# UNIVERSITY *of* ALASKA

## Faculty Alliance

**Monday, August 25, 2008 and Tuesday, August 26, 2008, Anchorage**

# DRAFT MINUTES

1.    Call to Order and Roll Call

      Present:

      Jill Dumesnil, Chair, Faculty Alliance; President, UAS Faculty Senate
      Anne Bridges, President, UAA Faculty Senate
      Marsha Sousa, President, UAF Faculty Senate
      Genie Babb, 1st Vice President, UAA Faculty Senate
      Jonathan Dehn, President-elect, UAF Faculty Senate
      Jonathan Anderson, President-elect, UAS Faculty Senate
      Patt Sandberg, UAA Faculty Senate GAB Chair
      Cathy Connor, Past President, UAS Faculty Senate
      Jon Genetti, Past President, UAF Faculty Senate
      Pat Ivey, Exec. Officer, System Governance

2.    Adopt Agenda

      MOTION: passed without objection

      "The Faculty Alliance moves to adopt the agenda for the August 25-26, 2008 meeting as amended to change "John Dehn" to "Jonathan Dehn" wherever it appears, and to change the title of Attachment 7.2 to 'Summary of Oral Report by the Distance Education Legislative Audit Team'. This action is effective August 26, 2008."

      Pat Ivey was directed to paginate future agendas and attachments in sequential order.

3.    Approve May 12, 2008 minutes
      http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/Minutes/2008/05-12.pdf

      MOTION: passed without objection

      "The Faculty Alliance moves to approve the May 12, 2008 minutes as amended. This action is effective August 26, 2008."

      Amendments:

      Page 1, change "John Dehn" to "Jonathan Dehn" wherever it appears
      Page 4, item 7.10, first line; insert 'Governance" between 'UAF' and 'Coordinating"
      Page 4, item 7.10, change last word of last sentence from 'enhanced' to 'reviewed'.

1

Page 5, 2nd paragraph, insert 'UAFT faculty evaluation' between 'the' and 'calendar'.

4.    Report from the Chair – *Jill Dumesnil*

4.1    Board of Regents
       http://www.alaska.edu/bor/

       Jill Dumesnil reported that she attended the June Board of Regents meeting with outgoing
       Alliance Chair Bogdan Hoanca who introduced Dumesnil and familiarized her with board.
       The Board of Regents also met in August to hear updates from the president and
       chancellors. At the September 18-19 Board of Regents meeting in Anchorage, the
       MacTaggart Rogers report will be discussed along with the president's response to the report
       including what he will implement and will not.

4.2    Systemwide Academic Council
       http://www.alaska.edu/swacad/sac.htm

       SAC has met monthly and approved/recommended the charge for the academic master plan
       which is in route to the president's cabinet and to the Board of Regents for approval.  SAC
       wants endorsement from the Faculty Alliance. Alliance members responded with the
       following initial input. The items in the charge were in no particular order.  Formal
       procedures and ranking information should be included.  The academic master plan was too
       important not to have a documented procedure and majority faculty participation in the
       decision making and that it should be a formal process and not relegated ad hoc committees.
       The document also did not allow for growth in its current form and was more focused on
       centralization to achieve economies of scale.  More discussion and action may be found
       under item 7.1.

       SAC also received an oral report by the Distance Education Legislative Audit Team and Dan
       Julius sent the Alliance the notes.  The leg audit did say that the UA is doing good work and
       is making a lot of progress. SACs presentation to the Board of Regents will highlight the
       successes at the three MAUs. The provosts and vice presidents control the discussion of
       distance education now and the Educational Technology Team (ETT) has been disbanded.
       SAC intends to form a series of ad hoc committees to address individual issues related to
       distance education. See item 7.2 for additional Alliance discussion of the oral report.

4.3    Business Council

       The Business Council meeting on August 11 was actually a joint administrative council
       budgetary meeting on the FY10 budget.

