

Academic Assembly
January 24, 2011
1:30-3:30pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: John Weaver, Kristen Shuyler, Mary Ann Bozzette, Mary Rose Bumpus, Charles Lawrence, Jason Wirth, William Kangas, Chips Chipalkatti, Paul Fontana, Allison Henrich, Katherine Raichle, Mary Graham, Francisco Guerrero, David Reid, Rob Rutherford, Sonora Jha, Jacquelyn Miller, Joseph Harrison, John Strait, Karen Feldt, Jacqueline Goade.

Guests: Matt Philip (HR), Janiece DeSocio (DNP), Azita Emami (DNP)

1. Welcome

2. Minutes from 1/10/11 were reviewed. *T* ~~MD~~ ~~1/10~~
~~1/10~~ 10, 2011.

3. Update on Compensation and Faculty Focus Groups from HR (Matt Philip)



2011-01-24
Academic Assembly

- a. Mercer is the HR Consultant for this Survey on Compensation. The data is in, but they are requesting focus groups with faculty to put meat behind the numbers.
- b. Faculty members are randomly selected for these focus groups.
- c. HR wants to review not strictly the pay issue, but all things that motivate/attract people to work at SU (pay, benefits, and other appreciations) to observe our competitive positioning among others.
- d. Everything is getting pulled together soon in order to think about the next steps and overall strategy.
- e. Overall study (Faculty/Staff Benchmark Pay & Benefits)
 - i. Convergence of market data for pay/benefits with internal perspectives
 - ii. Anticipated next steps: set strategy, establish priorities in context of annual planning and shift to plan design
- f. Pay Benchmarking
 - i. To make sure pay levels are competitive
 - ii. 125 ranks within disciplines and 75 staff positions, about 50%
 - iii. Higher ed and general industry market data -- as a point of reference (such as CUPA)
 - iv. Past 3 weeks, HR has been reviewing Mercer's report of anomalies (where high/low against market, etc.)
 - v. Selecting market comparators and weighting of those comparators
>breaking down the reports – private vs. public higher ed for example
 - vi. Mercer reports to the E Team in late February
- g. Market Comparison Groups

- iv. ACTION: Email particular amendments/comments to Allison and Paul for revisions after looking through their memo. They will have a new revision for the next meeting.

5. Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) Review (Janiece DeSocio & Azita Emami)

- a. Program Review Committee wrote memo regarding the DNP – took the data, strengths and weaknesses, and basic materials
 - i. The biggest concern raised was having enough **resources**.
- b. Competitive disadvantages: nursing requires you stay current in the field, as if you were a practitioner
- c. Increases in salary and support services – work load is high and competitive market is not good
 - i. “Double whammy” – increased competitive market nationally, increased competitive market in the private sector, which pays faculty better
 - ii. UW, WSU, Oregon Health & Sciences, other sister colleges of nursing – all competitors in DNP
- d. Recommendation to Academic Assembly from Program Review Committee
 - i. Approve the program, but express strong concerns about availability of resources
- e. Future goals
 - i. By the 5th year, the DNP is hoping to be all online to attract more students.
 - ii. First, a post