

# UNIVERSITY *of* ALASKA

---

## Faculty Alliance

Friday, December 14, 2007, 10:30am – noon by audio conference  
Fairbanks site: Carter Conference Room, Butrovich Building  
Bridge #1-800-893-8850, pin 2151251

### Draft Minutes

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Members present:

Bogdan Hoanca, Chair, Faculty Alliance and President, UAA Faculty Senate  
Jon Genetti, President, UAF Faculty Senate  
Cathy Connor, President, UAS Faculty Senate  
Shirish Patil, Past Alliance Chair and Past President, UAF Faculty Senate  
Jill Dumesnil, President-elect, UAS Faculty Senate  
Anne Bridges, 1<sup>st</sup> Vice President, UAA Faculty Senate  
Genie Babb, Chair, UAA Faculty Senate Graduate Affairs Board

Executive Officer: Pat Ivey

2. Adopt Agenda

**MOTION:** passed

“The Faculty Alliance moves to adopt the agenda. This action is effective December 14, 2008.”

3. Approve November 16, 2007 minutes  
<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/Minutes/2007/11-16.pdf>

**MOTION:** passed

“The Faculty Alliance moves to approve the minutes from the November 16, 2007 meeting. This action is effective December 14, 2007.”

4. Report from the Chair – *Bogdan Hoanca*

In the interest of time, reports will be given under relevant agenda items.

5. Vice President for Academic Affairs – *Dan Julius (standing agenda item)*

Pat Ivey was instructed to confirm Alliance meetings on Dr. Julius's schedule.

6. Old Business

6.1. External Administrative Review Status

The title should be changed to "Internal Administrative Review" of administration as opposed to the external review the Board of Regents is discussing that would focus on state needs. Bogdan Hoanca reported that Bill Spindle was expecting the draft report by December 15, but further investigation revealed that MacTaggart and Rogers will be working on it over the holiday break. The Board of Regents intends to wait for the MacTaggart report before proceeding.

6.2 Student Success Update

<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/Minutes/2007/11-16.pdf>

The statewide Student Success Task Force meets for the first time on December 19 in Fairbanks and a full report will be scheduled for the February Alliance meeting.

On the campus/MAU scene, UAA is focusing on advising and placement, and received data from statewide institutional research on student educational goals which was shared with the Alliance. UAF has an ad hoc group looking at the NSSE survey results. It is expected that the group will produce a draft report in January and the final report in February. Genetti will share the report with the Alliance.

The Alliance members will discuss the disappointing administrative delay in implementing the mandatory student survey with the task force at that time. The Alliance wanted the survey to be kept simple, but administrative discussions are leaning toward making the survey too complex. The Alliance will draft exactly what it wants on the survey, and Bogdan Hoanca will discuss the matter with Vice President Julius. The Alliance hoped the survey as is could be made mandatory beginning Fall 2008 at the very latest.

6.3 Alliance Constitution and Bylaws Review

Final Draft

<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-12-14.constitution-final.pdf>

<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-12-14-finalbylaws.pdf>

UAS Faculty Senate approved the proposed changes to the Alliance constitution and bylaws, The UAF Faculty Senate delegated approval to the senate president and president-elect. UAA Faculty Senate has not yet acted on the proposed changes but UAA Alliance members agreed that the Alliance could proceed to vote on approval of the proposed changes.



**MOTION:** passed unanimously

"The Faculty Alliance moves to approve the proposed changes to the Alliance Constitution and Bylaws. This action is effective December 14, 2007."

YES

NO

ABSTAIN

Bogdan Hoanca  
Anne Bridges  
Genie Babb  
Jill Dumesnil  
Cathy Connor  
Shirish Patil  
Jon Genetti

6.4 **ORP Update**

<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-12-03.JI-ORPmemo.pdf>

The Alliance discussed the response from Jim Johnsen, indicating the response was disappointing but predictable.

6.5 **Other Old Business**

There was no other old business

7. **New Business**

7.1 **Electronic Faculty Activity Report**

<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-11-27.efarupdate.pdf>

<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-11-27.CleanActivityReport.pdf>

The Alliance believes that the faculty input sought and received during the implementation of the pilot project was largely ignored. UAA and UAS provosts do not find the activity report useful. The UAF provost does want to use the activity report. The cost is the same for one MAU as for three and is costly.

**MOTION:** passed

"Because faculty input has been largely ignored in the development of the faculty activity report model, the Faculty Alliance moves that the faculty activity report project be abandoned. This action is effective December 14, 2007."

7.2 **Draft Plan for Distance Education**

<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-12-03.draftplan-distance-ed.pdf>

Alliance members expressed serious concerns about the draft plan. However, it was revealed that this was a very early draft and that the final draft would look very different. The Alliance believes development of the draft plan should be faculty-driven and that the Alliance should review it before ETT or SAC acts on it.