4.4    Dumesnil also had two hour meeting with President Hamilton which was very beneficial.
       President Hamilton said he would be happy to meet with us but doesn't get invited to our
       meetings.  He does, however, receive the agendas.  He also reiterated his position that the
       current travel restrictions do not apply to faculty.  The Alliance directed Dumesnil to ask the
       president if he would put that in writing because some campus administrators are restricting
       faculty travel because of his original July 1 memo.  See http://gov.alaska.edu/faculty/2008-
       07-01.travelcostreduction.pdf.

5.    Internal Items

5.1    Approve Alliance Calendar
       http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/calendar/default.html

2

MOTION: passed

"The Faculty moves to approve the calendar of meetings for fall 2008 and tentatively approves the spring 2009 meeting calendar as follows. The spring calendar will be reviewed at the October meeting after the spring teaching schedules are known.

Friday, September 12, 2008, 2:00-3:30pm by audio conference
Friday, October 10, 2008, 2:00-3:30pm by audio conference
Wednesday, October 29, 2008, on-site, Fairbanks (President's Retreat)
Friday, November 14, 2008, 2:00-3:30pm by audio conference
Friday, December 12, 2008, 2:00-3:30pm by audio conference
Friday, January 23, 2009, 3:00-4:30pm by audio conference
Friday, February 13, 2009, 2:00-3:30pm by audio conference
Friday, April 10, 2009, 2:00-3:30pm by audio conference
Friday, May 8, 2009, 2:00-3:30pm by audio conference
This action is effective August 26, 2008."

5.2     Administrative Council Liaisons and Alternates

The Alliance notes that since the MacTaggert Report considers the administrative councils as governance, that they are subject to the Alaska Open Meetings Law requiring advance notice, posting agendas, recording minutes and meetings open to the public. Chair Dumesnil will correspond with each Council chair requesting clarification of the Alliance liaison (voting or nonvoting), council mission, charge and meeting calendar.

   5.2.1     Systemwide Academic Council *next meeting Anchorage, September 23, 3-6pm*
             Lead Liaison: Jill Dumesnil
             Alternate: Marsha Sousa
   5.2.2.    Human Resources Council, *meets occasionally, monthly during summer*
             Lead Liaison: Jonathan Anderson
             Alternate: Genie Babb
   5.3.3     Instructional Technology Council                    Attachment 5.3.3.
             *Meets September 4, 1-4pm audio, Oct 2, Nov 6, Dec 11, Jan 8, Feb 5, March 5,*
             *April 2, May 7*
             Lead Liaison: Marsha Sousa
             Alternate: Jonathan Dehn
   5.3.4     Research Advisory Council *may be combining with SAC*
             Lead Liaison: Jonathan Dehn
             Alternate: Patt Sandberg
   5.3.5     Business Council, *meets Sept 2, video, 8:30am-12:30pm, Oct 1, Nov 11, Dec 9*
             Lead Liaison: Cathy Connor
             Alternate: Jon Genetti
   5.3.6     Student Services Council *meets August 28, Sept 25, Oct 30 3-5pm audio*
             Lead Liaison: Genie Babb
             Alternate: Anne Bridges
   5.3.7     Retirement Committee
             Lead Liaison: Jon Genetti
             Alternate: Jonathan Anderson

6.   Old Business

6.1   <mark>Electronic Faculty Workload Status</mark> Electronic Faculty Activity Reports

<mark>MOTION: passed unanimously</mark>

<mark>"The University of Alaska Faculty Alliance moves to reject the use of Digital Measures software for electronic Faculty Activity Reports throughout the UA system. The Alliance supports the idea of an effective, efficient electronic reporting system tailored to the unique needs of the University of Alaska.</mark>

<mark>Our concerns with the proposed system being tested at UAF focus on the following liability, accreditation and union issues.</mark>

- Potential FERPA violations.
  Much of the data is specific to students (grade distributions in classes and graduate student advising by name, with project title, graduation dates, etc.) There is no demonstrable security provision within the Digital Measures software to protect this data.

- Data stored with Digital Measures, not solely controlled by and at UA.
  In addition to FERPA concerns, much the data is proprietary or personal, and the data storage is not at UA in the current system. This jeopardizes potential classified research, developments for business relationships and personal security.

- No data entry validation.
  The current system does not provide for accurate data entry, or validate entries to other databases. Any data extracted from the system should be treated as suspect and could potentially misrepresent the university during any evaluation including an accreditation process.

