

MINUTES
UAF STAFF COUNCIL #219
Wednesday, August 31, 2011
8:45-11:00 AM
IARC Room 501

Audio Conference information: 1-800-893-8850, Participant PIN: 8244236

1. 8:45-8:50 CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by Pips Veazey, Staff Council President.

A. Roll Call – Quorum Present

PRESENT

Jodi Baxter
Gary Bender
Travis Brinzow
Mary Sue Dates
Debbie Gonzalez
Kala Hansen
Megan Hoffman
Naomi Horne
Shawn Houston
Claudia Koch
Bradley Krick
Forrest Kuiper
Richard Machida
Gary Newman
Evelyn Pensgard
Carol Shafford
Kayt Sunwood
Ben Tucker
Robin Weinant
Walker Wheeler
John Clendenin, Jr.
Sharon Corbett
Jennifer Elhard
Shelbie Umphenour
Heather Wells
Katie Wilson

ABSENT

Sara Battiest
Dawn Dearing
Brad Havel
Heather Leavengood
Robert Mackey
Carolyn Simmons
Bryan Uher
Jennifer Ward

EXCUSED ABSENCE

Jennifer Ward

OFFICERS PRESENT

Pips Veazey, Staff Council President
Juella Sparks, Staff Council Vice-President
Maria Russell, Staff Council Past-President

GUESTS

Brian Rogers, UAF Chancellor
Cathy Cahill, Faculty Senate President
Mari Freitag, ASUAF President
Heather Bryant, UAF *Sun Star* Editor
Beth Behner, Chief Human Resources Officer
Martin Klein,

During roll call, Megan Hoffman announced that she would be stepping down from Staff Council and asked for someone to assist Naomi as co-chair of Staff Affairs.

B. Approval of Minutes of Meeting #218

There were two amendments to the #218 meeting minutes.

- Under 1A., Shelby Umphenor's name was added to the list of 'Present' members
- For item 6B, Pat Pitney's title was corrected to read 'Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services'

The minutes were approved as amended.

2. 8:50-9:00 STATUS OF PENDING ACTIONS

A. Motions Approved:

- No Motions Approved

B. Motions Denied:

Pips indicated that three of the motions made at the last meeting that were denied due to Staff Council's improper procedural approach when submitting the motions. These motions were:

- Motion 2011/215/3 – Tobacco Surcharge Motion
- Motion 2011/217/1 – Employee Tuition Waiver Motion
- Motion 2011/217/2 – Healthcare Task Force Motion

These motions were denied by the Chancellor because they were not things that he directly impacted. All items from the last meeting were systemwide items, which can be taken to Staff Alliance if Staff Council makes a formal resolution.

Pips and Juella have discussed the importance of following correct procedures to ensure that Staff Council's voice is heard. In the future, Staff Council will look at motions and then create resolutions to be moved forward to the appropriate body. If it is a statewide issue or a system wide issue, then the issue will be taken to Staff Alliance.

Pips suggested and Juella agreed that these three issues not be addressed at this meeting. It was suggested that the issues be taken back to committee. Committee can then write draft resolutions for review and approval for the September Staff Council meeting.

C. Motions Pending:

Juella indicated that some of these resolutions have to do with health care,. The healthcare benefits review situation is such that Beth wants all changes to the FY13 health care benefits to be approved and discussion done by January. We have three short months to get input on the Tobacco Surcharge and the Spousal Surcharge, and the Healthcare Task Force.

Carol S. asked to address this matter. Carol missed the last meeting, but stated that the Healthcare Task Force was planning on having public meetings. The Healthcare Task Force is planning on having public information meetings in October and November. She stressed the importance of having as many people as possible at meetings, to listen to what is said, so that we can provide informed input. Members were requested to attend these meetings when they receive notification.

Juella S. suggested that Staff Affairs meet to draft resolutions on these two issues. Once she has received something in writing from Council and Staff Affairs she will take present it to Staff Alliance.

Juella S. suggested that for the other two motions, Staff Alliance needs to draft resolutions and have it on the September Staff Council Agenda. This way it will make its way to Staff Alliance and the Staff Health Care Committee. She stressed the urgency in getting these matters addressed; there is not much time to get input in before changes are made.

- Walker W. indicated that Council had not approved the meeting agenda.
- Pips V. announced that there were changes to the agenda format which could be addressed if needed.
- Debbie G. requested that the scheduled break be included in all meetings
- Pips V. approved of this request and indicated that both officers were concerned with maintaining the break and the time frame and that this was a factor in the restructuring of the agenda.
- The agenda was adopted as presented.

3. 9:00-9:05 PUBLIC COMMENT

- There were no public comments at this time.

4. 9:05-9:15 OFFICER REPORTS

A. Pips Veazey, President

President's report was to be emailed to those not physically present; there were paper copies for those at the meeting. Pips welcomed everyone back and expressed thanks for having the opportunity to work with Juella. Nicole was introduced as a replacement for Joyce for a couple of months. Pips V. explained that the agenda has been reorganized a bit in order to place some of the most important

parts earlier in the meeting. Movement of business sections to earlier in the meeting was the main change. They also want to try to more closely adhere to the 11 a.m. time frame.

Pips V. wants to see committees take on a larger role in how we do business. She views a strong council as being built upon strong committees. It was requested that most of the debate and the groundwork be done in committee before it reaches the council.

Pips V. stated that Staff Council has really great representation this year as Juella has been elected the Staff Alliance President. She acknowledged that most of the Staff Council members present were veteran Staff Council members, so most understand how Staff Council interacts with Staff Alliance. A group of staff presidents and vice presidents from all of the MAUs including Statewide and we are really lucky to have Juella leading that this year.

Pips explained that Nicole will be working over the next month to determine committee membership to ensure that we have an understanding of when each term ends and to identify where we might need to fill some gaps that are open. We have been working with the internal committees to get an idea of what issues they feel are the most important for the upcoming year and we will be continuing this over the next month.

Communications Committee will swing into gear and work on issues that are related to getting our messages out to our constituents and vice-versa and maybe try to form a stronger partnership with people around campus as well as a stronger voice for council.

Pips and Juella met earlier in the month with Donald Smith, the Director of Labor and Employee Relations in order to establish lines of communication and to inform him who Staff Council was and to tell him about some of our agenda items for this year. The meeting lasted longer than scheduled, and she is optimistic that they have established good, open lines of communication that we can build on over the year.

B. Juella Sparks, Vice President

It wasn't Juella S.'s intent to take the lead on Staff Alliance. However, since Staff Alliance is made up of the eight officers of Staff Councils from across the state from each of the MAUs, and five were brand new and one of the remaining three was leaving. So she is excited about the opportunity. She plans on sharing with the Council a lot of what is going on. She and Pips have been trying to decide how to divide the workload here and how to also take advantage of Juella's work at the statewide level. This will be sorted out over the next couple of meetings.

Juella announced that her committee assignments at the state level included representing Staff Alliance on the Tuition Task Force. She is also the representative on the Educational Benefits Project Team. This team will put together the process for the Tuition Waiver changes which to date had not been finalized. Juella S. explained that there was still input needed and Staff Affairs needs to produce Staff Council's position on the Tuition Waiver. Juella also serves as an alternate on the Human Resources Council at the statewide level. She will report regularly on the activities of those groups and Pips will report regularly on the committees at the statewide level that she serves on.