7.3 Establish Policy on Retention of Course Records  
<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-11-30.retaincourserecords.pdf>

Dan Julius discovered that the university does not have a uniform policy on records retention. One MAU has an official policy but the other two do not. The OIT currently retains electronic records, including Blackboard, in perpetuity, but there is also the question of faculty records. If a faculty member grades a paper and retains that paper without giving the student an opportunity to take it back, how long should that faculty retain the records (for grievance purposes primarily.)

If the issue is primarily an IT issue, the provosts can handle it. If this is also a faculty issue, then the issue goes to the senates.

The Alliance directed Chair Hoanca to reiterate to provosts, Dan Julius, and the other statewide staff how critical it is to notify faculty of Council meetings in a timely manner. Many Council meetings do not occur on a regular schedule, are announced with minimal warning and do not allow faculty representatives enough an opportunity to attend.

7.4 Student Educational Goals Analysis Attachment 7.4  
<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-12-06.ed-goal-Bogdan.pdf>  
<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-12-06.2006earnings-by-career-cluster.pdf>  
<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-12-06.earnings-by-careercluster-and-MAU.pdf>  
<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-12-06.earnings-by-careercluster-MAU-program.pdf>  
<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-12-06.residents-in-degree-related-jobs.pdf>  
<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-12-06.residents-in-nondegree-related-jobs.pdf>  
<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-12-06.student-reported-goals-analysis.pdf>

Shirish Patil will analyze the data in January and report to the Alliance in February.

7.5 Other New Business

7.5.1 Retirement Committee

Mike Humphrey apparently advised that the Retirement Committee, while dormant for some time, might be meeting in December. However, the date has been changed to some time in January.

Jon Genetti is the Alliance liaison to the retirement committee and Mike Humphrey will be reminded to include Jon on the retirement committee meeting notices distribution list.

8. Reports - Administrative Councils

8.1 Systemwide Academic Council

Hoanca reported that SAC considered some occupational endorsements and that Dan Julius would be doing a lot of policy work. Hoanca was asked to advise



provosts and through Dan Julius, the other statewide academic staff about the importance of notifying faculty of these meetings in a timely manner.

8.2 Human Resources Council

Jill Dumesnil said she has received nothing from the HRC for a while now and will check with Beth Behner to see if she is still on the distribution list.

8.3 Ed Tech Team – *See Item 7.2 above.*

December 10, 2007 ETT Meeting

<http://gov.alaska.edu/faculty/2007-12-10.ETT-meeting.pdf>

ETT Faculty Input Committee

<http://gov.alaska.edu/faculty/2007-11-09.ETT-FacultyInputCommittee.pdf>

8.4 Instructional Technology Council

Attachment 8.4

<http://www.alaska.edu/itc/meetings/>

ITC was not discussed.

8.5 Research Advisory Council

RAC has not met since last meeting. However, during the Business Council meeting, SAC and RAC were invited to discuss the PBB process and whether or not it was useful. No one from RAC was able to attend.

8.6 Business Council

<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-12-04.buscouncilagenda.pdf>

Cathy Connor was unable to join the meeting because she had been given the wrong bridge number and pin. It was noted however that sustainability was on the Business Council agenda. Jill Dumesnil recommended that the Alliance should take up sustainability next year.

8.7 Student Services Council


The Student Services Council will meet on December 18. It was noted that usually very little notice was given before meetings which makes it difficult for faculty to attend.

9. Senate Reports UAA UAF and UAS

UAA Faculty Senate is working on constitution and bylaws, changes to its faculty evaluation for promotion and tenure. Some changes will have to be brought before the unions.

UAF Faculty Senate finally garnered enough support to review the core of general education requirements every five years, and continues to deal with problems associated with plus or minus grading.

UAS Faculty Senate reviewed the ETT draft plan for distance education, approved the Alliance constitution and bylaw changes and is taking up sustainability as an issue.

- 
10. Agenda items for February 15, 2008 meeting, 10:30am-noon – audio conference

Agenda items should be submitted to Bogdan and/or Pat Ivey ten days in advance of the meeting. Pat will poll the members as to their availability to meet during the spring semester.

11. Other Items of Interest

There were no other items of interest.

12. Comments

There were no additional comments.

13. Adjourn – The meeting was adjourned at 11:50am.

*Approved by the Alliance, April 8, 1994. Revised 1997-1998 to change name of UAS Faculty Senate to Faculty Council at request of UAS Faculty Council.*

**2007 AMENDMENTS:** FIRST READING OCTOBER 18, 2007, MOSTLY EDITORIAL AND TO CHANGE UAS FACULTY COUNCIL BACK TO UAS FACULTY SENATE AND FIX OTHER OUTDATED TERMINOLOGY. ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS FOR SECOND READING NOVEMBER 16, 2007, INCLUDE MORE EDITORIAL CHANGES AND SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES TO ARTICLE IV.E. TO INCLUDE PROVISIONS FOR A CHAIR-ELECT, AND REPLACEMENT OF ARTICLES IX AND X TO COMPLY WITH GOVERNANCE REGULATION DEVELOPED BY GOVERNANCE AND APPROVED BY PRESIDENT 8/31/2006. NOVEMBER 16, 2007 CHANGES INCLUDE REPLACING ARTICLE IX WITH "*The review and transmittal of actions from the Alliance shall be done according to Regulation 03.01.010.*"

