MINUTES
GOVERNANCE COORDINATING COMMITTEE (GCC) Meeting #68
Tuesday, 28 February 2006
Chancellor's Conference Room

1. Paul Layer called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

A. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Paul Layer, Faculty Senate, President, GCC, Chair
Shirish Patil, President-Elect Faculty Senate
Maya Salganek, President Staff Council
Jeff Stepp, President-Elect Staff Council
Maria Reyes, Co-Chair Diversity & Tolerance Committee
Joseph Blanchard, President ASUAF
Dani Carlson, Vice-President ASUAF

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Scott McCrea, Chair Intercollegiate Athletics Committee

OTHERS PRESENT:

Lynette Washington

B. Approved as distributed, GCC #68 Agenda Tuesday, 28 February 2006.

C. Approved as distributed, GCC #67 meeting Minutes, Tuesday, 13 December 2005.

2. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Intercollegiate Athletics and Recreation Committee (IAC), Scott McCrea

Paul Layer called the committee's attention to an e-mail query sent by Scott McCrea about the IAC reporting to the GCC. Paul Layer called for discussion about Scott's e-mail. Lynette Washington commented that she sent Scott McCrea, Roy Bird's comments from GCC meeting #58, in order to inform Scott that the issue had been brought up before.

Scott McCrea sent the following note via e-mail:

I do want to throw another thing out for future discussion...does
everyone really find it necessary that the chair of IAC serve on the
GCC? It just seems a bit odd to be there within the mix of the larger
Governance units (students, staff, and faculty) since the issues we deal
with are really on a smaller level than what the rest of you deal with.
If folks agree, maybe we need to look at bylaws and see if there might

be a better "home" for this group outside of governance.

Lynette Washington sent the following response to Scott McCrea:

Scott, below is what Roy Bird, former GCC Chair, stated to the GCC members at GCC# 58, Thursday, 25 September 2003:

Roy Bird asked what connection does IAC have to GCC, especially given the discussion about who appoints to the IAC. He stated that he has always seen IAC as serving Athletics not the GCC. He stated that it is almost a contradiction in purpose. He stated that maybe there is a reason that IAC became part of the GCC, but he is having trouble justifying it. He stated that IAC as a committee will not disband, because of their functions and things that they do annually. He stated that he doesn't know if what they do has any connection to GCC or what we need to be concerned about...

Paul Layer asked for more information about the issue. Maya Salganek informed the committee that IAC was placed under GCC(most likely), because it was composed of faculty, staff, and students just as the GCC. Lynette Washington added that Roy Bird discussed changing the committee to report directly to the Chancellor, but that the Chancellor decided against it. Paul Layer commented that it may be that it could be moved under Tim Barnett, Executive Dean, Student and Enrollment Services. Paul Layer stated that putting IAC some place with faculty, staff, and student oversight is probably the best place until the Chancellor decides otherwise. Paul Layer added that if anyone on the GCC thinks that it should stay under GCC, then we can take it up at the next meeting.

B. Chancellor's Campus Diversity Action Committee (CCDAC) – Maya Salganek

Maya Salganek reported that the committee discussed changing the mission statement of the committee. Maya informed the committee that the CCDAC group discussed the term of the chair's appointment. She stated that right now there is no specified term, but that a one-year term of appointment was discussed. She stated that the committee is still reviewing the Women's Center Survey and the Faculty Work life Survey. She informed the committee about International Women's Day Living Museum scheduled 8 March in Wood Center.

3. GOVERNACE REPORTS

A. Joe Blanchard – ASUAF President

Joe Blanchard reported that the student association recently returned from a Juneau conference where they met with legislators. He stated that students are currently contacting legislators that they met with in Juneau. He stated that students want legislators to know that we are watching and hope that they are supportive of the University budget requests. Joe Blanchard commented that it seems that there is a battle with President Hamilton about student tuition increases. Our costs keep rising; we want to make sure that the benefits we are getting out of it equate to those costs that are increasing. This cycle of fighting all of the time wears the group down overtime and does not feel productive.

Dani Carlson commented that she approached legislators in Juneau to get the point across that maybe they should start telling students exactly what they are doing with the tuition money.

Paul Layer commented that we the students, staff, and faculty are given the budget prepared by the administration. We are asked to defend something that we were not engaged in preparing. It is a very difficult situation.

