of this policy, then staff/recruits that do not enroll in UNM health plans because they are covered under another plan (i.e. through partner, Medicare, etc.) should be able to request a the "monetary value" of these benefits be added to their salary. If staff and recruits are to "consider this value when reviewing compensation" then those not enrolled in health benefits are receiving lower compensation than their peers. Providing the employer portion of costs to an employee is a common practice at other organizations and supports the argument that they have "monetary value." If the value cannot be added to their compensation, than these benefits do not have monetary value to the employee/recruit.

Please provide clarification about who will be responsible for various approvals. In most cases, the policy indicates salary changes, exceptions, etc. will be "approved by HR" or "determined in consultation with HR." The exception is in section 3.2 where there is a clearly indication of who must

approve concerns pertaining to equity. We have had situations where we work extensively with our HR Consultant to compose a job post, complete hiring paper work, and determine salary based on our needs and the candidate only to have it rejected by those higher up in HR. This is inefficient and an incredible waste of time and money (given that everyone was paid for the months spent on this and all the work was useless). It is important to know 1) who has the authority to grant approval and 2) that this process does not require many layers of bureaucracy, which inevitably leads to long delays and wasted time.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → anonymous • 21 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your feedback and question. The specific approvals needed are dependent on the type of personnel action (competitive hire, reclassification, career ladder, etc.) and are the same approvals needed for the current process. We are constantly working within HR to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of our review and approval processes to minimize unnecessary delays.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Grace Faustino • a month ago

Section 4.7 says a department can initiate a Salary Review. Can an employee request a salary review through the department? Is there training offered for departmental hr agents on the SPET Tool?

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Grace Faustino • 21 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your questions. Requests for salary reviews or adjustments must be submitted to HR by departments. Employees should discuss salary requests or concerns with their supervisor and department. Once the proposed policy revisions are finalized and approved, HR will begin the process of training HR Agents and departmental staff on the SPET and new processes.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Grace Faustino • a month ago

Will this policy establish a salary baseline for all level 3 Orgs based on the current cap for grade/job family? Or will equity only be triggered when a hire/promotion/reclass etc happens in the Org Level 3?

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Grace Faustino • 21 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your questions. No, there will be no baseline review or adjustments. Equity reviews are only conducted when there is a qualifying personnel action that "triggers" a review, such as new hire, reclassification, career ladder, etc.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Anonymous • a month ago

If the Salary Placement Equity Tool process will be adopted as part of a UNM Policy and HR Compensation Guideline, wouldn't justifications to pay above or below the recommended salary ranges provided by the SPET be considered as exclusions or exceptions to this process and therefore wouldn't that mean these justifications for exceptions should be rare? The proposed Policy also says these rare justifications will be approved by HR. At what level will HR be reviewing and approving them (i.e. HR Analyst, HR Consultant, HR Mgr, HR Compensation, HR Assoc. VP)? This information needs to be clearer and HR has not fully communicated it especially if it may delay hires, reclassifications, career ladders, etc. and HR is only be able to approve justifications on a case by case and infrequent basis.

1 ^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod ➔ Anonymous • 21 days ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your feedback and questions. A requested salary outside of the recommended range is not considered an exception to policy and/or guidelines. The specific approvals needed are dependent on the type of personnel action (competitive hire, reclassification, career ladder, etc.) and are the same approvals needed for the current process.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Anonymous • a month ago

What are the implications and complications to UNM's Bargaining Units with regard to the 3rd Level ORG Equity?

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod ➔ Anonymous • a month ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your question. Once the public comment period has concluded and a final draft of the policy revisions is available, HR will bargain the changes as required by the CBA with each staff union.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Anonymous ➔ unmpolicy • a month ago

So it appears there is a very real possibility of UNM having two very different types of Salary Equity policies and processes (one for union and one for non-union) if a similar agreement is not reached with each staff union to uphold the proposed 3rd Level ORG Equity. The current Salary Equity policies and processes for union and non-union staff are very similar, however there is a clear possibility that this proposed revision can make an already challenging situation for UNM units to become even more complicated and complex!

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Anonymous • a month ago

"Benefits have a monetary value and both the University and employee should consider this value when reviewing compensation"

A little tiresome that UNM continuously emphasizes this when a) the benefits aren't amazing compared to similar-sized or even many smaller employers, and b) my landlord still refuses to accept benefits in lieu of rent.

Rant aside, do sections 2 through 4.8 all apply to both hourly and salaried employees?

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Anonymous • a month ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your question. Yes, sections 2 through 4.8 of UAP 3500 apply to both hourly and salaried employees and are subject to the requirements for the specific personnel action.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Concerned Lobo • a month ago

There has been much communicated inferences (the most recent seems to have occurred at UNM's recent Budget Leadership Team Meeting) that the proposed SPET and 3rd Level Organization Equity process is already "a done deal." This raises a much more serious issue questioning the integrity of UNM's Campus Review-and-Comment procedures in general. This appears to go against the Policy Office's endorsement and motto that "it takes a campus community to make good policy."

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Concerned Lobo • a month ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for sharing your concerns. Campus community input plays a critical role in policy revisions and we encourage you to share your feedback. Following the 30 day public comment period, feedback will be reviewed and considered for additional changes.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Concerned Lobo • a month ago

Thank you for sharing your concerns about the integrity of the policy all-campus review and comment procedures. I am not familiar with the inferences you suggest regarding our proposed policy revisions being "a done deal;" and please know that we are truly interested in your feedback. Campus input is critical to making good policy. All input will be shared with the core group involved in the development of the draft, who then will review the comments received and, as appropriate, draft additional changes to the policy. The Policy Office will continue to work to try to engage stakeholders and solicit input on proposed policy revisions and new policy drafts.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Grace Faustino → unmpolicy • a month ago

This might have been the reference for the above comment by Concerned Lobo. The SPET tool has been piloted prior to this policy. See <https://hr.unm.edu/salary-p...>

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



Anonymous • a month ago

Section 3.1 has A written justification for all salaries outside HR's salary placement parameters must be submitted with the qualifying personnel action request and be approved by HR. - do these need to be signed by Deans, Directors, EVP?

Section 3.2 - so an incumbent's job performance can be the determining factor for a higher salary than another employee with the same job title, same education and experience?

Section 4.3.3 & 4.3.5 - Are we still limited to 10% per grade increase

^ | v • Reply • Share ›



unmpolicy Mod → Anonymous • a month ago

Please see the response below, provided by the Division of Human Resources:

Thank you for your questions.

In reference to Section 3.1, there is no additional departmental approval required. Requests for a salary outside of the recommended range are subject to the specific approval requirements of each action.

In reference to Section 3.2, yes, this is consistent with current policy.

In reference to Sections 4.3.3 and 4.3.5, no, these actions will be evaluated based on the criteria and process outlined in Section 3.1 rather than the current practice of 10% per grade.

^ | v • Reply • Share ›