

UAF Staff Council Strategic Reorganization

- Large number of representatives – is this effective?
- Overall participation rates are low relative to total numbers
- Compare to UAA – members elected at large
- Faculty Senate participants are rewarded for participation – what is the incentive for staff?
- Communication structure is not working – less than 50% getting info to staff
- Communication structure is cumbersome – every unit responsible for comm.

Staff Affairs	attend	total	percent
March	9	16	.56
April	6	16	.38
May	10	15	.67
June	8	15	.53
August			
September	8	15	.53
October			
November	4	12	.33
December	2	12	.17

Staff Advocacy

March	4	5	.80
April	4	5	.80
May	4	5	.80
June			
August			
September	4	4	.80
October	1	4	.80
November	0	4	0
December			

Rural Affairs

March	5	11	.45
April	8	11	.73
May	8	11	.73
June			
August			
September	4	10	.4
October	5	10	.5
November	7	10	.7
December	5	10	.5

EMR

Average			.50-.70
---------	--	--	---------

Communications

March	0		
April	0		
May	0		
June	0		
August	0		
September	4	4	1.00
October	4	4	1.00
November	4	4	1.00
December	0	4	0

Staff Council

December 2011: 25/34 rep seats filled (.74); 13/34 alt seats filled (.38)

January 2012: 24/34 rep seats filled (.70); 7/34 alt seats filled (.20)

Units 4 and 11 have no representation – IAB and Facilities Services

	Attend	Total	Percent of reps	Percent of seats
March			.83	.69
April			.67	.56
May			.70	.58
June			.73	.53
August			.77	.56
September			.72	.50
October			.60	.42
November			.56	.39
December			.60	.44