Joe Blanchard stated that housing costs will increase from $300 to $500 dollars next year and that is on top of the proposed ten percent tuition increase. We are starting to reach the point where students feel that off campus housing is a more feasible option and going to school elsewhere is a more feasible option. Students are reaching a breaking point, services don't equate to what we receive. Maria Reyes asked what kind of response the students receive from the administration. Joe Blanchard replied that those folks are truly convinced that they have not reached the threshold yet. They don't quite realize how disappointed students are yet, because the enrollment numbers are fine.

Joe Blanchard informed the committee that student elections will be coming up during the 3rd week of April.

Joe Blanchard stated that regarding the plus and minus grade issues it is unclear what direction students want to take. Paul Layer commented that the Senate will try to set up a couple of forums right after spring break for people to come and talk about this issue. Paul Layer said the Curriculum committee will put together a survey to present both sides of the issue.

B. Paul Layer – Faculty Senate

Paul Layer asked Sharish Patil to report for the Senate. Sharish Patil reported that the Senate continues to look at the retirement issues. Sharish reported that the Senate is looking at the issue about financially interdependent partners and working on a resolution. Sharish Patil stated that Senate Curriculum committee is looking at core course cycles. Paul Layer added that the Senate is also looking at the value and transferability of core courses and general education requirements between the three MAUs.
Paul Layer stated that other campuses don't have a Core curriculum, but more of a General Education shopping list. He said that there may be some interest on the UAF campus to reassess the Core and maybe move in that direction, but right now we have the Core.

C. Maya Salganek – Staff Council

Maya Salganek reported that Staff Council is revising the Chancellor's Recognition staff award and adding a Chancellor's supervisory award to recognize staff and faculty that are in leadership positions. Maya Salganek reported that the Ad Hoc Health & Wellness committee is planning on a forum to discuss employee concerns about health coaches contacting them at work. She stated that some people are interested in getting a health coach, but opted out of the health survey so there is no way for them to opt in at this point. Maya stated that she will be going to Kotzebue and Nome campuses in March.

Jeff Stepp reported that he was a member of the search committee to recruit a Director of Training and Development. He stated that candidates for the position will be invited to campus soon. He is learning what the training and development needs of staff are. Jeff Stepp informed the committee that he attended an enrollment management task force retreat. Jeff Step reported that the primary discussion involved what the requirements will be to get into a BA program. Maria Reyes commented that it is almost like creating a second tier of students and that Bernice Joseph, Dean, CRCD is concerned.

4. OLD BUSINESS

A. Tobacco Issue follow-up – Open Discussion

Paul Layer opened the floor for discussion on the tobacco issue. Paul Layer stated that Chancellor has not acted to stop the selling of tobacco on campus. Maya Salganek stated that there is still an opportunity to discuss the issue in a positive rather than a reactionary way. She reported that many people are concerned about smokers being allowed to smoke in entry way areas. Joe Blanchard stated that students are moving towards a phase out of selling cigarettes on campus within the next two to three years.

B. KUAC Issue follow-up – Open Discussion

Paul Layer stated that the Senate passed a KUAC resolution since the last GCC meeting. He stated that the Senate sent the Chancellor a letter regarding what the Senate meant about the mismanagement of public trust; the Chancellor took the information under advisement. Paul Layer stated that the KUAC Task Force came up with two sets of recommendations. The task force did not accomplish its stated goal to come up with a unified set of recommendations that is palpable to all concerned. Maya Salganek commented about the Board of Regents not wanting to become involved in programming decisions.

C. Proposed motion to delete the Diversity and Tolerance Committee

Paul Layer asked the question about continuing the Diversity and Tolerance committee if the Chancellor's Campus Diversity Action committee (CCDAC) has basically the same charge. Maria Reyes stated that the CCDAC is doing everything that the Diversity and Tolerance committee was charged with doing. Maria Reyes informed the GCC members that the CCDAC has a budget, but the Diversity and Tolerance committee does not. Maya Salganek read the Diversity and Tolerance committee charge to the Governance group.

Jeff Stepp asked what is the status of the Chancellor's proposal to remove the word "diversity" from the strategic plan. Maria Reyes stated that the decision was made to leave the word diversity in the strategic plan.

Paul Layer called to move the motion to the floor. Maria Reyes commented that the CCDAC is progressing well, but that she is concerned that the committee has a lot of independent voices. Maya Salganek stated that the CCDAC has a higher profile than the Diversity & Tolerance committee. Maya Salganek stated that we might want to change the motion to emphasize that the GCC is still committed to diversity. Paul Layer stated that we can add to the rationale statement that the GCC remains committed to the ideals of the Diversity & Tolerance committee; however the goals and charge are being met under the Chancellor's Campus Diversity Action Committee (CCDAC). Maya Salganek stated that the statement can be stronger, because the GCC evoked the configuration of CCDAC. Maya recommended that the amendment include a statement that the GCC accomplished its mission by creating the CCDAC and we feel that the Diversity and Tolerance committee is no longer necessary.