- By more than tripling the number of data fields, this system changes the criteria under which faculty are evaluated.
  This is not in the spirit or the letter of the UNAC and UAFT Collective bargaining agreements. Changes in faculty evaluation criteria should be negotiated with the Unions.

  Second, our concerns focus on technical problems, some of which have not been addressed in more than one year.

- Lack of reliable search functionality.
  Since two thirds of the data fields in the Digital Measures system are free form alpha-numeric, making a complete and effective search is virtually impossible. Invariably data will be missed or misrepresented in a search. This does not help administrative tasks of reporting faculty performance.

- No data entry validation.
  In addition to the concerns above, faculty could enter joint publications, or grants and contracts which are not editable by their colleagues. The potential for error is too large, and the interaction with other databases to check for accuracy is absent.

- Limited or no use of existing database efforts on campus.
  The current system does not effectively use the Banner system, and none of the other campus databases that keep track of faculty performance. This system is an incredible duplication of effort.

4

- Not time saving over the current system for faculty or administration.
  The Digital Measures system is so time-consuming it has a significant negative impact on academic responsibilities. Given the problems stated above

  Given the problems stated above, the Faculty Alliance does not support the use of the Digital Measures eFAR system, requests that all further beta testing be cancelled throughout the UA system and that the development of a product specific for UA begin immediately involving the collaborative efforts of faculty and staff.

  This action is effective August 26, 2008."

  DISTRIBUTION: President Hamilton and Vice President Julius with copies to chancellors, provosts and the Faculty Alliance

6.2     Mandatory Student Survey

The mandatory on-line student survey was initiated by the Faculty Alliance as a way of more accurately measuring retention based on student goals (personal interest, certificate, associate baccalaureate, graduate degree, etc.). This is also intended as a faculty tool to better advise students and enhance student success. The survey is up and running this fall. Students have to fill out the form in order to proceed to register on line. Those registering in person have to provide the information in person.

6.3     Student Success Report
http://gov.alaska.edu/faculty/2008-04-11.studentsuccessreportdraft.pdf
http://gov.alaska.edu/faculty/2008-04-11.studentsuccessmetric.pdf

The Student Success Steering Committee has met every month since Dec 2007. The April 10, 2008 version was the last published report. The SSSC Met April may June and the report is currently being updated. The committee made several budget recommendations regarding student success priorities which are being vetted through the FY10 budget process. The student success metric chart contains four statewide student success metrics but the fifth regarding low income students is now being listed as an indicator not a metric.

6.4     Other Old Business

6.4.1     ORP Update

Genetti updated the Alliance on activities related to ORP rate calculations.

6.4.2     HRC

Jonathan Anderson said he emailed Beth Behner who responded with an invitation for faculty to join another Emeriti presentation on retirement healthcare benefits. Dumesnil will recommend Emeriti use illuminate to make the presentation for 30 minutes at the September 12 Faculty Alliance meeting.

7.     New Business

7.1     Academic Master Plan                                             Attachment 7.1
http://gov.alaska.edu/faculty/2008-08-19AMP.pdf

5

Academic Vice President Dan Julius asked the Alliance to endorse the academic master plan charge.

MOTION: passed unanimously

"Faculty Alliance moves that it cannot endorse the academic master plan charge for UA as presented by Dan Julius without shared governance in accordance with Regents Policy and University Regulation 03.01.010. In its current form, the document does not constitute faculty involvement, provides no opportunity for expansion, contains no provision for sustainable consistent faculty involvement in academic master planning in the long term but rather relegates decision making to SAC and/or ad hoc committees. The Alliance is encouraged by the second sentence, of section 5 that ...'governance bodies will be ...involved in the review/development of this plan prior to recommendation to the President's Council) and its implementation', and look forward to working collaboratively on this very important mission. This action is effective August 26, 2008."

DISTRIBUTION: President Hamilton and Vice President Julius with copies to chancellors, provosts and the Faculty Alliance.

NEXT STEPS: The Alliance proposes to meet jointly with SAC on November 14. Meanwhile, the Alliance will take both the original proposal and Alliance motion to their next senate meetings for input and/or action prior to the joint SAC/Alliance meeting on November 14.