## University of Alaska

### Faculty Alliance

# Constitution

## ARTICLE I. INTENT

It is the intent of the Board of Regents: 1) that the faculty shall share in the governance of the university, 2) that shared governance is an integral part of the business of the university, and 3) that participators in shared governance are empowered by the Board of Regents to carry out their governance responsibilities to the best of their abilities without interference or fear of reprisal.

## ARTICLE II. NAME

The Board of Regents hereby establishes a mechanism for faculty system governance consisting of the Faculty Alliance, hereinafter "Alliance."

## ARTICLE III. AUTHORITY, PURPOSES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

### A. Authority

The Faculty Alliance receives its authority by policy 03.01.01 of the University of Alaska Board of Regents which derives its authority from the Constitution and statutes of the State of Alaska. The Alliance shall carry out its functions subject to the authority of the Board of Regents and the President of the University.

### B. Purposes

#### 1. Representation

To provide official representation for the faculty of the University of Alaska in matters which affect the general welfare of the University and its educational purposes and effectiveness.

2. Consultation

To provide consultation to the President of the University and the Board of Regents.

3. Communication

To serve as an instrument by which information which is of interest and concern to the university system faculty may be freely collected, disseminated, coordinated, and discussed.

C. Responsibilities

The Alliance recognizes the faculty of the individual academic major administrative units as having the primary responsibility and authority for recommending the establishment of degree requirements; implementing the degree requirements; establishing the curriculum, the subject matter and methods for instruction; determining when established degree requirements are met; and recommending to the President and the Board of Regents the granting of degrees thus achieved. The Alliance shall have advisory and coordinating role in academic affairs; no action of the Alliance shall abridge individual academic major administrative unit's authority in academic matters.

When issues have statewide impact, the responsibilities of the Alliance may include, but are not limited to, coordination on matters relating to academic affairs such as academic program review; the addition, deletion or merging of academic programs; curriculum; subject matter and methods of instruction, those aspects of student life relating to the educational process such as degree requirements, grading policy, course coordination and transfer, student probation and suspension, standards of admission and scholastic standards ; and faculty welfare issues, including, but not limited to compensation, benefits, appointments, reappointments and termination, workload, promotions, the granting of tenure, dismissal, ethics, and other matters affecting the faculty, the general welfare of the university and its educational purposes and effectiveness.

Representatives shall promote maximum dissemination of information to local faculty governance groups before voting in the Alliance.

**ARTICLE IV. MEMBERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION**

A. Membership

The membership of the Alliance shall consist of three faculty each from the University of Alaska Anchorage, University of Alaska Fairbanks and University of Alaska Southeast.

If issues require special knowledge or exclude members because of bargaining unit status, one or more of the three votes from each campus may be designated to alternate faculty members.

B. Selection

Representatives to the Alliance shall be selected in such a manner as prescribed by local faculty senates.



C. Term of Service

The term of service shall be one year.

D. Recall of members

Any member may be recalled by the faculty senate by which the member was chosen. The method of recall shall be determined by the local faculty senate. That faculty senate shall select a replacement to complete the term of office.

E. Officers

Alliance officers include the Chair and Chair-Elect.

1. Elections

The Chair and Chair-elect shall be elected by and from the voting membership by a majority vote, with at least one vote from each MAU required.

2. Duties

The Chair shall serve as the official spokesperson for the Faculty Alliance. The Chair shall a) preside over all meetings of the Alliance b) represent the Alliance, except that the spokesperson be required to present majority and minority opinions regardless of personal opinion. The Chair-Elect shall carry out the duties of the chair in the Chair's absence.

The Chair-Elect shall become Chair at the beginning of the next term of the Alliance.

F. Task Forces

The Alliance may establish task forces independently or in response to requests of the Board of Regents or the President of the University to consider complex system wide issues relating primarily to academic matters or faculty welfare issues. Issues and suggestions of the task force, from whatever source, shall be referred to local faculty senates before action occurs at the Alliance level.

## ARTICLE V. MEETINGS

A. Regular and special meetings

The Alliance shall have four regular meetings during the academic year. At least once per semester, the Alliance shall meet with the President of the University to identify system issues and plan for the coming year. Special Faculty Alliance meetings may be called by the Board of Regents, the President of the University, the Alliance Chair, or on petition of one-third of the membership.

B. Voting

Voting shall be by simple majority of the full voting membership to include at least one member from each MAU, except for amendments to the Alliance constitution or bylaws. Amendments to membership rights require a unanimous vote.

Representatives may defer voting pending action by local faculty senates on the issue.