They will also report on other things, including her upcoming one-on-ones with President Gamble's administration. She will report back to Staff Council with the highlights. She already spoke about her concerns about the Healthcare changes and the fact that they intend to have the changes approved by the end of calendar year. Staff Council has a very short time frame to make its positions known about the proposed changes.

Recently, Beth Behner who is the Chief HR officer asked the Staff Health Care Committee about a list of possible changes that were not made this last July. Beth Behner asked our Health Care Committee what items they were ok with having on the table for changes coming next July. Juella will get this out to everyone so that you know what they are looking at possibly changing.

Juella S. was asked by Pips V. to orchestrate this to leadership and Juella was honored to be able to do this and she is excited by the opportunity to work as a Staff Council officer, she enjoyed her first experience as a Staff Council officer and is glad to be back.

Juella S. indicated that Pips V. is the ex-officio member of the Rural Affairs Committee. Juella plans to regularly participate in Staff Affairs. She encourages everyone to join a committee and reminds all Staff Council members that participation on an internal committee is one of their requirements of the position. It is the officer's hope to have the leg work done in committee, with you returning from committee with a proposal or recommendation and then Council can be more effective and get more done in the limited time available.

5. 9:15-9:25 REMARKS BY CHANCELLOR ROGERS

Chancellor Rogers explained how this is his favorite week of the academic year due to the excitement in the air associated with the arrival of students and the arrival of fall. The Chancellor thanked staff members who assisted with events associated with students moving into dorms. He heard many positive comments from parents about the welcoming they felt from our staff. He thanked everyone for their patients during the summer which was the busiest construction season here at UAF in decades. Overall construction progress to this point included: near completion of the parking lot in front of IARC, rapid progress in the Center for Energy and Powers Lab (scheduled to be completed in November), and major progress in the construction of the Life Sciences Facility. The Chancellor noted that the Life Sciences Facility represented the fastest construction with a bond issue in the state's history. Other projects this summer included continued work on the new greenhouse and the rapid rise of the UAF Climbing Wall which is part of the UAF Outdoor Education Center. The Climbing Wall was funded with ASUAF funds along with matching private funds.

A ribbon cutting ceremony was held during orientation for the Climbing Wall which will soon be open for use. The Chancellor described the Climbing Wall as a symbol to everyone that it is ok to take responsible risks at this university as part of keeping UAF an interesting place.

The Chancellor was to meet that afternoon with President Gamble and his cabinet. This meeting was to include discussion of the strategic directions process in general. This process involves the President's talking point draft addressing approximately half a dozen strategic initiatives over the next few years. This draft will go out to the general public in Alaska along with a series of 30 or 40 public meetings, including regionally based, community based, stakeholder based, and teleconferenced meetings. These meetings are designed to get feedback from the people of Alaska about their expectations and what they want out of their university system and out of their colleges. They are interested in receiving public and community input from both within the university and outside the university. They plan on using this feedback to draft a document by the end of the calendar year. From there, further vetting would take place before adoption by the board late in the year. The Chancellor stressed the importance for those of us here at UAF to remain aligned with these strategic directions.

The Chancellor also addressed the upcoming completion of the first round of the accreditation process. The university has completed a strong report for institutional accreditation. There was really no question that we would be accredited, but we look forward to seeing what the recommendations are made. Under the new continuous accreditation process, a second round of accreditation is scheduled to begin as soon as the first round ends in early October. With the beginning of this second round of this process we will again look to missions, goals, and themes. He will be convening work over the course of this year to begin addressing our long term goals: 'where do we want to be in 2017, 2018.' Over the course of this year he will also be working towards addressing a request that Staff Council made to him when he first came became Chancellor. This involved ensuring that there was better supervision at the university. This request has led to the initiation of a supervisory training program that is now entering its third year. He wants to review this program and is interested in suggestions from people who have been through the program. He is also interested in suggestions from Staff Council concerning what could be done to improve supervision. He stressed that a strong process of training is an element of this, but are there other things that we can do to improve the quality of work for those who are supervised and those who are supervising. He also requested feedback from Staff Council on the Staff Appreciation Day process. In particular, what else could we do for professional development either as part of Staff Appreciation Day or as other professional

Question: A question was raised regarding the mounds of dirt on the side of the hill. The Chancellor indicated that this is the next phase of the Outdoor Education Center. It is a ski and snowboard terrain park. That was dirt taken out of the Life Sciences. He also indicated that a national terrain park design and certification team on campus that same day. The team was here looking to see if it is set up right before they go further with rails and other components.

Question (Kala H.): A questions was posed concerning workforce development and the possibility of administration possibly looking into better ways to address student needs, how the university interfaces with the community, and determining what resources are available - what do we need to do with a constantly changing economy to better train our staff for the overall benefit of the workforce of the state. Chancellor indicated that the administration has clearly placed a high a priority on workforce development over the last several years so we are seeing more and more coming out of federal agencies with requests for what the council member was talking about. The primary response for the university tends to be in the certificate or associate level. So, it is within the college of Rural and Community Development that we see the primary response for that. Some is coordinated at the system level, because the question is where do we want to offer it in Alaska, should it be at CRCD, should it be at one of the UAA community campuses, etc. Bernice Joseph and her staff at CRCD really are our front line for this kind of workforce development. He liked the idea about how we can use this in terms of building our own UAF workforce. He would love to see some ideas about how we could take advantage of these proposal ideas.

Question (John C.): John asked if there were supervisory training programs already on the schedule? Chancellor Rogers indicated that they are not on the schedule yet. Over the course of the year he wants to see what suggestions people have. He indicated that he has been through over half of the modules himself, so he has a sense of some of the things that have worked and what hasn't, but he really wants feedback. When we have our executive leadership workshop he will be asking deans and directors to talk with their staff who have been involved in it to see what we can do to improve it. There is already some regular feedback from people who are teaching them. They have made changes in them over the course of the two years.

Comment (Naomi H.): Naomi H. thanked Chancellor Rogers for his support in terms of all of the hiring that has taken place, especially in terms of the group of newly hired deans.

The Chancellor stated that there are more new deans this year than any other year that he could think of. This includes CLA dean, new Library Dean, Graduate School Dean, Permanent Dean for both the School of Fisheries and CMSM, and CCD. He also noted high quality of these incoming people. A new GI Director, Ron McCoy has been appointed and will be arriving shortly. There were two areas where we had problems in the search. One is the School of Education where we now have an interim and the other is Director of Diversity and EEO Search. In that case, Earlina Bowden has agreed to stay on until January to try again to fill this position.

Question (Juella S.): In terms of the Supervisory training program, she asked for a clarification of the unanswered question about faculty as supervisors. Chancellor Rogers responded by saying that this is no longer unanswered. The latest contract, as he understands it, provides clarity; that there is a bar on faculty supervising other faculty but there is not a bar on faculty supervising other staff.

Comment (John C.): John indicated that from the OSHA perspective, OSHA will look at the person overseeing the day to day activities as another employee. This would apply to situations where you have faculty employees with PIs that are overseeing grad students. If something happens, OSHA is going to go to that faculty member. This is probably one that is going to be required. They really should know the requirements. The Chancellor indicated that in terms of the safety requirements and other legal requirements, if we lay out to faculty the personal the liabilities for them, they will understand the need to attend safety training

Comment (John C.): Stated that he just completed new faculty orientation. One of the things he presented concerned responsibilities when looking after students and it was very well received from faculty.