7.2    Distance Education Legislative Audit
http://gov.alaska.edu/faculty/2008-07-31.de-auditsummary.pdf

The faculty survey by the legislative audit team as part of the audit was emailed out by an individual with an unfamiliar name, was viewed as junk mail by the faculty and deleted unread. Some people who always teach by distance never received the survey and some faculty who never teach by distance did receive it. Distance education should not be separated from the regular curriculum and distance education should be based upon programmatic decisions made by departments and programs based on pedagogy and need. This document prevents the university from addressing the individual needs of students and is administrative-centric rather than student centric. If SAC proceeds, it needs to involve faculty members who actually teach distance education, and the distance education courses cannot be moved away from the root program unit. It results in administration dictating curriculum and that is the primary faculty responsibility. It can also result in accrediting distance education instead of accrediting root academic programs that include distance education courses.

NEXT STEPS: Distance education will be a standard Alliance agenda item all year. When the written legislative audit is distributed, the Alliance will respond.

7.3    Sustainability – Jill Dumesnil

Student success has been pushed by the faculty, staff and student governance groups and while still of great interest to the faculty, the next initiative surfacing is sustainability. At UAS, faculty, staff and students are involved in this, formed a committee and aimed at the low hanging fruit such as using recycled paper in accordance with state law to use paper that is at least 25 percent recycled paper and we currently aren't even doing that. The national sustainability report card gives UA grades of C and D. UAA, doing a lot; recycling as been assumed by administration, new recycle position has been created, the food service program

6

is using compostable cutlery and is trying to get NANA to use compostable items. UAS chancellor doesn't want to fund recycling institutionally but governance would like to see more institutional buy in. UAS did install motion detectors so lights only go on when someone is there. At UAF there are pockets of recyclability, managed by ASUAF. One faculty member is passionate about this and is scheduled to speak at the faculty senate. For sustainable practices to be viewed at a high level, it will take the concerted efforts of all groups. Each MAU is working collectively to establish their own centers of sustainability. We need to measure how sustainability impacts the budget.

NEXT STEPS: This item will be a standard agenda item all year and will be placed on the System Governance Council September 22 agenda. Meanwhile, the Alliance will establish links from its web site to sustainability information across the system.

7.4    Faculty Initiatives – System and Campus

7.4.1    Needs Based Financial Aid – The Alliance will join student and staff governance in support of this initiative, and incorporate this as a standard agenda item all year. The Alliance requests this item be placed on the System Governance Council September 22 agenda.

7.4.2    Civic Engagement

Jonathan Anderson will lead this initiative which consists of two parts; student involvement in the community, and university assistance analyzing state agency data.

Student Involvement in the Community – Integrate this initiative throughout the UA system and incorporate it into the outreach metric.

University Assistance Analyzing State Agency Data - Often state agencies need help with data and the university makes it difficult to provide that service. Need easy ways to hook up the need with the resource.

7.5    Other New Business

7.5.1    Administrative and/or SAC Fellows Program.

SAC worked on an application form and a list of faculty to recruit for the academic year to work on particular issues identified by SAC. Provosts will send out a memo soliciting applications.

8.    Senate Reports UAA UAF and UAS
UAA - http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/governance/facultysenate/index.cfm
UAF - http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/facultySenate.html
UAS - http://www.uas.alaska.edu/FacultySenate/

UAA – IDEA, An on-line system implemented for student evaluation is not proving to be as successful as intended. The big issue for the senate this term is to increase usage. The task force on Promotion & Tenure (P&T) was created and reports to the Provost. The faculty senate is working closely with this task force. UAA has finally published its 2017 strategic plan for UAA, on line at http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/strategicplan/. Fran Ulmer at convocation provided a handout with UAA data which is quite informative and cut the time down considerably.
The handout is available at
http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/chancellor/regentsreports/upload/Faculty_Staff_Convocation_20080
821.pdf.

7

UAF – The senate has not convened yet but faculty are very busy with new chancellor transition teams (11). All transition team reports are on line at http://www.uaf.edu/transition/. The interim chancellor is focusing on saying he is only here for two years. Faculty have asked for a permanent chancellor search in the spring but are pleased with the interim chancellor so far. Convocation is in the middle of September.