## **ARTICLE VI. QUORUM**

A minimum of a simple majority of the voting membership to include at least one member from each MAU shall constitute a quorum.

## **ARTICLE VII. PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY**

The parliamentary authority shall be the latest edition of Robert's Rules of Order.

## **ARTICLE VIII. CONSTITUTIONS AND BYLAWS, AMENDMENTS, APPROVAL**

### **A. Constitutions and bylaws**

The constitution and bylaws, once passed by the Alliance, shall be transmitted to the President of the University for approval. Copies of the Faculty Alliance constitution and bylaws shall be maintained in the system governance office.

### **B. Amendments; distribution prior to voting**

Amendments to the constitution and bylaws shall be sent to Alliance members and to the local faculty senates at least 30 days prior to the Alliance meeting at which they will be considered. Amendments to the constitution require seven Alliance member votes.

## **ARTICLE IX. REVIEW AND TRANSMITTAL OF PROPOSALS**

The review and transmittal of actions from the Alliance shall be done according to Regulation 03.01.010.

## **ARTICLE X. PRESIDENTIAL ACTION ON RECOMMENDATIONS**

If the President determines that Board of Regents action is warranted as a result of a governance recommendation, including, but not limited to changes to Regents' Policy, the governance item is placed on the regents' agenda for discussion or action as appropriate and the sponsoring governance leader(s) are invited to participate in the discussion of the issue.

Spokespersons for governance groups may also present their views directly to the board of regents in accordance with board procedures.

## **ARTICLE XI. HANDBOOK**

The Faculty Alliance shall annually submit a directory of Alliance members, a description of the Alliance and how it works, and the annual Alliance calendar to the system governance executive officer for inclusion in the governance handbook. This handbook shall be distributed to the Board of Regents and to the shared governance groups.

## **ARTICLE XII. REPORTS**

The Alliance Chair or designee shall prepare a report of Alliance activities. This report shall be submitted to the system governance executive officer for compilation into a single report of governance activities for submission to the President of the University and the Board of Regents as part of the agenda for regular Board of Regents meetings.. The system governance executive officer shall also maintain Alliance electronic and written communications systems.

*Approved by the Alliance, April 8, 1994. Revised 1997-1998 to change name of UAS Faculty Senate to Faculty Council at request of UAS Faculty Council.*

**2007 AMENDMENTS: FIRST READING OCTOBER 18, 2007, MOSTLY EDITORIAL AND TO CHANGE UAS FACULTY COUNCIL BACK TO UAS FACULTY SENATE AND FIX OTHER OUTDATED TERMINOLOGY. ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS FOR SECOND READING NOVEMBER 16, 2007, INCLUDE MORE EDITORIAL CHANGES.**

# University of Alaska

## Faculty Alliance

### BYLAWS

#### Section I. Membership (Constitution Article IV.)

##### A. Voting membership

The voting membership shall consist of three faculty selected by the UAA Faculty Senate, three faculty selected by the UAF Faculty Senate and three members selected by the UAS Faculty Senate. Representatives to the Alliance shall be selected in such a manner as prescribed by local faculty senates.

##### B. Corresponding with the Alliance

Incoming correspondence to the Alliance shall be addressed and sent to the Alliance Chair with a copy to the system governance executive officer. All outgoing Alliance correspondence shall be sent with the approval of the Alliance Chair.

##### C. Task Forces

###### 1. Membership

The UAA and UAF and UAS faculty senates shall nominate representatives to serve on Alliance task forces. The Alliance shall endeavor to ensure that there is at least one task force representative from each academic MAU.

Requests to the Alliance for nominations to task forces established by the Board of Regents, the President of the University, or others within the university community shall be relayed by the Alliance to the UAA, UAF and UAS Faculty Senates. The leaders of these groups shall submit nominations to the Alliance. The Alliance shall forward the list of nominees to the person requesting nominations.



2. Charge

The task force charge should be clearly stated, should accompany any requests to the Alliance or from the Alliance to appoint or nominate faculty representatives, and should include where known:

- (a) Scope of the issue to be considered;
- (b) Role of the task force, an estimate of the amount of work involved, the resources allocated to the task; force to complete its task, and the timelines within which the task force is expected to complete its work;
- (c) A process for selecting members mutually agreed upon by the Alliance and the party establishing the task force, with the recognition that Alliance appointments are dependent on faculty senate interest in the issue. The Alliance appointees to the task forces will be required by the Alliance to represent the views of the faculty from all three universities;
- (d) The relationship of the task force to the Alliance and to the faculty senates mutually agreed upon by the Alliance and the party establishing the task force;
- (e) Methods and process the task force will be using to communicate its progress to governance mutually agreed upon by the the Alliance and the party establishing the task force.

Section II. MEETINGS (Constitution Article V.)

A. Public meeting notice

The Alliance chair shall prepare the public meeting notice in conjunction with the system governance executive officer.