Chancellor Rogers explained that President Gamble has thought that generally our risk management approach has been to focus on risk avoidance as opposed to focusing on safety awareness and that he wants us to rearrange it a little more on safety awareness while maintaining an overall evaluation of our risks, focusing on the idea that we ought to be able to run this university without people getting hurt. Slips, trips, and falls happen, but if they happen in the same place year after year - that is a management problem. Back injuries happen, but if they happen because people aren't adequately trained or they are not given adequate safety equipment - that is a management problem. Slips, trips, and falls are our number one hazard. We have miles and miles of sidewalks and roads, and stairs and not enough money to keep them all repaired. We are trying to attach our worst situations by dedicating a little more toward fixing some sidewalks that have become a problem.

The Chancellor urged that if staff see hazardous circumstances on campus they let someone know who can do something about it. Every cabinet meeting, the first item on the agenda is safety, and they go around asking whether or not there are things that need to be addressed. Next summer we will be building a new stairway next to the sidewalk known as 'the luge' in order to provide safer walking from the lower parking up. Sometimes those kinds of circumstance take a little while. That stairway actually requires some engineering to do, but we want a safe environment in which we can come to work.

Chancellor Rogers concluded his remarks by thanking staff for their patience with the ongoing construction. He is confident that once we see the end results, including seeing how big Life Sciences really is and the significant contribution it will make in terms of our research and instruction, we will all decide that the inconveniences associated with construction were well worth it.

6. 9:25-9:35 GOVERNANCE REPORTS

Pips V. indicated that she and Cathy Cahill have been in contact with one another over email expressing their interest to work together over the coming year on common agenda items. Pips expressed thanks to Cathy for attending the meeting and for addressing Staff Council.

A. Cathy Cahill, President – Faculty Senate

Cathy plans on attending Staff Council meetings because she thinks it is important for the staff and faculty to communicate since we are all in the university together. Over the next year Faculty Senate plans on working on a number of things. This doesn't mean they

are ignoring others. If there is something that the members of Staff Council believe that Faculty Senate should address, she asked that the issue either be run through Staff Council and then to faculty senate or to contact her directly to see that the matter is addressed.

She also wants to try to make things more transparent, especially with issues like healthcare which affect us all.

The Faculty Alliance, which is the faculty leadership from UAS, UAF, UAA, met last Friday and Saturday. Based on this meeting, the main issue that faculty will be dealing with on a statewide level is the strategic direction that the president is doing. What was previously called Strategic Planning is now called Strategic Direction to make it a little more ongoing, so that it is an evolving plan. Here on campus they are dealing with issues like electronic labs, can you do a lab via distance and be sure that students are getting the proper experience.

The accreditation report is basically done. The accreditors will be here on campus Oct 3-5 and this will be important for maintaining our accreditation as a university. We have five key themes that we are working on: Educate, Discover, Prepare, Connect, and Engage. These are the five key things that the accreditors will be looking at the progress we are making.

Another thing that Faculty Senate will work on is the revitalization of the core courses and general education requirements and determining how we are going to do it. Cathy thinks that there may be some large changes coming in terms of what courses will be approved. They are talking about options like putting a 'G' if it handles globalization and an 'S' if it touches on Sustainability and trying to get students a breadth of these experiences.

The Dean's and Director's who met this summer that said that survey classes are not the cash cow that everyone thinks that they are. So they might be willing to make some changes.

Another issue related to staff will be looking at the use of term faculty in departments. These are instructors and other people that are on 1-year contracts. Faculty Senate is also looking at directing and of course keeping an eye on the administration in terms of where we are going with things like healthcare changes, trying to make sure that the dialogue is open so that if we see something coming, hopefully we can stop it from occurring. So, faculty in the senate will be focusing on these things that affect faculty, but we don't want to lose sight of those issues that affect both faculty and staff.

Question: What is the reason for going toward more term faculty?

Cathy stated that they are evaluating how term faculty are being used. This is not a function of going towards more term faculty, but they are asking the question as to why are term faculty being used as opposed to full blown faculty. They have worked over the past couple of years to get this information which has not always been easy. At the end of last year, Faculty Senate was able to pull up, with the help of the Provost's Office and others, how many faculty are term, how many course sections are they teaching, etc. It is really a function of budget and capability but then the question is how are they evaluated, what are the standards, are they being evaluated the same as full time faculty, are the students getting equivalent experience and this is part of what they are looking at. What is the process, procedures, how do they guarantee academic quality.

Question - What catalog year might the core course changes affect? Cathy said that these changes would be in the 2013 catalog at the earliest. She expects that these changes will take some time to go into affect due to the fact that they are changes to core courses. They also want to discuss transferability to make it easier for students to transfer in and making it easier for our students at other UA campuses. Pips thanked Cathy who stated that she was available to Staff Council member to hear their concerns.

C. Mari Freitag, President – ASUAF

Pips V. introduced Mari Freitag, ASUAF President, and thanked her for attending.

Mari, introduced herself as the new ASUAF President and student regent. ASUAF is very excited about the construction of the Outdoor Education Center. ASUAF donated fifty thousand dollars which was matched by the Chancellor with private donations. The new climbing wall and winter ice climbing wall are set to open in two weeks. The ribbon cutting ceremony for took place during student orientation. They are also excited about the developing terrain park. She also announced that the *Sun Star* Publication turned a profit with the first issue. This is a very rare occurrence. She is working with great staff and she anticipates that it will be a great year.

Over the next year, she will be working on is the NANA contract. She has is looking to see if there are ways that it can be improved upon or hold NANA to different parts of the contract to provide the students with the quality of food that they want. She is looking into meeting with Robert Fulton at some point, but the NANA contract comes up for renewal next June, and she thinks the University will decide soon whether or not they will renew the NANA contract for another two years.

Gary N. Thanked Mari for coming, said it was the first time an ASUAF representative had been present at a Staff Council meeting in an extended period of time and he encouraged her to attend future meetings. Pips V. thanked Mari for coming. Juella S. pointed out that Mari was the student regent and the Staff Council congratulated her on this accomplishment.

7. 9:35-9:45 UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. OIT Staff Council Representation

Pips V. suggested that the unfinished business of staff council OIT representation remain unfinished for this month. She thought that the conversations she has been having around campus reinforced her feeling that the OIT voice is very important. That there are lots of valuable members in our OIT department who participate in Staff Council and we value them being part of Staff Council. She indicated that this issue has a history and she does not want to rush into a position that leaves people feeling unsettled. In turn, she suggested that EMR take this up as an issue and come back at the next meeting and plan to address the issue. She said she will start with that, if other people want to talk about it, it is great, but this is what she would hope would happen

Juella S. explained that the goal of sending it back to committee is for the committee to give Council its recommendation as well as provide an alternate choice. The very diverse membership of Staff Council necessitates options. Her recommendation for committee is that they research the problem or the issue and come up with a solution that they think works, but also prepare an alternative.