UAS – The UAS faculty are upset about the reorganization dictated by current interim provost during the summer and implemented August 18. UAS Faculty Senate has a committee on research and one on sustainability. The last UAS accreditation report last time said all faculty should be involved in scholarship. The interim provost wants to change the term research to scholarship without defining what that is which puts s a burden on bipartite teaching faculty who teach four courses and are now required to do scholarship. It also demotes traditional research.

9.    Agenda Items for Next Faculty Alliance meeting September 12

Agenda items will include but may not be limited to an Emeriti presentation, academic master plan, distance education legislative audit, sustainability, needs-based financial aid, administrative council reports, senate reports and other items of interest. Agenda items and attachments are due to pat.ivey@alaska.edu no later than 10 working days in advance of Alliance meetings.

10.    Agenda Items for System Governance Council Meeting *September 22, 3-5pm audio/video* 
*(Members include senate presidents; President Hamilton attends, schedule permitting)* 
http://www.alaska.edu/governance/sgc/

Alliance requested agenda items include student success, sustainability and needs-based financial aid.

11.    Other Items of Interest

There were no additional items of interest.

12.    Comments

The Alliance members complimented Jodi Shaver for her selection of meeting place and food for this event.

13.    Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned August 26 at approximately 3:30pm.

CHARGE APPROVED BY SAC OF AN ACADEMIC MASTER PLAN FOR UA:

In the broadest sense, discussions of an Academic Master Plan (AMP) for the UA should result in the following;

1. A series of recommendations made to the President's Council (and, if the President agrees, to the BOR) concerning;
    a. Reaffirmation and differentiation of missions and related programmatic functions among respective MAU's,
    b. Identification of new research, programmatic and related academic initiatives undertaken at respective MAU's,
    c. Reaffirmation of the principles associated with access and choice for respective MAU's,
    d. Reaffirmation of the principles of governance and clarification, if needed, on the role and scope of various systemwide academic governance committees and forums.

2. The following considerations should frame SAC discussions of the AMP;

    a. The AMP as discussed here may not usurp the role or authority of the BOR, but should seek to clarify and build upon broad mission related mandates, academic governance processes, and prior academic plans/strategies in place at respective MAU's,
    b. It is recognized that some duplication in programs and degrees presently exists and will remain or be added in a number of programmatic/degree areas,
    c. Similarly, existing programs and degrees may be identified and assigned to a various MAU based on criteria (e.g., economies of scale, MAU capacity, regional needs, demonstrated expertise, enrollment demand, available resources or related factors) leading to such conclusion. The criteria, which shall be construed broadly, for the identification and assignment of such programs or degrees will be discussed.

3. As the role, scope and function of various systemwide academic governance forums and groups are identified and clarified, SAC may recommend discontinuation or further refinement of such governance bodies following appropriate consultation.

4. All ideas and issues should be considered if brought forward. However, all written recommendations must be approved by SAC.

5. As discussions unfold on the AMP, SAC may agree to identify and appoint ad hoc committees to work on various aspects of the AMP, including implementation matters. It is assumed that other individuals, constituencies, forums and governance bodies will be identified and involved in the review/development of this plan (prior to recommendation to the President's Council) and in it's implementation.

6. It is hoped that discussions for an AMP will be concluded by spring semester 2009. However, recommendations concerning various aspects of the AMP may go forward prior to that time.

Summary: End of Audit oral presentation, July 31, 2008

1. An oral presentation by the legislative Audit Team reviewing Distance Education at UA was presented on July 31, 2008 (10:30 a.m. – 12: 00 Noon) Present for UA; VP's Redman, Pitman, Julius, Steve Smith, Kate Ripley, Saichi Oba, Gwen White, Ramona McAfee, Nikki Pittman (chair)

2. The purpose of the meeting, as expressed by the audit team was to "wind down the audit" provide general findings, conclusions and recommendations, and insure the end-of-audit findings (a precursor to the management letter which is expected in late September) are "realistic". The Legislative Audit team provided background for the audit, discussed a brief legislative history, highlighted the data/ surveys, reports, etc., examined by the audit team, and expressed thanks to the UA for being highly cooperative