Public meeting notices for regular meetings shall be distributed to the university community and posted on the Alliance web site -at least ten days prior to the meeting. Notice shall be distributed and posted at least 24 hours in advance for special meetings.

B. Deadline for submitting agenda items

Deadlines for receiving agenda items shall be set by the Alliance spokesperson no later than ten days prior to regular Alliance meetings and these deadlines shall be distributed by the system governance executive officer to administration, the Board of Regents and the university community.

C. Agendas

The agendas of each regular meeting shall include a standing agenda item for interaction with the Systemwide Academic Council.

The agendas of each regular meeting or special Alliance meeting shall be distributed to the Alliance membership by the system governance executive officer at least five working days prior to the meeting. The executive officer shall submit a written explanation for any exception.

The Alliance chair shall prepare the agenda in conjunction with the system governance executive officer, and approve the final agenda before distribution.

D. Recording meetings

The Alliance and its committees and task forces shall record meetings and create written minutes, except for those times when the Alliance meets in executive session. Records of the meeting shall be preserved for at least three years and shall be available to the public upon request.

The minutes of all meetings shall include all actions taken by the Alliance, shall be prepared and distributed no later than seven days after the meeting, shall be made available to Alliance members and the public, and shall be posted on the Alliance web site.

E. Open meetings

All Alliance meetings are open to all members of the university and the general public; however, only Alliance members may participate in the meeting unless the rules for participation in a meeting are suspended by a two-thirds vote of the members present.

F. Executive session

The Alliance may meet in executive session at any meeting when the subject to be discussed tends to prejudice the reputation or character of any person, or when the subject under discussion includes matters which are required by law or university policy or regulations to be held confidential. The portions of a meeting spent in executive session shall not be recorded.

G. Roll call vote

A roll call vote shall be ordered if requested by one-third of the members present.

H. Teleconference and video conferenced meetings

Any regular or special Alliance meeting may be conducted by teleconference or video conference.

Section III. QUORUM (Constitution Article VI.)

A. Alternates; proxy voting prohibited

When Alliance members cannot attend a meeting, they shall make every effort to send an alternate and shall advise the Alliance spokesperson prior to the meeting if this is not possible. Voting by proxy is prohibited.

#### Section IV. PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY (Constitution Article VII)

##### A. Time limit on speaking

The Alliance chair may set time limits on each agenda item. No speaker shall then speak for more than the fixed number of minutes on any one topic unless more time has been granted in advance. The time limit may be extended by a two-thirds vote of the members present.

#### Section V. AMENDMENTS TO THE BYLAWS (Constitution Article VIII)

##### A. Written submission

Amendments to the bylaws must be presented in writing by voting members of the Alliance to the Alliance chair at least two weeks before the meeting at which they will be considered.

##### B. First reading and action

Amendments shall have first reading and discussion at the first meeting after they have been received by the Alliance chair. Amendments may then be voted at the same meeting or postponed for further consideration.

##### C. Voting on amendments

Amendments shall be by a simple majority of a quorum of the membership, and at least one member from each academic MAU must be in agreement.

##### D. Submission to the President

Within ten days after the meeting at which amendments were approved by the Alliance, the executive officer shall forward them to the President of the University with a request for response within 30 days.

**UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA  
Vice President for Administration  
208 Butrovich  
Fairbanks, Alaska 99775**

3 December 2007

TO: Bogdan Hoanca  
Chair, Faculty Alliance

FROM: Jim Johnsen  
Vice President for Administration

SUBJECT: Optional Retirement Program (ORP) Conversion

I wanted to provide you with a few reactions to a question recently posed by the Faculty Alliance--Would it be possible to provide participants in ORP I a one-time opportunity to revisit the choice they made between participation in the ORP program and the state's TRS retirement program? Behind the question lay an interest in responding to faculty members' concerns about the absence of retiree health benefits in ORP.

Offering such a choice would require a change in state law, which since 1990 has provided only one lifetime opportunity to choose between ORP and the state's retirement plans. As well, it would require the approval from the Alaska Commissioner of Administration, who understandably would be very hesitant to add more employees (and their accompanying future health benefits liabilities).

Setting these very serious obstacles aside for a moment, is it possible that employees would have enough money in their ORP accounts to "buy" their way back in to one of the state's plans?

Without doing an in-depth analysis, it's rather obvious that the rate of return on the employee's ORP funds and their date of entry into ORP 1 would greatly impact their ability to meet the estimated liability due PERS or TRS. Based on some rough estimates, it looks like only employees who entered ORP before 1999 and earned over 8% annually would have a sufficient balance to cover the contributions under the state's plans. All entrants into ORP after 2000 would have to make an additional payment. Note that these estimates do not include the funds we would expect the state to require in order to address the underfunding of the state's plans, driving the cost of "buying" back in even higher.

Even if some employees were able to cover the cost, there are other exceptionally large issues to be addressed.

1. Would the ARMB and the Division of Retirement support legislation allowing ORP Tier 1 participants the opportunity to buy in to the DB program?