Pips V. reiterated that their recommendation to send things back to committee is not intended to stop the conversations and healthy debate that goes on during Staff Council meetings. However, she believes that we can be more efficient in how we are addressing issues if the leg work is done in committee and people come up to speed on the issue and then help the rest of the group decide the right course of action. Improving efficiency and being able to tackle bigger issues are issues that both she and Juella would like to have resolved so that everyone is clear on the issues. Pips V. thinks that this is an issue that the Chancellor would also like to have resolved

Juella S. asked Walker W., EMR chair, if he had been able to hear what was said online. He responded that he had. Pips V. stated that she had spoken to Walker about this issue over the last week and that she would be speaking to him more in the near future.

9:45-9:50 BREAK

Immediately following break, Juella introduced Martin Klein as an honored guest and emeritus president of Staff Council and announced that we would give him a few moments of our time.

Martin Klein thanked the Council for providing him with a chance to speak and he apologized for not following the proper procedures. He wanted to address a few parking issues and update the council on what his department was working on.

Staff Parking Decals: Parking decals for staff who have not renewed them for this year expire today, 8/31. They are encouraging everyone to renew their decals online at www.uaf.edu/parking. The process is entirely paperless if you renew online. You no longer have to fill out a paper payroll deduction form, this can now be done online. And if you do this online today, you can print out a temporary permit that is good for 10 days. You don't have to stand in a long line with students, the best way to get your parking decal now is online as opposed to standing in line.

Martin then updated Council on the work of the Parking Advisory Committee which has Staff Council representation. It is tentatively planning to meet about the third week in September, he will update us when this happens. Martin and Scott McCrea are heading this up.

Construction Updates:

Koyukuk Drive:

They had originally hoped to have Koyukuk Dr. open by tomorrow (9/1). Unfortunately, they will not meet this deadline, the project has been indefinitely delayed, so shuttle service to West Ridge is going to be a challenge for a short period of time. They will open this as soon as possible.

IARC Front Parking Lot:

The plan for the parking lot in front of IARC is to allow people to begin parking in the lot as soon as possible even though the electrical work isn't quite done. They are striping it right now and it will open for parking soon.

Lolly Tilly Parking Lot:

An old manhole cover that had a sewer line coming into it, that actually drained rainwater, was not capped off. They didn't know this because it wasn't raining at the time. They paved it all over and two days later, when it rained, all of a sudden a hole developed. Worse yet, they could only find it when it was raining. It had quit raining and they had to try and dig around to attempt to locate this frustrating hole. That's why we ended up with this huge hole. They finally found it, it was capped off, and they are getting ready to pave it but, it is still probably a week or so away from completion.

Nenana Parking Lot:

This lot will be open for parking tomorrow, September 1st.

Martin also suggested that those searching for parking on West Ridge should not forget the Museum Parking Lot. This is an available parking lot.

Martin also addressed the status of work for the custodial contractor. They have been working with this contractor to get up to speed as far as quality. If you have issues or problems with custodial, please let them know at 474-7000 or send him an email about the problem and he will address it. They are making progress, they are getting there and they are working hard to get them there.

Question: A question was asked about the status of a previous Parking Services announcement for the creation of additional administrative parking places on main campus. Martin K. announced that about 13 additional AO spaces have since been created. He indicated that he would a map to Staff Council indicating where these new spaces were located.

Question (Gary N.): The original concept for the IARC parking lot construction involved two phases. Martin acknowledged that this was accurate, that there are two phases. Gary then asked if they were going to start with the second phase. Martin indicated that currently funding for the second phase was an issue as they have run out of funding. As soon as they have additional funding they will work further. Martin acknowledged that they were going to pave a small area that had already been cleared.

Question (Naomi H.): A question concerning the completion date for the Lola Tilly parking lot. Martin it is currently scheduled for completion on September 10th of this year. Pips thanked Martin for keeping Staff Council informed.

8. 9:50-10:05 NEW BUSINESS

A. Winter Warm-Up

Juella S. explained that she has been a member of the Really Free Market Planning Committee since the first *Really Free Market*. The *Really Free Market* is held twice a summer across from the SRC and it is, in fact, really a free market. From 8-10 they accept drop offs and donations and then a group of volunteers organizes an area. At 10 it opens to the public and the public is welcome to come in and take anything they want. There is no bartering, no money exchange, it is simply a vehicle for people who have things that they don't need any more and getting these things out to people who need them and would actually use them. So, for this *Winter Warm Up*, Michelle Bartlett is the director of Summer Sessions and she has been trying to get the *Really Free Market* (RFM) committee to host a student version. The RFM committee has decided they are already planning and hosting two that this was enough for them. In turn, Michelle Bartlett has approached the Staff Council Administrative Committee asking that Staff Council host this *Winter Warm Up*. It is for students and involves the community, mainly the university community bringing their items to be donated to campus on a Saturday morning and then students come in and take what they can use and need. Michelle is determined to make this happen and she would love to have staff council sponsor it.

Juella stated that, certainly, Staff Council will promote this; we will put the word out to the public. She also asked if there was anyone on Staff Council who was willing to serve on the planning committee for this event. Juella stated that Michelle has already done most of the planning for this and the RTF committee really has most of this down. She then asked if anyone here willing to volunteer to be on the planning committee and indicated that she would also be asking for volunteers for October 1st to organize things as stuff gets dropped off and to facilitate as students come in and take it away. She indicated that it is really a Saturday morning project.

Question: Is Michelle Bartlett planning on holding the event indoors or outdoors? Juella believes that Michelle has reserved the Wood Center for this event.

Question: Is the idea that you would just bring warm clothes? Juella indicated that it was not just for clothes, it is for things like small appliances. It is also not limited to students who live on campus. With the free market in the spring the dorms store all of the stuff

that is left by students as they leave the dorm and they bring a massave amount of clothes, small furniture, etc to the really free market. The goal was to be able to store all of this stuff and have it available for the students when they come back in the fall. The problem was logistics. So Winter Warm up came up out of this discussion

Question: Is there a way to donate items early, before the day of the market. This has been a problem in the past and previously prevented people from donating items. Juella answered that there are challenges to this in terms of storage. One possible solution would be that if you know someone who is going to donate and who can hold the items until the day of the market, they can drop them off for you.

Juella then asked if there were any questions or volunteers. Debbie Gonzales volunteered to be on the planning committee. Juella thanked Debbie for volunteering to serve on this planning committee and asked that she keep Staff Council informed.

9. 10:05-10:15 GUEST SPEAKERS

A. Heather Bryant – UAF *Sun Star* Editor

Pips V introduced Heather Bryant and stated she and Heather had a nice conversation a couple of months ago about the *Sun Star* searchable database that is going to come online at some point.

Heather stated that it would probably be a couple of semesters before this happens.

Pips asked Heather to speak to council today so that she could answer questions as well as provide us with an update on the project's status. Pips then thanked Heather for attending the meeting.

Heather stated that, at this point, the *Sun Star* has received the data, but they have not done anything with the data. They have a very small staff so it will be a while before anything is really coming out of it. She wanted to answer any questions or address any concerns. She said that ultimately what they want to do is have the full database for the entire UA system, so statewide offices, UAA and UAS as well. They had to start somewhere, so they started with the UAF data since the *Sun Star* is the UAF paper. At this point they are still working through data and working on the means that they are going to use to actually make the database function. With security concerns they want to make sure that the database is as secure as it can't be altered in any way. She asked if the Staff Council had any questions or concerns that she could address. She indicated that she knew that there had been a lot of discussion online and that she had personally received a wide variety of opinions about it. She wants to make sure that everyone has a chance to ask questions about it.

