Faculty Alliance meeting Sept 12, 2008 2-3:30pm

Everybody present Mike Humphrey, Dan Julius

EMERITI

Emeriti until 2006 choice between TRS and ORP choice. State changed TRS in July; obvious to us it may not meet UA needs i.e., thresholds for healthcare. Looking to future, we discover why faculty stay at UA longer than normal and that is the lack of healthcare provisions. That led to Emeriti healthcare similar to TIAA-CREF including insurance and VEBA which allows you to save money and use that money to pay for healthcare not covered by insurance. Medicare and pension will pay about 51 percent and will need tax advantaged savings plan to pay for difference. Emeriti using Fidelity Life Cycle Funds to fund this. Also set ujp program with Aetna to manage the program, based on zip, your rates are adjusted. Also has an annual open enrollment period.

How is it funded? Requires an employee contribution; a flat dollar amount per person. Emeriti also recommends employee contribution after tax.

Half percent of identified employee salary goes in as ua contribution; about 300-700 per year per employee. 500-650 would pay half the premium. This would allow us to retire earlier. The ORP is a separate thing. Emeriti is an add on as part of the core program, new tier ORP IV.

Will this change the contribution to ORP? Yes, by the difference of the congtribution to Emeriti. Would the decision to go to ORP IV be irrevocable. Feds and Alaska say irrevocable. Counsel says there may be certain times when you can switch between ORP plans. Emeriti only comes into play only after retirement. After age 65, Emeriti coordinates with medicare. TRS continues after 65 as a medicare supplement. Comparing TRS healthcare and Emeriti, will TRS be better than ORP IV. 90 percent are taking ORP.

Behner presenting to BoR

PAGINATE AGENDA NEXT TIME.

ADOPT AGENDA – passed
APPROVE MINUTES – passed as amended. couple typos, 6.2 delete repeat phrase in motion, bullet lack of reliability etc., Genie didn't understand it –

CHAIR REPORT – going to BoR next week/ SAC meeting on 9/23 in Anchorage; did forward the motions to president and vice president.

ACADEMIC MASTER PLAN

Dan Julius thanked the Alliance for reminding us how important consultation is and in no way was the academic master plan meant to circumvent that. We only got as far as writing the charge which states in part number 4 (state from charge). WE were hoping we would discover which governance groups should be consulted. As it unfolds development of academic plan, that the provosts would bgo back to campuses and get input from their groups. He hopes SAC and the Alliance can meet jointly to discuss this further. A face to face meeting would allay fears (Dan pays?) Not intended to usurp MAU missions or governance roles.

Point three caught Alliance concern not construe consulting the Alliance as having consulted with the faculty. The Alliance has to go back to the faculty oln their respective campuses and consult with them. Affirm of faculty consultation means that the Alliance has to go back to the senates. Julius agreed. Unless faculty and acadmic administrators at the MAUs by into this, it won't be worth the paper it's printed on. That's not to say we won't have tough issues. That's why we say that there will still be duplication.

Re the discontinuation, there is some confusion about the term governance. WE are calling some things governance and they are not. Item 4 is meant to address that. Four is not meant the governance groups on campus. There is some confusion about governance. Some of the campuses weren't sure what some of these systemwide groups are doing. Let's have a joint SAC/Alliance on Nov 14. Some may be committed on the 14th and have a frank discussion. Julius wants it on site and will find money for that.

Sandberg: there is so much turnover in the faculty and administration if the written language is not clear, the confusion is exacerbated.

The draft charge was merely the framework for having the discussion. Some of the administrators have issues with this as well. WE also said in item 6 that other governance groups will be involved. It is hoped that the plan would be finished in spring 2009 but if this is too optimistic, then we need to change it. The point is to assign major areas to particular MAUs and set up broad missions to MAUs. Will the broad missions precludes other MAUs from doing the same things. WE have to have a conversation that draws some broad lanes described in 2.b. WE need to look out into the future. The budget is driving the academic programs instead of the other way around.