2. Because the funding of PERS and TRS and its associated liabilities are now pooled across all employers, would other PERS/TRS employers support taking on more liabilities, i.e., the additional health liabilities from these new entrants?
3. Would the State be willing to put in the additional money (the difference between the employer-established rate and full funding rate) for participants who have had a change of heart?

Assuming the above issues are resolved and we allow ORP Tier 1 participants to make another election, the education and communication hurdles are formidable, and expensive.

1. Each person making an election would need an individualized statement of the amount necessary to transfer.
2. The university would need to provide decision tools for employees to assess the long term impact of one program over the other.

Neither of the above is something that could be done at the campus level and it is unlikely the Division of Retirement would be willing to take on such projects, leaving Statewide Benefits (and its two employees) with the responsibility.

In conclusion, while a very interesting idea, it appears there are too many financial and political obstacles outside of the university's control, even if the university determined it wished to endorse such a possibility.

My advice would be to address the interests and concerns of ORP participants through the defined contribution retiree health option we are developing. Through our benefits office and with the participation of the UA retirement committee, the university is exploring the possibility of a new ORP tier that will have a health care component for retirees. The goal is to make this plan available to current ORP participants as well as to newly hired employees. After the recommendation and review stage in the development of the planned offering, the creation of a new tier of ORP will be subject to the president's and the Regents' approval. I will be happy to discuss features of the new ORP tier with you and Faculty Alliance when a draft plan is ready for circulation.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer some feedback on this issue.

November 27, 2007

To: Systemwide Academic Council  
cc: Jim Johnsen

From: Dave Veazey

Subject: Faculty Activity Reporting Project

Enclosed please find information regarding the Electronic Faculty Activity Reporting Project.

#### Background

The project was initially conceived at the UAA campus in 2003 to tie faculty workload to actual faculty activity during the year. The goal was to show accountability regarding university productivity. The program was written by graduate students at UAA and did not have sufficient documentation, support or scalability to be used on a continuing basis. In 2004 the system office took over the project with the goal of implementing an electronic version of faculty workload and activity reporting. A strategic planning session was conducted in April of 2005 with Professional Growth Systems to design a plan for implementation with a broad group of stakeholders. In May of 2005 the Faculty Alliance officially approved a Project Charter Agreement for implementation of an electronic system (attached). Upon gaining feedback from faculty and deans in over forty meetings across the system it was decided in June of 2006 that the scope of the project would be narrowed to only activity reporting. There was not consensus on the decision to change the scope and many did not even want such a database created. Some still desired the accountability of tying the workload to the activity report. Many faculty voiced concern over the security and use of activity report data. During this time period information needs were being collected from various stakeholders, data integrity and availability was determined both in Banner and unit level spreadsheets and databases and an RFI from vendors was being conducted. In March of 2007 Digital Measures was given a five year contract to implement the project (this contract can be void due to budgetary limitations or non-performance).

#### Current Status

In January of 2007 President Hamilton approved the project and a three year funding plan (attached). SAC did approve the change in project scope in July of 2006 and VPAAR Craig Dorman tasked me to complete the project at that time. While Chancellors were briefed at a Presidents' Cabinet meeting, at no time have the Chancellors or Provosts officially approved the project for implementation. A pilot was done in the Fall of 2007 and completed in October at the UAF School of Fish and Ocean Sciences and the UAS School of Education. Two other units at UAS were added at the time of implementation but due to limitations of the product they ultimately did not participate. Based on faculty feedback the product has had over 60 revisions in the past month. These include minor changes such as ease of navigation and changes to pick lists to a feature that can receive exports from bibliographic software products (Endnote, Procite, Refworks) and parse the data elements automatically. We are currently prepared to expand the pilot to more units that wish to use the product. The initiative is ready for expanded usage. Some units with

specialized needs (Schools of Business and Management migrating from Sedona software, Cooperative Extension) require further work. While a significant amount of time has been expended in gaining faculty input there is not yet the campus leadership support that will be required for successful implementation. Also find attached in this document a summary of activities and budget since FY06 to include the most recent report for the Executive Project Review Committee for FY08. Included as a separate attachment is an activity report created by a faculty member at the School of Fish and Ocean Sciences during the pilot. Note that all fields are searchable through a database within and across units, campuses and MAUs.

#### Budget

	FY08		FY09		FY10		FY11 and on	
Personnel	1 FTE	\$113K	1 FTE	\$115K	1 FTE ½ yr ½ FTE ½ yr	\$86K	½ FTE	\$57K
Vendor	+200 hrs	\$44K						
Functional user Travel / Training	\$20K		\$10K		\$10K		\$1.5K	
Software License (Maintenance Cost)	\$48K		\$48K		\$48K		\$48K	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$225K</b>		<b>\$173K</b>		<b>\$144K</b>		<b>\$107K</b>	

#### Recommendations

- Re-visit objectives of the project with the President, Chancellors and Provosts and determine cost-benefit of implementation.
- Identify and locate resources and support for the project if it is determined it should move forward.