Question (John C.): A question was raised concerning the accuracy of the data, whether or not it will be updated, and if it is current. Heather explained that the university itself does a data pull every April for budgeting purposes and this is the data pull that the *Sun Star* has and this will be the data that they will be getting every year from now on.

Question (John C.): John asked if the data would always be a year behind and Heather acknowledged that, yes, the data will always be a year behind.

Question (Gary N.): What are the *Sun Star's* expectations for the use of this? What does *Sun Star* gain from having this available? Heather said that one of the main reasons that they decided to do this is because there were a number of students who were curious about the information. Personnel costs make up about 60% of the budget and students wanted to know where the money was going and it is the job of the *Sun Star* is to give students the information that they want to see. There are at least forty-something databases at different universities in different states. She mentioned that one of the stories they are interested in here pertains to how the university uses adjunct professors. One of the things that she has heard is that adjuncts are over used, that there are more adjunct professors than there should be associate or full professors and this is something that they will be able to see in the database. But before they can say exactly what they will address they have to analyze the data. They don't go into it with preconceived ideas about what they will find. But if this turns out to be a story on just what the University spends and in this way and this is how the departments break down in terms of their funding then this is what the story will be. If there is more than this, then that is what the story will be.

Heather stated that one of her main reasons for wanting to publish the database is that she doesn't believe that journalism should be done behind closed doors, that all readers should have access to the data that they are working with. And this is one of the major trends now is that institutions are providing the hard data that they are working with as opposed to just publishing articles. Propublica which is one of the major institutions right now that is really getting out there and getting their name out there, they provide all of the hard data that goes along with publishing a story and she thinks that it is a really good trend since she believes that there should be transparency, not only in government and public institutions, but there should be transparency in journalistic organizations.

Question (Gary N.): Question: And so if someone comes to you and wants the entire database, do you give it to them? Heather stated that they haven't really decided their policies yet because they are still in the process of building the database. This is a long term project.

Question (Naomi H.): Concerning 'longevity,' specifically what longevity are we discussing. Will it be the employees longevity with the university or with a particular position? Heather believes that the data that was pulled referred to longevity within a specific position. She did not think that they had a lifetime sort of number available, but they are also working out which numbers they want to include in the data pull. It has taken actual months to get an accurate idea of what types of data they are getting and there may be additional fields available to them as they work through this. As of now, Heather's understanding is that it refers to longevity within a specific position.

Question (Naomi): The question was asked that if someone notices that the published information is incorrect, what exactly is the course of action that they would take to have this corrected? Heather indicated that the data they are getting is as it is pulled from HR. Her suggestion would be to contact HR because this should be the same data that they are using.

Naomi reiterated that the pull is only once a year, so they would have to wait an entire year to get the issue fixed. Heather responded by saying that it would be corrected in the following pull, but if there is an inaccuracy and HR is contacted and then the *Sun Star* gets changed data that has been modified due to inaccuracies, then they would modify the database accordingly, but that has to come through HR so that the *Sun Star* knows that their data they are getting has been verified by the university.

Question (Naomi.): Indicated that the staff, in CLA in particular, are asking again - why does a name make a difference, as opposed to just saying an office assistant in a particular department. What is the difference that a name lends? Because if you are looking at statistical information and sort of trying to talk about larger theories like inequity in pay for women or for minorities, then a name is not useful in that. Staff understand it then because you are looking at larger numbers and not necessary an individual and she was wondering how Heather has been responding to this? Heather stated that aside from the larger statistical stories, there is also accountability and having a name adds that level of accountability. This is a public institution and she thinks that a lot of the money, she thinks that the budget for this year stated that 45% of the funding is coming from state appropriations another 16% is coming from tuition, there should be a level of accountability about who is receiving that money and where it is going and a name adds that accountability

Question (Naomi H.): Stated that she thinks a lot of people are not sure as well because the funding mechanism, as you have pointed out, is not 100% one way and there are a lot of other revenue chains around campus that are neither of those and so it seems, sort of like someone going through your mail and she is sure that Heather was aware of this and what it feels like, but particularly for UAF staff, the fact that we are the guinea pigs, that it is starting right here and then possibly going to statewide and the other campuses. Naomi then asked if the *Sun Star* was working with the other student organizations and units to spur them along as well, because it seems like it is best if we are all in this together to some extent, as opposed to UAF being singled out. Heather indicated that UAF is not being singled out. The *Sun Star* has a small staff and they had to begin somewhere. It is their intention to have this data pulled for the other institutions as soon as possible to be added to the database.

Comment (Naomi H.): Naomi stated that he wanted to make sure that the *Sun Star* was aware that everyone is concerned about the stress that this will put on the HR departments, that a lot of people will be looking up and questioning why someone is making more than another person when the explanation as to why one person makes more than another person is not for public consumption. Staff, in particular, felt that this adds to a sense of disempowerment. Naomi wanted the *Sun Star* to be aware of this and remember that they have, to a certain extent, a lot of good will, a lot of people are interested in the transparency and a lot of people are with you on that because it helps us in a lot of different ways, but if we are powerless to address the inequities, it just creates more frustration. Heather stated that if the inequities aren't exposed, then how they can be addressed. Naomi agreed with Heather and went on to say that we live here all the time, if in ten years you are still here and working for this university, I hope that it is still going then, and I do, but again addressing that immediate sort of fix, there is no immediate fix for what comes out of that, and which effects moral.

Comment: It seems like there are a lot of factors involved in what a person makes that are not going to be fully explained. It was unclear how the *Sun Star* would get any meaningful data about the history and whether or not such a history even existed.

Comment: By tying it to a person, legally, a lot of the things that would explain why there are inequities in pay you are not legally allowed to show. And so, by tying it to a person you are limiting the explanations to statements such as 'yes, this person makes 10 thousand more,' but there might be a very good reason for this.

Comment (Kala H.): The media has the allowance to ask anyone about our salary at the university under the Freedom of Information Act. So, this information itself is not necessarily protected,

Question: Are there going to be search parameters built in to indicate where someone's salary is coming from? Juella explained that they will not know that. Kala responded by saying that if you look at her position, she is funded, but not by the state, but when it comes down to it, through all of the research and all of the proposals she does. She generates her own salary. She was not saying that the *Sun Star* didn't have a right to this information; she would share this information since she wants to see more research being done on this campus. She wants people to know what her salary is and she wants it to be comparable at some point to other institutions because she believes that in research administration, HR has gone in the wrong direction in terms of pay and what they do, but at the same time, the state is not paying her salary. So there are other things that need to be addressed, especially at this university with how much research we do, and how many of the people here are funded through the work that they do.

Juella stated that ultimately the University of Alaska is your employer which puts you under the umbrella of public employee which then makes your information sharable in this manner.