A master plan projects into the future using a bottom up process through the provosts to SAC to the BoR. Right now a new program goes through campus constituencies and comes to SAC. SAC votes sends it to VPACAD then he takes it to President's Cabinet. A new program has go go through the MAU and system procedures before going to the board. An academic master plan provides direction over time and would evolve as needs and situations change. The change is where the strategic planning is taking place and how that changes things. We are looking at some major system issues; where are we going to invest heavily in the future and areas of coordination where resources are less robust and less into campus based planning. Can't do system planning without impacting campus and faculty academic freedom when you limit where things should go.

What exists now is no real guidelines for what the system is doing; everyone is doing their own thing. The budget process is political and what we are trying to do This doesn't impact what's going on now; it impacts where we are going to put new programs like law schools. WE have to meet first before moving forward. WE are combining RAC and SAC.

The decision elements that guide decisions today may not be the ones we use tomorrow (Anderson). If we know where something is going, there is less fighting over scarce resources. We haven't discussed the effectiveness of shared appointments, programs etc., and if it doesn't work, we won't do it.

Basic is that oour fears about consultation. We don't have enough academic voice in the system and absent that, budget drives the academic process. WE have to get into a groove with the budget train.

Item 6.2 distance education –Julius

DE really is growing by leaps and bounds but without a plan as who is going to do what and where. We attempted to gather a group together and decide on some basic principles. Did this last May. Jill has a copy and can be distributed, i.e., incentives for creativity, looking at best delivery methods, shared revenues. We laid out a set of principles and haven't implemented because of the audit. Audit team gave us an oral report and waiting for the management report that puts it on paper. Promised it in Septemb er. Once the audit,. SAC will set up an ad hoc committee to address the issues brought up in the audit.

Anderson said concept of how to deliver a class gets very close to telling a faculty how to teach the class. To the extent those kinds of pedagogical decisions made centrally make de faculty very nervous. Elements of he technological delivery impact pedagogy, the direct responsibility of the faculty.

Should every MAU have the right to teach anything they want to anywhere in the state? Anderson more of a fan of competition.

Wait for the legislative audit before proceeding. Anderson will join the DE group developing the DE vision. As DE becomes more central, it becomes a fourth MAU and moves outside the individual departments. When cost and economies of scale drive academics we will marginalize that which we most value.

HAVE ANOTHER MEETING WITH SAC OVER DISTANCE ED.

The Alliance considers DE a big part of master planning.

EFAR – passé the motion and sent it forward; response from Susan Henrichs. Since Digital Measures didn't make the changes she wanted, she cancelled it for this year. She limits it to Banner upload of teaching, of research and EndNote for publicaqtions. This will still require keeping an eye on.

New Business: Sustainability high on BR's list and will be on vocation. Larry Foster heading it up at UAA. Looking for a director. When director comes on board Foster will move on to other things. If Alliance is interested in sustainability, Foster will give an update.

SUSTAINABILITY FOR PRESIDENT'S RETREAT.

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT – Where is it happening.. SAC or other? Get Anderson into those meetings.

SAC has not met since Alliance last meeting; meeting on 9/23.
HRC – Jonathan Anderson is the actual lead; change and notify Behner
ITC – UAF will be adapting Google APS as the official email server.
RAC – no meeting since Craig Dorman was VPACAD. Want to make sure RAC stays RAC and doesn't become merged with SAC.
BC – Bc met on first day of classes so Colnnor couldn't attend.
SSC – attachment came out of meeting last may; something staff came up with in response to DJ asking staff for input. Some of the items could affect faculty. No idea where it stands; lots of problems with a lot of things. JD will email the Banner student team members.
Student Success Steering Committee – last version was April draft.
Retirement

SENATE REPORTS

UAA – written report attachd. We actually developed a set of goals for the year passed fb y the senate; six goals.

UAF – Buck Sharpton will be guest speaker at the UAF Senate meeting; anticipate Carl Kowalsky on Google APS and Musueum report.

UAS – met last Friday; reports from chancellor and provost; main item of business was a GER proposal. Senate will ask the faculty about reevaluating the GERS including the categories. Provost restructured the sc hools, shuffled the deans around and identify the campus as teaching driven and how that impacts UAS research. Provost also wantst to take active role in search committees to make sure faculty have teaching credentials, and will review all grant applications to see if they fit at UAS. (Get DJ to send minutes)

Ocrtober 10 meeting agenda
UAA CAS electronic faculty workload-Genie
Sustainability, community service, DE,

Adjourned at 4pm.