#### Impact of Electronic Faculty Reporting

##### Opportunities:

1. Access to publications, research and service at the campus and unit level in addition to student activity in research (graduate and undergraduate).
2. Ease of gathering information for reporting purposes.
3. Standardized method of reporting publications in refereed journals and other media.
4. Searchable database allows rapid comparison of faculty and unit activities.
5. Electronic activity reporting is common at most other universities.
6. Faculty members have easy access to multiple year data for compiling comprehensive review, tenure and post-tenure review materials.

7. Could be used in the future to automatically create portions of promotion and tenure.

**Challenges:**

1. Management of the project.
2. Training and mindfulness of campus culture to accommodate change.
3. Access and security of data.
4. Use of time and scarce resources.



*Original copy  
kept in record  
room full copy*

## **UA Faculty Workload System**

### **Project Charter**

**Endorsed by Faculty Alliance – May 10, 2005**

#### **Purpose**

Implement a more efficient and interactive electronic database system for faculty workload and activity reports across the University of Alaska System.

#### **Specific Objectives**

Convenient, automated process for creation, review, revision and communication of a faculty workload

- Workload document conversion into an editable activity report
- First step towards an automated system for electronically updating CV's, promotion and tenure packets, and grant proposal information
- Paper-less
- Integrates with existing information technology (Banner) to the greatest extent possible
- Controlled, secure access to faculty workload and activity reports within the UA network
- Meet the needs of faculty members (e.g., reduced time for compiling, easily revised and resubmitted)
- Meet the needs of faculty unions (e.g., determining whether workloads are consistent with CBAs)
- Meet the needs of UA administration (e.g., supply aggregated workload and activity data to Legislature)

#### **Constraints**

Implementation requires full participation of faculty, chairs and deans.

- System only collects data directly related to the substance of faculty workloads and activities (e.g., not data on timeliness of workload submission or frequency of revisions).
- System must be subject to faculty oversight regarding policies for authorized access to data, distribution of personally identifiable information, and archiving of data in order to guarantee the appropriate use of workload and activity information within UA.
- System must be protected from unauthorized access.
- Information content must remain essentially the same as the current paper-based system, to avoid altering CBA-defined conditions of employment.

*Temporary copy.  
See electronic  
records for full  
copy.*

**A PLAN FOR  
DISTANCE EDUCATION  
AT  
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA**

Submitted by the Education Technology Team  
For  
Dr. Daniel Julius  
Vice President Academic Affairs, UA

December 3, 2007

**Subject:** [Faculty]SAC requests

**From:** "Hoanca, Bogdan" <afbh@nero.scob.uaa.alaska.edu>

**Date:** Fri, 30 Nov 2007 11:03:21 -0900

**To:** "Faculty" <ml-faculty@email.alaska.edu>

At the SAC meeting yesterday, Dan Julius asked the Alliance to consider a policy on Retention of Course Records. This is something UAF has already approved in April of this year, and which would be nice to have standard across the state. We should discuss this idea at our meeting in December, and see if the UAS and UAA Senates are willing to pass similar motions. See below for full text and link to the text of the motion from UAF.

A second charge, of lesser urgency is to consider recommending policies for the retention of P&T files. We seem to have very different practices at UAA and UAF, possibly also very different policies.

Thank you,

Bogdan

From: <http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/fsfy07meetings/fsactions143.html>

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #143 on April 9, 2007

**MOTION :**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a policy on Retention of Course Records.

**Retention of Course Records**

The classroom records pertaining to course work of any student that have not been returned to the student must be retained by the instructor for a period of one full semester (excluding summer session) after the semester in which the course was completed. These records may include but are not limited to: exams and answer sheets, homework, course papers, term papers, essays, laboratory reports, and other assignments submitted by the student in order to fulfill the requirement of the particular course. The Office of Information Technology must archive all Blackboard course content, including statistics, for a period of 1 1/2 years following completion of the course.

Classroom records of any instructor for the purpose of evaluation of grade must also be retained for a period of at least one full semester (excluding summer session) following the semester in which the course was completed. These records may include but are not limited to: syllabus, class attendance, complete list of student's performance in all relevant course work, paper work related to the determination of a grade, and a record of final grades.

In case of any dispute or grievance process initiated by the student all the above records must be retained until the end of the process. Any records or copies of records that are required for program review, accreditation purposes, or any other audit as mandated by the university may be retained for a period as deemed required by the process.

After the retention period, all records may be destroyed or properly discarded.

**EFFECTIVE:** Fall 2007

**RATIONALE:** The University does not have any policies or regulations regarding the retention of course materials, which has led to confusion among the faculty and has resulted in different retention

practices and policies across the disciplines. This proposed motion will help alleviate the confusion and provide a uniform retention policy across all disciplines. The one-semester guideline is what was suggested by UA General Counsel as a reasonable policy to accommodate grade appeals. This policy should be added to the faculty handbook.