Juella summarized the Council's concerns by stating that it is obvious that Staff anxiety is raised by this, and she can imagine that the administration who will be on the ground taking phone calls from staff, that their anxiety level is raised as well. There is ultimately, in her understanding, that the university has done its due diligence, has made every effort to protect staff and to work with *Sun Star* and at this point we have to recognize that there is not a lot that we can do and that what we can do is ask that the *Sun Star* respect the information that they have been given, that they make every effort to get to the bottom of it and that they do their role in journalism to point out all of the flaws. All of the weaknesses, all of the places that the administration can improve, that HR can improve and make sure that you express this. For example, if you determine that there are no inefficiencies or no flaws or no concerns about salary that you express this to the legislature. That you did your journalistic duty and the legislature should know that the University is taking care of its own. She feels that the *Sun Star* sees Staff council's side of it and she hopes that they honor their responsibility to do all that they can do with the data and getting the word out about what they find.

Juella thanked Heather for speaking with Staff Council. Heather thanked Staff Council for allowing her to speak. Heather's contact information is on their website if anyone has questions. She wants to address people's concerns, she wants for this to be a dialogue and not a one way street and she thanked Staff Council for giving her the time to speak today. Pips also thanked Heather.

B. Beth Behner – UA Chief Human Resources Officer

Beth indicated that her job has changed because the president has hired a new Executive Director of Labor and Employee Relations. It used to be that her position encompassed the unit that Labor and Employee Relations contained. So the Director position reported to Beth and the staff reported to the director. Two years ago, in 2009, Kris Racina who had been the Director of Labor and Employee Relations moved to HR to take the Director position there. Since this time, the director position has been vacant and Beth had taken over those responsibilities. She worked with staff and they did all of the bargaining for contracts that were recently negotiated and did all of the employee relations work. However, when President Gamble had been here a year he decided that the position needed to be filled. Beth agreed that this is a big responsibility to handle labor and employee relations. The fact that she was able to do this as Chief HR Officer was really more because of her background. She had been the director before she took the Chief HR Officer role. The President decided that he was more in favor of a structure where the Labor and Employees Director reported directly to him. This is the structure that is now in place. The new Executive Director is Donald Smith and he is located in Anchorage. Part of the staff are in Anchorage. We have a Labor and Employee Relations Coordinator, Paula Harrison in Anchorage and Donald Smith and then there are two labor and employee relations coordinators in Fairbanks along with a legal assistant who has a paralegal background. So it is more equally divided, but there will be a lot of travel and back and forth and video conferencing for staff meetings that will be utilized now that the Director position is filled in Anchorage.

Beth stated that she knows that questions have come up about how she can neatly separate what she does as Chief HR Office from what Employee and Labor Relations does. She said that this has not been too complicated so far. For example all of the labor contract administration, negotiations, grievance handling will all be under the new position of Executive Director of Labor and Employee Relations. On the non-represented side, for employee relations, any issues coming up under the employee relations part of the university regulation., for example grievances filed under regulation by a non-represented staff member, would now be under Donald Smith.

Similarly, on the union organizing front, because this is a matter that potentially involves labor relations and the unrepresented staff group, this is also under Donald Smith. There are some issues that are kind of transitional. For example, what happens when a statewide employee is recommended for termination? If it was a campus termination, the HR office at the campus would have to talk with the supervisor and be on board with the termination before recommendation would go forward and any action would take place. Now, because Beth is the statewide HR Director equivalent, those kinds of requests come through her, but then, if it is something that is going to go forward, the Labor and Employee Relations Office takes a staff work to prepare for the investigation, the termination

action to go forward working with General Council's Office and others. So it is a little more complicated because there are two separate offices involved. But she thinks that it is doable and that they will just have to clarify anything that comes up that seems to be in a grey area.

Beth then asked if there were any questions. She did let Donald Smith know of the meeting today and the topic of interest to UAF Staff Council, but Council could invite him to an upcoming meeting to share his thoughts and points of view. He did go before the Staff Alliance Retreat and answered questions about his background and initial thoughts. He has been on board with the state less than a month, so he is still in the learning curve. But he is studying the issues and getting up to speed. She thinks that he would be more than happy to join Staff Council at an upcoming meeting.

Another topic that was on her agenda to address today was on union organizing. This is something that has been taken out of her realm and is in the new executive director's realm but she offered to share with us what she knew. The only recent happening is that APPA has notified the university that they are not going to be pursuing organizing for supervisors any longer. The university was notified just a courtesy from the union.

On the non-represented staff side, nonsupervisory staff, they have not heard anything similar from AESCA, so their organizing effort is still continuing. She knows that the university has recently responded to a data request for an updated list of employees in a possible unit for them to organize. Beth's impression is that they are continuing in their interest to organizing non represented university staff. However this is not something that the university has any real data on because it is the union's realm to conduct their own organizing effort, they don't have to tell the university anything at all about how well it is going, how far along they are in their collection of interest cards. And the university would not know for certainty beyond any of what staff might know on this topic until they would get a petition statement from the labor relations agency. In other words when they have the requisite number of interest cards signed by their selected unit that they would like to represent, they would file that information with the Alaska Labor Relations Agency. The Agency would then let the university know a petition has been filed seeking representation of this group and the union is to define the group they would be interested in and once the university would get this information then the proceedings would start from there. This is sort of how the process works. Of course for the university will let Governance know as soon as they do get any petition of that kind. They have been trying to keep people up to speed on everything. Again, Donald Smith would be the person to give any more particulars; Beth will probably be even more removed from even awareness of these issues as time goes on.

Beth stated that not having the added responsibilities will free her up to do lots of things in other parts of HR. There are important things in the benefits realm, HR operations, automation projects, and classification and compensation. These areas have probably been getting less of her supervisory attention because she has been doing more work in Labor and Employee Relations over the last two years. She does think that it is good to have the director position filled and maybe even have it carved out as its own entity. By having the position report directly to the President the importance of the position is elevated.

Question (Juella S.): Will it be from you that the BOR hears a recommendation as to potential staff compensation increases? Beth responded by stating that yes, it will because it is still within the compensation area. But, it may be that Donald Smith would weigh in on those issues from the aspect of Labor Relations. If there are discussions on equity in compensation Donald might weigh in, but Beth would certainly be onboard to give her thoughts as well. She stated that her office is still happy to work with Staff Alliance representatives on a compensation committee and provide data and any input that the Staff Alliance governance groups want to share. Question: A question was also raised related to the University's new executive office positions and why those are located in Anchorage. Beth could not say that she personally knows why this was the case other than the individuals selected for these positions are residents of Anchorage and to some extent, some of their job duties are more easily performed in Anchorage. For example, Wendy Redman retired, Mary Rutherford retired, those were Vice President and Associate Vice President roles. To some extent it is easier for that position to function from Anchorage, because when pursuing development and seeking donations for university foundation purposes, a lot of corporations and donors are in the Anchorage area.

The new employee has filled more of a transitional position instead of being one or the other, it is kind of a combination of the two vacancies, between Wendy Redman and Mary Rutherford's positions. It's a new position kind of morphed between the two but it will be largely responsible for university relations on the legislative front and then the development and advancement front to seek donations for the university foundations. Some of these duties do make sense to be housed in Anchorage. Carla Bean, who is the new employee, does work often in Fairbanks as well as Anchorage. The new replacement for Pete Kelly on the State Relations side, a position has been vacant at least a year and whose needs were assumed by Wendy Redmond during the last legislative session, is being filled by Chris Christiansen. He is also based in Anchorage which is where he lived. He was a long time representative for the State of Alaska court system, so he has a lot of experience that we feel will be very beneficial as an advocate for us in Juneau to peruse the university's interest. He will be coming back and forth to Fairbanks to meet with groups and constituents, governance groups, the Chancellor, etc.

