Faculty Alliance Minutes
November 15, 2024
3:30-5:00 pm
[Zoom Link](#)

Members

UAS	UAA
Glenn Wright, Past- President UAS Faculty Senate,	**Jackie Cason**, President, UAA Faculty Senate
Brian Blitz, UAS Faculty Senate President	LuAnn Piccard,Past- President, UAA Faculty Senate
Ali Ziegler, UAS Faculty Senate President-Elect	**Matthew Cuella**r, President-Elect, UAA Faculty Senate
UAF	
Jennifer Carroll, Chair, Faculty Alliance, UAF Faculty Senate Past-President	Ex Officio: Paul Layer, Vice President ASR
Abel Bult-Ito, President, UAF Faculty Senate (on leave)	
Leah Berman, Acting President UAF Faculty Senate	Support: Sharon Dayton Noel Romanovsky
Donie Bret-Harte, Interim Faculty Senate President-Elect	

1. Call to order
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Meeting [Minutes](#) October 5 - these are my notes, not official minutes, but they do Approved Minutes
4. Guest: Jeannette Okinczyc, Chief Information Security Officer - modernize our standard user password policies - new policies to be announced in late November and go into effect in 2025 There was a significant security event which affected a faculty member.
   5 - 10 reports of phishing.
   Compromised accounts 1-5 accounts resets per day
   Malware/unauthorized access 5-10 incidents per year
   New Standard Used Password Policy
5. Old Business
   a. FIF Update
6. New Business
   a. Curriculum/program approval process and BOR scheduling
      i. "New program proposal process" flow [document](#)
   b. Thought Leaders Forum - [Draft RFP](#)
   c. FTO: collective faculty action to ensure that everyone takes their FTO
7. Information/Discussion
   a. Geo Differential issue: Staff Alliance is considering whether to ask for the Geo dif to be reviewed. It hasn't been revised in some time.

       b. FIF RFP suggested changes: collection of issues/suggestions from faculty who applied this year

       c. Software request process: Ben Shier email (scroll to below)

8. Faculty Senate Reports
    a. UAS
       i. We still have concerns about UA Software Request Process.
       ii. We will start evaluating Deans/Campus Directors in the spring. We will use a Qualtrics survey and results will go directly to the Provost to help them do their annual evaluation of the Deans/Campus Directors.
       iii. We will be transitioning to Ambassador Education Solutions Bookstore starting in Spring 2025.

AY 24-25 Calendar as of August 2024

Day (Friday, 3:30 to 5 pm unless otherwise noted)	Tentative Agenda Items
August 23, 2024	Invite Ben Shier to discuss Banner Upgrade
September 13, 2024	
Saturday, October 5, 2024 in Fairbanks	Fall Face-to-Face - identify: ● Key issues for the year ● Prep for FIF ● Prep for Thought Leaders Forum
November 15, 2024	
December 13, 2024	Determine Juneau F-T-F dates for February/March
January 10, 2025	
February 14, 2025	
March 14, 2025	
April 11, 2025	
May 9, 2025	

Email from Ben regarding software process:

Thank you for the questions. The software review process has been a work in progress over the past two years. It was started to address growing compliance requirements for financial regulations and audit findings around better review and management of third-party vendors as well as

accessibility. This process kicks in whenever software is purchased or renewed by the university; for this reason, the review process may be mysterious to anyone who is not involved in regular purchasing. Currently, a review is needed any time a purchase or renewal occurs.

The team put together a few news items on the process in UA News, the most recent being in June of 2024, and continues to hold biweekly listening sessions with each university's procurement groups to encourage continuous improvement on the process. I am sure there is more we can do to get the word out, and I am open to your thoughts and feedback on how to better reach faculty. I think one of the key challenges here is that this topic isn't all that relevant to one's day until someone is trying to buy something. If it becomes challenging at that point to purchase something for the classroom, I understand that frustration. Open to your thoughts on how to improve here.

Below response to your specific questions:

1. The Software Review process is initiated whenever a software package is bought or renewed by the university; unless a person is involved with the purchase of the product, they likely would be unaware of the process. As software is reviewed the first time, the intent is to publish it in the Software Catalog, so it is easier to procure in the future.
2. We appreciate the feedback on the Software Catalog that is part of the new software review process. We are working on streamlining this process and the way that the software is represented. We often recommend people use the "Search page" function for the web page, but I recognize a responsive field where you could start typing the name and it would locate it would be a better tool. We're also working as fast as we can to add additional software we know about or have reviewed to the list. We're behind. Thank you for the feedback.
3. University faculty and staff requests for individual GenAI tools has significantly influenced what tools we have reviewed. Our goal has been not to slow down exploration and use of as many tools as

possible. OIT review is limited to a standard set of risk criteria addressing data privacy, legal/regulatory compliance mandates, and enterprise security. From this, we are producing a guidance matrix for the use of commonly requested tools based on applicable data classification. This has been distributed to university CIOs and will eventually be posted to an OIT AI informational website. Determination of appropriate use beyond that basic guidance is at individual university discretion and subject to each institution's policies and procedures. Additionally, there are some key tools that are becoming available in our environment from current providers, such as Microsoft and Google, as well as new AI features built into Zoom. Beyond these mentioned, OIT is not in any way selecting tools that the university community is required to use.

4. No formal policies have been established yet specifically related to the use of AI tools beyond standard information technology use policies. However, we would urge caution when accessing unvetted AI services, particularly with non-public data, as they can ingest and use end-user data in a variety of ways, often without your knowledge (e.g. storing and reusing user submitted data, scanning files, taking screenshots, etc.). This is true for web-based services as well as downloaded applications. Neither Grammarly nor Boodlebox have been formally reviewed by OIT for privacy, compliance, or enterprise security implications. Grammarly does provide major compliance attestations, such as FERPA, HIPAA, PCI-DSS, etc., although they do use some third-party LLMs. Boodlebox functions as an AI service aggregation platform with numerous third-party providers, so it is impossible to provide risk recommendations without a detailed investigation of the company's architecture and data handling practices.

5. Logging into a personal account from a work computer is not prohibited but can nevertheless expose University data to access by those services. Note that both Google Gemini and Microsoft Copilot GenAI chat tools are available at no charge to all UA employees and students. Copilot uses the same LLM as OpenAI ChatGPT, so unless there is a specific OpenAI tool not otherwise available, there is no

need to purchase a subscription. Both Google and Microsoft provide enterprise data protection assurances to individuals accessing their services with their UA accounts.

OIT is currently working with university CIOs to develop a website that will provide informational resources specifically related to the understanding, adoption, and use of AI solutions. This is being developed simply as guidance. This is a rapidly evolving space, and we want to provide guidance on reasonable use while not slowing efforts to explore and innovate with this technology. We hope to have that available by the end of the year.

Finally, related to the Faculty Alliance's recent email on GenAI access to Paul Layer, my hope is that we can meet and dialogue soon. I know faculty are very interested and working in this space, and I'm eager to both share what we're seeing as well as learn more about how to better support faculty exploration and innovation, resources, and guidance where helpful. I'm hoping we can schedule time soon.