

2008 Staff Compensation Review Project - Minutes

Fourth Meeting – July 17, 2008

Inman Room 407

Members Present:

Paula Gill
Sally McKay
Jason Chandler
Tina Hunt Frost
Mike Bannon
Mark Grones
Donna Gwaltney
LaKiesha Armstrong
Andrew Johnston
Millicent Jolly
Mike Umphres, Compensation Advantage

Members Absent:

Jimmy Davis
David Fish – no longer Belmont employee

The group began a discussion of ranking all staff jobs based on the 5 critical factors that are used to differentiate job groups at Belmont University:

- Scope and complexity of the job
- Financial impact
- Interpersonal focus, customer orientation and communications
- Leadership responsibility
- Education, knowledge and skills

Mike Umphres discussed the ground rules (see attached) for the ranking exercise for job titles which focuses on reviewing the job and not the person in the job. The group was given a list that was presorted using the current compensation groups and alphabetized by job title. The decision was made to not discuss coaching jobs or jobs in Centers at this point.

Many jobs held the same rank and the group reviewed and ranked approximately half of the staff jobs. Jimmy Davis had sent his ranking order and Mike Umphres also reviewed it during the discussion. The suggestion was made for Mike, Donna and Sally to review the administrative titles and presort them for the group to review and edit for the next meeting. Responsibilities for the next meeting are:

- Complete the ranking of staff jobs
- Review titling system for administrative support positions. Review these jobs and the integration with budget management and admission support responsibilities
- Discuss titling templates for other job families

The next meeting was set for July 24, 2008 at 1:00 pm in Inman room 407.

Ground Rules

Ranking all Jobs at Belmont

Our objective today is to reflect the internal value Belmont University places on all current jobs by placing job titles in order from most impactful to less impactful. To do this effectively we must remember the following ground rules.

1. Focus on the job

We are placing **jobs** in rank order not employees. The performance level of incumbents does not have any bearing on the value of the work performed.

2. Volume of work does not equal responsibility

Just because there is a lot of work to be completed does not necessarily translate to significant decisions being made. We need to focus on the Critical Factors as we think about each job.

3. Focus on the job

We are placing **jobs** in rank order not employees. The personality of the incumbent does not have any bearing on the value of the work performed.

4. Use Critical factors Holistically

As we consider each job, we should find that each factor will have different weight by job. We are not to assign values to the factors but rather compare the whole job against other similar jobs.

5. All factors have equal value

Each of the 5 Critical Factors have the same relative value.

6. Focus on the job

We are placing **jobs** in rank order not employees. The resume of the incumbent does not have any bearing on the value of the work performed.