Donald Smith is another position based in Anchorage, but he does plan to and will be coming to Fairbanks as needed. He will also assist other sites throughout the state as needed for his Labor and Employee Relations function.

Karen Purdue has been an Associate Vice President working for the Office of Academic Affairs. Her role has been in healthcare. Karen lived in Fairbanks most of her career. However, when that position was replaced, the new employee, Paula Johnson, has a different role for the university, no longer in health care. She was kind of slated to help the university in academic affairs on elearning and answering the administrative audit concerning distance Ed. Now as Beth understands it, her position is going to morph as she is going to be a primary support person for the university's strategic directions effort that has been in progress which will become more active over the semester. Paula will be working with the President and other groups on strategic directions. She is housed in Anchorage as well. That is where she lives and this is where she will be located, but she will travel to meet with groups on the strategic directions process.

Beth also noted that Mike Humphries is now gone. His work for statewide ended last Friday. He will soon begin working at UAA as the Chief of Staff of the Chancellor at UAA,. This is a new position and he is very excited about transitioning to this. He has been with the statewide organization for about the last 15 years in healthcare and benefits management so we will miss his role. No decisions have been made about filling the position. In Beth's opinion the director position is necessary for the university. In the meantime, Erica VanKline and Beth will function to fill in for the director in his absence and they will keep working on healthcare. Erica and Beth have been meeting with the Staff Healthcare Committee and the Joint Healthcare Committee to keep working and making progress on the various projects that are going on in healthcare.

The Healthcare Dependent Audit is a project that they are wrapping up right now. There was quite a bit of controversy and difficulty on people's part on trying to understand why we wanted to do a dependent audit and then getting responses to it because it was burdensome and some people felt intrusive. At the very least it took some effort to get documents together and get them submitted to the vendor that was handling this for us. This effort has been wrapped up. They are now at the point of sending letters to people indicating whether their dependents were fully approved, if they were still in question, or if they are among the approximately 100 who will have their dependents removed from the healthcare plan.

Dependents could have been removed from the healthcare plan for a variety of reasons. Some people may have decided that they don't want to continue having their dependent on the plan, therefore they just didn't respond to the dependent audit and they were considered nonresponsive. Other people who may have previously forgotten to take their dependents off. The common situation involved an employee who had gotten divorced and had just left their spouse on. When the audit came about they could not furnish proof of verification because now their status was divorced instead of married which would make their spouse ineligible. There were quite a few people whose dependents were no longer enrolled in college or they were beyond the age of 24 and therefore they were no longer eligible. But they hadn't actively taken them off, so they were considered ineligible for that. However, with the new change in federal law on July 1, those same dependents, now up to the age of 26, do not have to be fully enrolled or full time enrolled, so now they can come back on. We have some people for the last fiscal year were not eligible but became eligible in July. So there were people whose dependents were removed but they have since reenrolled them due to the change in law.

There were approximately 100 individuals who were dependents who will be removed from the University's Healthcare plan and they will be getting memos out to the healthcare committees to share statistics with them. We can only do projections of the possible savings to the university because until healthcare claims are filed we don't know what an individual might need for healthcare over a year. To the best of their ability, based on averages for claims who are dependents who are both spouses and children, it looks like we will save about \$400,000 for that time frame for those 100 people who are being removed. So that is a ballpark of what the university will save which actually affects employees as well at the university because we pay 83% of all claims as the employer and employees due cost sharing to pay the remaining 17%. So it is a good thing from the big picture that ineligible dependents are removed from the University's healthcare benefits for employees and their eligible dependents as well as the university as the employer. She knows that there is some controversy about how it all happened, but we are done with the dependent audit. They will probably not do another dependent audit for the next 5 or 6 years, it just doesn't need to be done every year and we'll move ahead and hopefully people will not be as upset about it as time passes.

Comment: A council member indicated to Beth that the audit was cumbersome and poorly discussed among staff prior to it happening. And beyond that people will be upset no matter what, but she hopes that the lessons can be learned and applied the next time, especially the fact that it was a third party vendor which was a big concern for a lot of people. Another concern was the fact that some of the requirements were tax forms and things which are legally not allowed to be required by private vendors. A lot of people looked into the tax code. Again, it wasn't just the fact that the dependent audit was being done, many were understanding of that. It was the method that it was carried out. She just wanted to make sure that the next time this comes around that the same mistakes are not made again.

Beth acknowledged that this could probably be a whole separate agenda topic, but she can assure that there were learning points out of the experience and one of them pertained to employee communication. She thinks that the University benefits office had been relying on the union representatives to the committee as well as the staff healthcare committee to be the conduit for information. This wasn't realistic. Their learning point was that they should have been communicating directly with the employees early on to share what was going to be happening, what they would experience, what the requirements were, and the rational was, and to get this information directly out to the employees. The vendor issue, Beth thinks that they really missed some good opportunity within the process in terms of informing the vendor of what our culture was and that we were not a private employer and these were the kind of differences they would expect. Because, frankly, they had not worked with public institutions. They were used to coming in with a private company and saying here is your list of ineligible dependents and they are off the plan. And we were talking with them and giving them guidance throughout the process, but she thinks they were very slow to transition and understand university culture what we expected and how we expected our employees to be handled, with more care, on a case by case basis. So when we got to the end point we said to the vendor, you give us your list and we will do a case by case review, we will talk to people directly we will make sure that they have every opportunity to supply us with the information and we did get approximately another 80-100 people who were able to furnish documents and explain their circumstances and they were allowed to keep their dependents on the plan. There was really a difference in the vendor wanted to be black and white and really hard lined about their determinations and if they weren't letter perfect then they were going to say no, you're not eligible. And we said that we need to give people more room than that. If you have a foreign born child and a foreign birth certificate were going to look at it to see whether or not this satisfies us that this child is your dependent and were going to look at that and say, yes, this child is find. Beth said that she agreed with the person asking the question, that yes, we will know a lot more the next time we handle this issue and we will handle things differently.

Question (Kala H.): Her understanding was that the concept was payment would depend upon how many people they found should not be on the plan. What is the university and whether or not once they got paid and whether or not they would choose a vendor whose payment determination was based on their findings. Beth said that this is probably something she can look into. She knows that they had some guarantees in terms of a result of so many ineligible dependents and if they did not find that many then they would shave back their cost to use. However, when all was said and done they didn't want to accept the vendor's higher number because they wanted to give people the benefit of having our judgment involved. Beth understood Kala's concern and she thinks that the vendor was very savvy in how they set their benchmarks for results and they will take this into account in the future.

Pips thanked Beth for coming and addressing SC's concerns. Beth concluded her presentation by stating that the Employee Tuition Waiver is also on the agenda. They did circulate a draft proposed revision to Staff Alliance during their retreat, but she would still be happy to come back and address Staff Council and this issue in the future.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

10. 10:15-10:30 INTERNAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Staff Affairs – Naomi Horne and Megan Hoffman

Naomi asked for assistance with the role of Staff Affairs Committee chair since it is a large amount of work. In the past Megan and Naomi have worked well together. Naomi indicated that she was sending out a Doodle poll the same afternoon to everyone in that committee to set a meeting time. This was important because Staff Affairs has a very full agenda for this upcoming meeting.