3. Major Findings:
   a. The University gets high marks for studying itself and attendant distance education issues, through the years, and low marks for implementing solutions to issues surfaced in such studies.
   b. Barriers exist between MAU's, "in regard to distance education, each campus is a silo", and these barriers present challenges to making distance education at UA more student centric (as opposed to campus centric).
   c. Competition between campuses is being driven, in part, by the metrics employed to reward student headcount. Incentives are needed to promote campus collaboration rather than competition.
   d. Much has been accomplished to date.

4. Specific Recommendations:

   * The UA must continue to utilize a centralized system wide (with broad constituent representation) body which will oversee and lead a "student centric", as opposed to the current model of "campus centric", approach to distance education.

   * Incentives (related to metrics used to reward campuses, assign resources and the like) must be reengineered and deployed in a manner which enhances collaboration and cooperation rather than competition.

   * Additional technological support, training and related support services for faculty and administrators are recommended. For example, more common approaches, practices and definitions are needed across the system; a "best practices" website should be employed; more generic, common and consistent information on distance education should be available on respective MAU

1

8/22/2008

websites; the banner system needs to employee common definitions, more consistent coding, etc; system wide "terminology" is recommended.

* The legislative audit team also discussed areas of excellence within distance education, the commitment of faculty, "awesome" progress to date, and other accolades in regard to distance education delivery.

* The timeline for the management letter, responses and delivery of written reports, when the report will become public, and the like, were discussed

Submitted by D. Julius

# UNIVERSITY of ALASKA

## Faculty Alliance

**Jill Dumesnil, Chair**
President, UAS Faculty Senate
11120 Glacier Highway
Juneau AK 99801
Phone: 907-796-6242
Fax: 907-796-6447
jadumesnil@mail.uas.alaska.edu

August 29, 2008

To:     Mark R. Hamilton, President of the University
        Dan Julius, Vice President, Academic Affairs

Fr:     Jill Dumesnil, Chair, Faculty Alliance

Re:     Alliance Actions, August 26, 2008

The Alliance had a very productive meeting this week as you may gather from the attached minutes. Also attached are two motions for your response.

The motion regarding the electronic faculty workload speaks to the need to abandon the beta testing and use of the electronic faculty activity report that was developed using Digital Master software because it is unworkable. The Alliance, however, is not opposed to a systemwide electronic faculty activity reporting system that is simple, accurate, searchable, secured, where the data only has to be entered by faculty one time; a system that is developed by UA faculty and staff, and one that augments rather than conflicts with promotion and tenure criteria.

The motion relating to the charge for the academic master plan speaks to the Alliance concerns and the need to hold off until it is vetted through the Alliance and senates. It is hoped, since the Alliance and SAC both meet on November 14, that the meetings can overlap a bit so the Alliance and SAC can jointly discuss this further. Meanwhile, Alliance members are taking it to the first senate meetings in September for input prior to the November 14 meeting. The Alliance strongly recommends against moving forward to the President's Cabinet and the Board of Regents with any academic master plan charge until Alliance and senate concerns are addressed and faculty governance is on board.

We discussed the summary of the oral report on distance education by the legislative audit team and look forward to receiving the final audit report. Since the electronic faculty survey portion of the audit was improperly conducted, we are understandably nervous about the final audit report. To quote the Alliance minutes, *"This document [referring to the summary of the oral report] prevents the university from addressing the individual needs of students and is administrative-centric rather than student centric. If SAC proceeds to handle distance education through ad hoc committees, it needs to involve faculty members who actually teach distance education, and the distance education courses cannot be moved away from the root program unit."* Otherwise it results in administration

dictating curriculum and that is the primary faculty responsibility. We were pleased, however, that the audit team seems to think that, overall, we are doing a good job in distance education.

We also discussed the impact of your July 1 travel reduction memo on faculty travel. While you have publicly orally stated your position that it excludes faculty travel, some faculty are being told at the campus level that it does affect their travel. If you would send a follow up memo to the chancellors excluding faculty travel, it would be greatly appreciated.