The UAF Governance Coordinating Committee passed the following Motion at the GCC #68 meeting, 28 February 2006.

MOTION (passed unanimously)
= = = = =

The UAF Governance Coordinating Committee moves to delete the Diversity & Tolerance committee under the Governance Coordinating Committee.

Effective: Immediately

Rationale: Having succeeded in establishing the Chancellor's Campus Diversity Action committee (CCDAC) the UAF Governance Coordinating committee concludes that the goal's and charge's of the Diversity and Tolerance committee are being met under the CCDAC, therefore; the Diversity and Tolerance committee is no longer necessary.

5. NEW BUSINESS

A. "Constitutional Amendment: Benefits & Marriage." It is designated in the Senate as SJR 20 and in the House as HJR 32 – open discussion officers –
   - Attachment #1 Benefits and Marriage Document Letter sent by Jane Weber and Sine Anahita
   - Attachment #2 Bill HJR32 text
   - Attachment #3 Faculty Senate Resolution on Constitutional Amendment: Benefits & Marriage, submitted by Sine Anahita and Jane Weber
   - Attachment #4 Public Comment Statement received from Tim Stallard, 22 February regarding Senate Joint Resolution SJR20 / House Joint Resolution HJR32

Paul Layer called the groups attention to the list of attachments related to SJR 20 and HJR 32. He stated that the Senate's resolution has not been approved by the Senate at this time. Paul Layer asked what does the GCC group want to do. Jeff Stepp recommended that before the GCC acts, we should wait to see what each of the governance groups does at individual meetings, before deciding if we should issue a unified statement. Maya Salganek stated that she would like to get institutional statistics on how many Financially Interdependent Partners (FIPs) are out there, because she is concerned about how many people would be denied benefits. Sharish Patil commented that there is concern about not just who would be denied benefits, but future hires. Paul Layer stated that we are aware of the issue, but at this point the GCC has not decided how we want to respond.

Paul Layer asked if there are other issues.

Lynette Washington asked when the CCDAC plans to distribute the campus-wide diversity plan. Maria Reyes stated that the committee is still working on the plan.

Paul Layer asked what happens to the Diversity and Tolerance committee Chair, since that committee has been deleted. Who will report to GCC for CCDAC? Maria Reyes stated that she could represent the committee to GCC or someone from the CCDAC. It was confirmed that Maria Reyes will report to the GCC about CCDAC.

6. Comments or Questions

No comments or questions.

7. Adjourn

Paul Layer called for the meeting to adjourn; the meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

****

Last Day of Instruction: Friday, 5 May / Final Exams: May 8-11

Governance Coordinating Committee #68 Minutes Attachment #1
28 February 2006

Benefits and Marriage Document Letter
Sent by Jane Weber and Sine Anahita

Dear Members:

The Alaska Legislature is considering an amendment of Alaska's constitution that would prohibit unmarried Alaska couples from continuing to access a wide range of benefits that university employees have enjoyed for nearly a decade. Although originally intended to target same-sex couples, the amendment is so broad and vague that it would affect all non-married couples and their families.

Currently at the university, financially interdependent partners (FIPs) are eligible to live with their families in university student housing, faculty housing, and are able to purchase health insurance and family memberships at the Student Recreation Center. The amendment could prohibit FIPs being able to enjoy these basic benefits, and also could prevent them from having access to tuition waivers, library membership, even parking passes for their financially interdependent partners. If passed, the constitutional amendment could prohibit the university to allow an unmarried partner to take Family Medical Leave to tend to their seriously ill partner, or even to take leave to attend their partner's funeral.

This amendment could harm recruitment and retention of faculty and staff, and would place UAF in a regressive position in the current marketplace. In addition, it has the possibility of making researchers ineligible for grant funding from those federal agencies and other grant sources that require grantees to have equal employment policies prohibiting discrimination based on marital status or sexual orientation. The amendment would negatively impact equal compensation for equal work. Inevitably, student recruitment and retention would also be affected. The proposed constitutional amendment would thus adversely affect all members of the university community. You can act by contacting your legislators to voice your concern.

The title of the proposed amendment is "Constitutional Amendment: Benefits & Marriage." It is designated in the Senate as SJR 20 and in the House as HJR 32. As of February 20, 2006, it has been referred to the Senate Judiciary and Finance committees. If it is subsequently passed by two-thirds of the Legislature, it will be put in front of Alaska voters in November for ratification.