**Subject:** [Faculty]FW: ETT Distance Education Planning Meeting  
**From:** "Hoanca, Bogdan" <afbh@nero.scob.uaa.alaska.edu>  
**Date:** Tue, 11 Dec 2007 09:47:55 -0900  
**To:** "Faculty" <ml-faculty@email.alaska.edu>

FYI, more on the DE plan from ETT.

---

**From:** Steven Hamilton [mailto:steve@csmgt.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 11, 2007 9:15 AM  
**To:** afbh@uaa.alaska.edu  
**Subject:** ETT Distance Education Planning Meeting

Bogdan,

The ETT met yesterday (Monday) by audio conference to review the draft plan that I provided to you last week. As you might expect, on such short notice a number of members were not present including Larry Harris (Dean of Education for UAS) and Bernice Joseph (VP, College of Rural and Community Development, UAF). They did provide some comments ahead of time.

I provided comments orally and added one point (related to one of your points) – the plan calls for some kind of distance course review and approval at the statewide level, although it is not clear what this would entail or look like. The fact is, we already have a rigorous system for reviewing and approving courses at the MAU level. Adding an additional layer at the statewide level for distance courses does not seem to add any value.

The committee, as a group, could not support the document as drafted. Along with all of the individual comments, a key element was that any such plan should be driven by strategic intent from top management...which includes chancellors, provosts, and the president. Without knowing where these key people would like to see the system go, coming up with a detailed implementation plan does not make much sense. The course of action agreed to by the committee was to request a meeting with all three chancellors, provosts, and the president to hear their perceptions of issues and ideas for direction. After that, we would decide how to proceed. The director of the ETT, Ramona McAfee, is going to draft a short request and circulate it to everyone for review. I will make sure that you get a copy.

If you would like to speak with me about this, I am around the office this week...grading papers. 277-1088.  
Cheers...Steve

No virus found in this outgoing message.

Checked by AVG Free Edition.

Version: 7.5.503 / Virus Database: 269.17.0/1180 - Release Date: 12/10/2007 2:51 PM

**Subject:** [Faculty]FW: UA ETT Faculty Input Committee  
**From:** "Hoanca, Bogdan" <afbh@nero.scob.uaa.alaska.edu>  
**Date:** Mon, 12 Nov 2007 15:14:15 -0900  
**To:** "Faculty" <ml-faculty@email.alaska.edu>

FYI

**From:** Steven Hamilton [mailto:steve@csmgt.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 09, 2007 12:12 PM  
**To:** Katy Spangler; 'Bernice Joseph'; Deborah Barnette; 'Jason Ohler'; Jennifer Brown; 'Saichi Oba'; 'Cathy LeCompte'; 'Karen Perdue'; 'Mary Snyder'; 'Melissa Brown'; 'Ramona McAfee'  
**Cc:** cathy.connor@uas.alaska.edu; afbh@uaa.alaska.edu  
**Subject:** UA ETT Faculty Input Committee

Karen and Saichi,

As we discussed in our last ETT meeting, the Faculty Input Committee is recommending that we "reconstitute" the group with a longer term view and with some revision in our membership. Specifically, since there is some expectation that this group will take some of our initial ideas, add some new ones from time to time, and shepherd them through to execution, we would like to see the group set up as a standing sub-committee rather than an ad hoc group. This would allow us to recruit membership with realistic expectations of the commitment they are making. At the same time our initial name, the Faculty and Campus Input Committee, does not really reflect what we perceive that the ETT wants from us. It would appear that our focus is shifting to recommendation and implementation of ideas that are related to faculty development for distance education. With that in mind, I would like to recommend, at least as a starting point for discussion, the committee title "Distance Education Faculty Development Subcommittee." I am not wedded to this title but would like to see something that more accurately describes what ETT wants from us.

There have been some changes in the make up of the committee. Several original members have expressed either a desire to leave the committee due to other commitments or at least some hesitation in making longer term commitments involving implementation of ideas. We have also had outstanding response from Faculty Alliance in identifying three interested faculty members that would like to be a part of this. These new members are Katy Spangler (UAS Juneau - Education), Jennifer Brown (UAS Egan Library), and Deborah Barnette (UAS Sitka - Natural Sciences). Joe Mason will be leaving the group. I will defer comment on senior management members and allow them to speak for themselves since they have demanding schedules but are also keenly interested in faculty development. I would also like to keep open the option of adding more members as interest grows.

Please let me know if this approach seems reasonable and I will work with Ramona to get this going. We are in the midst of planning for the ASTE conference in February and I am hoping to have a sub-committee meeting here within the next few weeks. Cheers...Steve

No virus found in this outgoing message.

Checked by AVG Free Edition.

Version: 7.5.503 / Virus Database: 269.15.26/1120 - Release Date: 11/9/2007 9:26 AM