EMR Committee Report – September 2012
Chair: Walker Wheeler

EMR Meeting
September 4, 2012

Members - Kayla Hansen(Excused), Gary Newman(Excused), Richard Machida (Attending), Walker Wheeler(Attending)
Also Attending: Nicole Dufour (SC Secretary)

EMR met and discussed two topics. The first of which was deciding on the election timelines. Two timelines were proposed. One met the traditional guidelines in the Staff Council Bylaws, and the second, which was an accelerated option, would allow the results to be reported in the November Staff Council meeting instead of the December meeting. The additional benefits the second option had were being able to communicate with high confidence to the Calendar committee the new Staff Council Reps, and give the newly elected reps the chance to attend and observe the December meeting. After discussion the first of the two timelines were decided upon. The timeline follows:

- First Week of September - Request staff listing from HR.
- September 17, 2012 - DB/Web-Site Ready with HR Feed loaded
- October 1, 2012 - Nominations Open (Monday)
- October 19, 2012 - Nominations Close - (Friday, open for 3 business weeks.)
- October 22, 2012 - Elections Open (Monday)
- November 26, 2012 - Elections Close (Monday, 5 full weeks, could end on Fri Nov 26)
- EMR discuses the same or following week, and prepares statement for SC meeting.
- December 19th, 2012 - Staff Council Meeting, Election Results presented

See attached document for both as well as additional considerations for the elections.

The second order of business was discussion of two partially developed reorganization strategies and focuses. A comment was made that when trying to convey any of the reorganization strategies the goals for the reorganization should be listed to help measure whether or not the proposal will move toward that goal. Although both proposed reorganizations are currently lacking, there was some good found in each. During the discussion of the different reorganization strategies a third one emerged that is a hybrid of the first and second proposed. Below are the goals of a reorganization (remembered in meeting), options one and two, and the third is a description of the combined proposal.

Goals of a Staff Council Reorganization
- Increase UAF staff's involvement with Staff Council and governance.
- Make Staff Council leaner and more responsive, with dedicated individuals.
- Make Staff Council more efficient, thereby decreasing active representatives' time commitment.
- Increasing involvement and effectiveness of Staff Council would elevate the role of governance in the eyes of both the staff and administration of UAF.

Proposed Reorganization Option 1
Move to fully at large with no differentiation between association at the University. The President and Vice President positions would continue to be the primary officers. The election cycle could be broken down into a similar even/odd year election cycles. Elections would be simplified, and highest vote totals would define who council members would be to fill the available seats that year. There is also the option in this scenario to have those running, run for seats that are arbitrarily numbered. For those who were not successful in being elected, they would only have to wait a year to re-run, as opposed to two years now.

Proposed Reorganization Option 2
Move to an at large membership that has three types of represented groups from the university. These groups would be Administrative, Research, and Remote? For those who were not successful in being elected, they would only have to wait a year to re-run, as opposed to two years now.

Proposed Reorganization Option 3
This option is similar to Option 2 in that it takes advantage of the different divisions into 3 main categories including Administrative, Research, Education Support staff and Non-Fairbanks staff. Each of the major categories would have a division to make two groups out of each category for rotating people on and off staff council. For elections cycles, the candidates would self select and explain why they are appropriate for a categories seat, only being able to choose one category seat to run for, and the election would then be at large. Each voting constituent would be able to vote as many times per category as there are open seats. (ie: 2 open Administrative Seats and 5 people running, a constituent gets to vote for 2 of them.) Highest number counts would determine who received the seat for each category. The number of seats available to each category would be done similar to how units are done currently. Groups will be determined based off likely function of the different groups, and percentages of the population will be used to determine number of seats.

Some of the optional components that were mentioned were the following:

1. **Communication Officer** The focus of this position would be to make minutes summary directly available after a staff council meeting for the constituent body as well as draft information to be communicated out to the constituents beyond normal minutes. The ideal person would likely have experience running a periodical publication system, such as a blog or newsletter.
2. **Technology Officer** The focus of this position would be to provide technical assistance during the time of elections, or other miscellaneous technology needs or recommendations. This officer could be always assigned to the TAB role and should have experience supporting various desktop, server, and web technologies.
3. **Elections** There are two ways to set these up. The first would include labeling each seat that is to be held, with candidates running for specific seats (though this only makes more sense if there is a division of types or locations). The second would take those seats that would be available, and have the highest voted in be placed in the available seats. If there were 5 seats available, then it would be the top 5 highest voted for members.