You can read its text here:
http://www.legis.state.ak.us/basis/get_bill_text.asp?hsid=HJR032A&session=24
Its sponsors in the House: Representatives Coghill, Lynn, and Kelly
Its sponsor in the Senate: Seekins

What you can do:
Please contact your representatives. You can find their contact information here:
http://w3.legis.state.ak.us/infodocs/infodocs.htm
You can also write Public Opinion Messages (POMs) from this

Governance Coordinating Committee #68 Minutes Attachment #2
28 February 2006

Bill Text

BILL ID: HJR 32

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 32

Proposing an amendment to the section of the Constitution of the State of Alaska relating to marriage.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

*** Section 1.** Article I, sec. 25, Constitution of the State of Alaska, is amended to read:

Section 25. Marriage <u>and related limitations</u>. To be valid or recognized in this State, a marriage may exist only between one man and one woman. **<u>No other union is similarly situated to a marriage between a man and a woman and, therefore, a marriage between a man and a woman is the only union that shall be valid or recognized in this State and to which the rights, benefits, obligations, qualities, or effects of marriage shall be extended or assigned.</u>**

*** Sec. 2.** The amendment proposed by this resolution shall be placed before the voters of the state at the next general election in conformity with art. XIII, sec. 1, Constitution of the State of Alaska, and the election laws of the state.

Governance Coordinating Committee #68 Minutes Attachment #3
28 February 2006

Faculty Senate RESOLUTION ON Constitutional Amendment: Benefits & Marriage (SJR 20 and HJR 32)

WHEREAS, Discrimination against faculty on the basis of marital status is expressly prohibited by the University of Alaska Board of Regents Statement of Non-discrimination; and

Whereas, the UAF Faculty Senate affirms the importance of complying with university non-discrimination policies; and

Whereas, SJR 20 and HJR 32 would have the effect of countermanding university policy prohibiting discrimination based on marital status; and

WHEREAS, to comply with SJR 20 and HJR 32 the university would deny financially interdependent partners (FIPs) insurance benefits, family membership at the Student Recreation Center, tuition waivers, faculty housing, and other valuable benefits currently offered; and

WHEREAS, The Faculty Senate affirms that providing insurance and other benefits to FIPs is a valuable way to recruit and retain excellent faculty, in addition to being required by university policy; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the UAF Faculty Senate is opposed to SJR 20/HJR 32.

Submitted by Jane Weber and Sine Anahita

Governance Coordinating Committee #68 Minutes Attachment #4
28 February 2006

Proposed constitutional amendment will harm UAF staff and our families
Public Comment to UAF Staff Council by Tim Stallard
February 22, 2006

- After a 1998 amendment, the Alaska constitution defines marriage as between one man and one woman. But in a case brought by state employees, the Alaska Supreme Court unanimously decided this past fall that it violates the equal protection clause of our constitution to deny spousal benefits to same-sex couples because they cannot legally marry.
- So a current resolution (Senate Joint Resolution 20 / House Joint Resolution 32) proposes adding language to Alaska's constitution that all the "rights, benefits, and obligations" of marriage shall be denied to unmarried couples.
- This resolution is so broadly written that nobody knows what it means or what its effects will be. But the intent is clear. The authors of this Resolution are actively opposing the Supreme Court's finding that our constitutional Equal Protection Clause applies to gay and lesbian Alaskans.
- While the intent of this resolution is to discriminate against gay and lesbians, it will harm thousands of Alaskan families (most of whom are not gay) and their children whom are not protected by a marriage contract. We are not living in the 1950's any more and family structures are much more complex and varied than they were in the past.
- A majority of Fortune 500 Companies offer domestic partner benefits to attract the best employees. Companies including:
    - Alaska Airlines, AT&T, BP America, Citigroup, Coca Cola, Eastman Kodak, Ford Motor Company, Home Depot, IBM, Intel, Microsoft, Motorola, and Wells Fargo.
    - Why would we ban an "industry-best HR practice" in Alaska?
- This resolution will be disastrous for the many UAF Staff members who participate in the FIPS program. Many of these couples are not gay.
    - The cost of the FIPS program is small, less than 2% of benefits program cost.
- As an institution, UAF needs to offer these benefits to remain competitive. This resolution would have a chilling affect on the University's ability to attract and retain the best professors, researchers, employees, and students.

The University has offered domestic partner benefits for more than 11 year

****

A tape of this Governance Coordinating Committee meeting is available in the Governance Office, Room 312 Signers' Hall.