

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. *The date on the last Minutes Draft that was sent out should be changed to January 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

- i. Looking at pay data for peers, looking at national data
- h. Mercer Benefits Valuation
 - i. Insurance benefits, retirement, time away, tuition programs
 - ii. Benchmark actuarial values to 10 of 11 academic peers (missed the University of Denver)
- i. Preference Study
 - i. 875 faculty and staff completed the survey for a response rate of 61%
 - ii. Results merged into late February Mercer report to E team
 - iii. Support statistical output with Focus Group feedback (story behind the numbers – opportunity for people to speak)
- j. Focus Group – January 25, 2011
- k. Concerns/Suggestions
 - i. Suggestion for an online focus group or online questions, always open
 - ii. Concern about “filling out” the data with these focus groups
 - iii. Concern about issues of transparency
 - iv. Matt will come back later in the year and discuss the results in detail to us.

4. Academic Assembly by-laws revisited (Allison Henrich & Paul Fontana)

- a. Memo passed out with proposed amendments – draft, to have discussions about
- b. Clarification of FTEs versus totals on the chart
- c. What should be the base number for representatives?
 - i. Just proportional on school/college level, not on other aspects
 - ii. Representative body of the faculty is the goal
 - iii. Full-time non-tenured track faculty should be incorporated
 - iv. Should part-time faculty be included? At least given the opportunity.
 - v. We want representation, but not overrepresentation of various groups.
 - vi. Matteo Ricci needs a representative. (Allison emailed the Dean to see what they want)
 - vii. The Law School and STM currently share 2 proportional reps – do we need separate ones?
 - viii. Should we have a larger group to lighten the load of what we do?
- d. Course release time to serve on this committee
 - i. What does this mean exactly? More specific about true release times
 - ii. The commitment to the assembly needs to be fully disclosed – meet twice a month (more commitment than anticipated?)
- e. Suggestions
 - i. At large positions?
 - ii. The “ten day” rule (John Strait) – any items to be published to all members of the assembly is sent out at least ten days prior to the meeting. This could be a useful tool, because we don’t need to have a full discussion about some issues.
 - iii. Try to get agenda out at least a week before, but things do come up. Recognize that we need significant lead time when planning for upcoming deadlines – meetings where a lot needs to get discussed and voted upon.

- 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-masters degree is being offered for MSN graduates (opportunity to get post-masters completion in DNP)
 - iii. By 2015, have tracks to continuously stay enrolled from the BSN level to DNP (full bachelorette to DNP track)
- f. VOTE to adopt the DNP Program and forward to the Provost
 - i. Unanimous **yes** on the behalf of Academic Assembly.