B. Rural Affairs – Brad Krick

According to Brad K., Rural Affairs is scheduled to meet next Tuesday at 10a.m. The meeting is available over the phone. If you would like to attend the meeting should give Brad a call or email him. Brad cc'd the Staff Council Office and he would like to see anyone who is interested at the meeting.

C. Elections, Membership, and Rules – Walker Wheeler

Walker W. stated that EMR had not met since the last Staff Council meeting. Walker has started to schedule a meeting for EMR sometime during next week maybe Thursday or Friday. The members should have also received this email.

D. Advocacy Committee – Jodi Baxter

Jodi B stated that the Advocacy Committee hadn't met since the last Staff Council meeting. They had their first 'brown bag lunch' and they are in the process of scheduling their first meeting.

Pips thanked the chairs for their updates. She requested that a written report be handed in a couple of weeks before the meeting or whatever is convenient to your committee so that we can get them online so that people stay connected with the committee work is being done. She encourages chairs to do this.

*Committee Chairs: If available please forward your reports to nmdufour@alaska.edu

11. 10:30-10:40 EXTERNAL STATEWIDE COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Staff Healthcare Committee – Carol Shafford and Richard Machida

Carroll stated that she was out of town for the last meeting, but she does have the agenda of what was discussed but she didn't know any of the final outcomes. Carol indicated that she could send the agenda out to people so that they can review it.

Some of the things *under consideration*:

- Institution of the Spousal Surcharge - they are still looking at this, she doesn't know where it is going to go
- Creation of new tiers for dependent charges so that covered members will pay more for larger families – under consideration
- Increased charge for part-time employees for healthcare - under consideration
- Excluding high-risk activities from health plan – under consideration

She stated that she will be attending the next meeting. Richard was also unable to attend the last meeting. He indicated that our debate is extremely important for these issues. Carol reiterated that it is extremely important for people to attend any of the meetings .

They also want to look at establishing an outside medical clinic in Anchorage or Fairbanks. She doesn't know how this would work. They are looking at eliminating the \$100 award when you fill out your wellness profile which Carol thinks is fair, she said she didn't know how Staff Council members feel about it. They are also looking at the surgical travel health care plan again. That one was one that got stuck last year and didn't go anywhere. Another reason they are looking at this is that they have done cost comparisons of certain major surgeries and they are far more expensive here in Fairbanks vs. out of state, such as Seattle. They are looking at you, someone to accompany you, your hotel room, and car rental for the period of time you are outside. These are things they are looking at. She knows that the rumor about surgical travel has trickled down all the way to the local health community. It is still just something that is being discussed because sometimes Fairbanks physicians charges are much higher than anywhere else.

Juella stated that Staff Healthcare is meeting again in two weeks or so, and she thinks they are pushing out the meeting because Joint Healthcare meets again on Sept 21, which is the date of our next Staff Council meeting. She thinks that the Staff Healthcare Committee will meet again prior to the next JHCC. Juella has information because she attended the last SHCC that she will share with us to get input and also Staff Affairs will be looking into it. She stressed that all of this will happen quickly in the next three months. The Staff Affairs and the reps on the Staff Healthcare Committee all have to be on their toes and aware of the meetings and so on.

12. 10:40-10:50 EXTERNAL UAF COMMITTEE REPORTS

Pips stated that we have a list of committees and people participating in those committees external to Staff Council. We would like to make sure list is accurate. We will also be looking at the terms for these positions because they don't always coincide with our year or an academic year. On any of these committees it would be helpful if you could contact Pips and let her know if you are continuing to serve or if you are for some reason stepping down or needing a change as Richard has suggested we can find a replacement for you.

Pips explained that she and Juella have discussed the possibility of making the External Committee Reports written only and just streamlining the agenda. They don't want to lose sight of the importance of staff representation on these committees. It is something they are discussing right now and if you have any input you can contact Pips. They don't want to short change external committees but they are trying to figure out a way to make sure that what we are doing in the meeting is really valuable and important and really maximizing our time.

Juella stated that during Pips and Juella's Face-to-Face with Chancellor Rogers, he brought up the minutes and indicated that there were many marked "no report." Basically he had some concern about how this portion of our minutes looked. We Staff Council representatives are given seats on these committees with the expectation that you will participate in these committees and then report back to Staff Council. He was encouraging a mechanism where either you indicate that the Committee "has not met" or you turn in a written report so that and it looks like Staff Council is meeting the expectations of communicating out to staff on these various committees. As part of that process Pips is confirming your membership on these committees and will be seeking alternatives if someone is stepping down. For example, there is a good chance that Juella will be stepping down from CDAC, the Chancellor's Diversity Action Committee. She will indicate this to Pips formally and she would expect an agenda item for September's meeting would be that anyone who is interested in this position put their name in.

Pips noted that once again they are just trying to set the stage for the year to become more efficient.

Carol S. stated that if council is going to move to this, then we need to get these minutes and information out well in advance of this meeting so we have time to take it home and read it. She further stated that with staff healthcare, she takes that home and spends a weekend going over the material. If we are going to do this then we need to get them out early so that people can review them. Pips supported this by stating that such a push towards getting the information out early would make the material more useful.

Question (Kayt S.): The question was asked, that considering the time, should we expect that we should send in our written reports for these minutes so that we will have it. Pips asked if this was ok with everyone.

Juella added that one thing that would help us is as representative on the committee that you serve, if there is a point that you really thinks needs to be made, then you put that word out. It is not just the minutes of the last meeting are here, if something is of significant impact should be noted to the rest of the members.

Pips reiterated, to make sure that we understand, if the committee has not met, just a simple "Committee has not met." This is better than "No Report." It is either a report or the "Committee has not met" and this should satisfy the Chancellor's unease at seeing a lot of no-reports.

Pips asked the council if everyone was ok with doing written reports and catching up that way due to the time limits on the room the meeting was in. All approved.

- A. Master Planning Committee (MPC) – Gary Newman <http://www.uaf.edu/mastplan/>**
- B. Parking Advisory Committee (PAC) – Shawn Houston**
- C. Chancellor's Diversity Action Committee (CDAC) – Juella Sparks**
- D. Student Recreation Center Board (SRCB) – Carol Shafford**
- E. Chancellor's Planning and Budget Committee – Juella Sparks**
- F. Chancellor's Advisory Committee for the Naming of Campus Facilities – Maria Russell**
- G. Accreditation Steering Committee – Kayt Sunwood**
- H. Meritorious Award Committee – Maria Russell**
- I. Technology Advisory Board Committee (TAB) – Brad Havel**
- J. Family Friendly Task Force/Bunnell House Adv – Walker Wheeler and Heather Leavengood**
- K. Intercollegiate Athletic Council – Pips Veazey and Heather Leavengood**
- L. Review of Infrastructure and Sustainability Energy Board (RISE) – Mayanna Bean**

13. 10:50-11:00 ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION

14. 11:00 ADJOURN