Beyond that, we were able to finalize the Alliance meeting schedule for the academic year and identify liaisons to the various administrative councils.

Last but certainly not least, we also wish to reiterate that both of you have a standing invitation to all Alliance meetings and we welcome your participation. We especially look forward to our discussions at President Hamilton's retreat with us in Fairbanks on October 29.

CC:    Interim Chancellor Rogers, Chancellors Ulmer and Pugh
       Provosts Henrich, Driscoll and Everett
       Faculty Alliance members

# UNIVERSITY *of* ALASKA

## Faculty Alliance

## MOTION RELATING TO ELECTRONIC FACULTY WORKLOAD

MOTION: passed unanimously

"The University of Alaska Faculty Alliance moves to reject the use of Digital Measures software for electronic Faculty Activity Reports throughout the UA system. The Alliance supports the idea of an effective, efficient electronic reporting system tailored to the unique needs of the University of Alaska.

Our concerns with the proposed system being tested at UAF focus on the following liability, accreditation and union issues.

- Potential FERPA violations.
  Much of the data is specific to students (grade distributions in classes and graduate student advising by name, with project title, graduation dates, etc.) There is no demonstrable security provision within the Digital Measures software to protect this data.

- Data stored with Digital Measures, not solely controlled by and at UA.
  In addition to FERPA concerns, much the data is proprietary or personal, and the data storage is not at UA in the current system. This jeopardizes potential classified research, developments for business relationships and personal security.

- No data entry validation.
  The current system does not provide for accurate data entry, or validate entries to other databases. Any data extracted from the system should be treated as suspect and could potentially misrepresent the university during any evaluation including an accreditation process.

- By more than tripling the number of data fields, this system changes the criteria under which faculty are evaluated.
  This is not in the spirit or the letter of the UNAC and UAFT Collective bargaining agreements. Changes in faculty evaluation criteria should be negotiated with the Unions.

Second, our concerns focus on technical problems, some of which have not been addressed in more than one year.

- Lack of reliable search functionality.
  Since two thirds of the data fields in the Digital Measures system are free form alpha-numeric, making a complete and effective search is virtually impossible. Invariably data will be missed or misrepresented in a search. This does not help administrative tasks of reporting faculty performance.

- No data entry validation.
  In addition to the concerns above, faculty could enter joint publications, or grants and contracts which are not editable by their colleagues. The potential for error is too large, and the interaction with other databases to check for accuracy is absent.

UNIVERSITY
of ALASKA

- Limited or no use of existing database efforts on campus.
  The current system does not effectively use the Banner system, and none of the other campus databases that keep track of faculty performance. This system is an incredible duplication of effort.

- Not time saving over the current system for faculty or administration.
  The Digital Measures system is so time-consuming it has a significant negative impact on academic responsibilities. Given the problems stated above

  Given the problems stated above, the Faculty Alliance does not support the use of the Digital Measures eFAR system, requests that all further beta testing be cancelled throughout the UA system and that the development of a product specific for UA begin immediately involving the collaborative efforts of faculty and staff.

  This action is effective August 26, 2008."

APPROVED:_____     DATE:_____

DISAPPROVED:_____     DATE:_____

COMMENTS:

# UNIVERSITY *of* ALASKA

## Faculty Alliance

**MOTION RELATING TO CHARGE FOR ACADEMIC MASTER PLAN**

MOTION: passed unanimously

"Faculty Alliance moves that it cannot endorse the academic master plan charge for UA as presented by Dan Julius without shared governance in accordance with Regents Policy and University Regulation 03.01.010. In its current form, the document does not constitute faculty involvement, provides no opportunity for expansion, contains no provision for sustainable consistent faculty involvement in academic master planning in the long term but rather relegates decision making to SAC and/or ad hoc committees. The Alliance is encouraged by the second sentence, of section 5 that ... '*governance bodies will be ...involved in the review/development of this plan prior to recommendation to the President's Council) and its implementation*', and look forward to working collaboratively on this very important mission. This action is effective.August 26, 2008."


APPROVED:_____     DATE:_____


DISAPPROVED:_____     DATE:_____


COMMENTS: