

**UAS Staff Council September Meeting**  
Wednesday September 2, 2020, 9–10:30 a.m.  
[Zoom link](#)

- I. Call to order and roll call
  - A. Eric Lingle, President 20-22
  - B. Mae Delcastillo, Vice President 20-21
  - C. Colin Osterhout, Secretary 20-22
  - D. Denise Carl, Member-At-Large Juneau 19-21
  - E. Gwenna Richardson, Member-At-Large Ketchikan 19-20
  - F. Kimberly Davis, Member-At-Large Sitka 19-20
  - G. David Felts, Past President
  - H. Members of the public:
    1. Claire Ligsay
    2. Alexa Koontz
    3. Kiwana Afattato
    4. Trisha Lee
    5. John Ingman
    6. Anita Parrish
    7. Greg George
    8. Jonathon Lasinski
    9. Sean Demello
    10. Kristen Handley
    11. Kimberly Matsuura
    12. Abby Kosmos
    13. Donovan Grimes
    14. Julia Guthrie
    15. Richard Hitchcock
    16. Kayti Coonjohn
    17. Cody Bennett
    18. Emy Roles
    19. Deb Rydman
- II. Adopt agenda (2 minutes):
  - A. Motion to amend agenda: Denise Carl
    1. Item 7: If we can add staff survey
    2. Second: Kim Davis
    3. Adopted
  - B. Motion: Gwenna
  - C. Second: Kim Davis
- III. Approve [minutes of August Meeting](#) (2-3 minutes)
  - A. Motion: Denise Carl
  - B. Second: Kim Davis
- IV. Guests and Public Comments (10-12 minutes)
  - A. Title III team “Complete to Compete” is hosting a series of speakers and wants to get the word out. Everyone is welcome. 4 events open to community at large, not

just UAS. (Note from David Felts — was recently updated to 5 events)

1. Registration link: <http://c2c.learningspaces.alaska.edu/events/>

V. Advocacy updates (10-15 minutes)

A. Staff Excellence Award Funding

1. Staff Excellence Award — vote on 2 from Juneau, and 1 from Ketchikan and Sitka. Awardees receive a \$500 award or a day of leave. Each department is responsible for paying the employee, which can be a hardship for certain departments. Certain awardees have had to alter their own budget to award themselves, which presents problems. Chancellor Carey agrees with SC that the Chancellor's office should shoulder this.
2. Gwenna: SC started this when Gwenna was the president. The Chancellor's office was supposed to pay. Unsure how this became a department process as this is similar to what faculty receive. Glad to hear that Chancellor Carey agrees. Eric would like to discuss with Gwenna at the end. Anita notes that Faculty Awards come out of departmental budgets.
3. Mae: her intention to ask Eric about the funding for the Staff Excellence Award. The mechanics of this: the funding is coming from the labor pool budget. It is a chunk of change, departments could set aside from the labor time. But the intention was that the Chancellor would take this up.
4. Eric asks if it'd be a problem to petition the Chancellor to be the source of the funds, as we're not sure when that moved over to the department level.
5. Cody: as someone who manages a budget, the \$500 isn't a huge issue, as the flux in the labor budget is great due to sick leave, etc. Wondering about the discrepancy between faculty and staff.
6. Alexa: wants to know if this is a departmental recognition or staff-level recognition. Recommendation: if this is a departmental recognition, the budget should come from the department budget. Otherwise, the Chancellor's budget. Wonders if the funding could be part of the equation whether or not people are nominated.
7. Eric: my understanding is that it's a campus-wide award (staff in Juneau vote on staff in Juneau, etc.), and not a department wide award
8. Gwenna: it isn't by department. It's campus-based, but you don't necessarily have to be from the campus to nominate someone from that campus. At the beginning, we put in the criteria that whoever is from your specific campus, you didn't vote on it, because there could be issues.
9. Denise: Staff Council members do evaluation via rubric and send decisions forward to SC President, who then sends selections on to Chancellor
10. Eric defers this action item until later

B. Proposed Title IX Advocate Position

1. Head SW HR, Steve Patin, sent email to Staff Alliance asking for feedback for the idea of creating a position called Title IX advisor (advocate) to help people navigate Title IX claims. These advisors would be put in a pool to help students. Staff Council raised concerns with HR. Concerns raised:
  - a) The consequences of these hearings are very consequential
  - b) Potential conflict of interest for staff
  - c) Little to no legal training in this area
  - d) \$1500 stipend is good, but concern here is that it's just big enough to motivate someone to sign up for the position, but may not adequately cover the responsibilities.
2. Response from HR:
  - a) Conflict of interest issue: could have a student from another campus to assist
3. Discussion:
  - a) Cody: It's unclear to me the scope of the role. Is this a 3rd party observer that will be attending meetings? Advising students of how to navigate title ix? The scope seems very unclear.
  - b) Denise: this is due to changes in Title IX where both parties are permitted to have an advisor in the hearings
  - c) Cody: What's the work scope. Is it during work hours, after work hours, how long can we expect to have to clear a calendar.
  - d) Eric: Undefined work scope at this time
  - e) Kayti: Well, could the additional duties push the staff from non-ex to exempt in classification?
  - f) Alexa agreed to take these questions up the chain
  - g) Trisha wanted to know if this was just UAS or if there's this at other campuses (UAA/UAF)
  - h) Eric: this specific set of policies isn't going to change quickly, regardless of election, and this policy would be statewide
  - i) Colin: would the supervisor have to sign off on this?
  - j) Cody: can advisors opt out due to work load
  - k) Kristen: Why is this being headed by HR and not the Title IX leads at the MAU's?
  - l) Eric: invited Romee McAdams to help explain — HR wanted to get system governance buy-in before any changes proposed. HR wants to do this internally to potentially save money on outside representation
  - m) Kayti: Did they mention how many people they would need in the pool? If there's enough people in the pool, this might amount to a part-time position.
  - n) Eric: no they did not
  - o) Denise: this would be open to both faculty and staff, and there'd be a selection process.

- p) Kristen Handley: Would these staff be held liable if things went wrong? Could they lose their jobs over a mishandled case?
- q) Denise: that was the question that she had raised. Denise is leary of Steve Patin's answer (No) due to Higher Ed case law

C. Work From Home

- 1. University is taking this pretty seriously
- 2. Eric met with Steve [Patin] who said that the university should be a leader in this space.
- 3. Eric asks that staff email their supervisor, email him if you have an ideal work schedule. It's important as staff prove that this will work well — staff should advocate for themselves with their supervisor, the Chancellors have been pretty clear that we should make our concerns known; we don't want to expose anyone to COVID

D. Market Based Compensation Study

- 1. Feels that this is languishing
- 2. Discussion:
  - a) Cody: has crossed paths with Karen about the study — she had a direct conversation with President Pitney, and this wasn't a topic of conversation for this next year. This will be a hard push.
  - b) Eric: Denise and Eric met with Chancellor Carey

VI. COVID Committee updates (10 minutes)

A. Denise reports:

- 1. Lori Klein was heading up a contact assessment group (not contact tracing per se, but in the same vein). A new process which hasn't been deployed yet. Housing has not had to use this yet.
- 2. Spring semester will look a lot like fall as far as classes go
- 3. In case anyone saw the NYT database of cases at universities, there's some potential discrepancies on how different institutions are handling their data. Some institutions may choose to remove numbers from their reporting. On the NYT database there was a tally of 1 for UAS
- 4. Colin: is there a public documentation on how this contact tracing will go?
- 5. Alexa: will ask Lori

B. COVID Dashboard?

- 1. Alexa: found a really cool dashboard for NC after she saw that students were being sent off campus. Alexa had demonstrated that to Michael Ciri.
- 2. Colin: One thing that wanted follow up on was the COVID employee dashboard and when it was appropriate to notify the supervisor. When should a person report this?
- 3. Jonathan: Not needed — only if you're an employee that's going to campus
- 4. Alexa: will send note to Michael to clarify expectations on employees and supervisors

C. [uas.virusresponse@alaska.edu](mailto:uas.virusresponse@alaska.edu)

- VII. COVID/Campus re-opening concerns from Staff (15 minutes)
- A. Denise: Raised question in last COVID committee meeting if we wanted to survey students to find out how they were doing across UAS. Perhaps we should also check in with staff/faculty. If we did do this, it seems like it should come from Staff Council to do a “gut check” to see if the university can be doing something better. Denise wanted to raise it to the group if they were open to do that.
  - B. Cody: part of the concern with the current practice (“tell your supervisor”), some concern that folks may not want to reveal information to their supervisor.
  - C. Kristen: If you decide to do a survey I'm happy to assist.
  - D. Eric: Could be a good vehicle to express concerns and to get them resolved.
  - E. Denise will draft something
- VIII. Convocation feedback/suggestions (10 minutes)
- A. Eric: typically convocation has nothing useful for staff outside of the General Assembly and congregation. This year we set up a mini-unconference to help people bump into each other
  - B. Denise: Colin gets a shoutout
  - C. Anita sent feedback
  - D. Colin — presented quick slideshow with recent feedback from staff. Biggest takeaways:
    - 1. staff were generally satisfied with the trainings provided
    - 2. as well as the environment used (Zoom) + the breakout rooms
    - 3. there didn't seem to be one medium which stood out for getting the message out to staff members.
  - E. Anita feedback
    - 1. Lots of appreciation for clear effort made to include staff, particularly from KTN and SIT who don't get to participate much previously
  - F. Eric: 4–6 people per breakout room is a pretty good size
  - G. Denise: wants to know about feedback addressing the different tracks
  - H. Anita: surprising amount of support for doing future events via Zoom. Several comments from folks presumably from KTN and SIT that liked that convocation included them as well
  - I. Kristen: Thanks for the great 'unconference'! it was great!
  - J. Cody: Zoom allows for a level playing field for all participants. Allows people to work in their areas of strength. Played to peoples' strengths. Doesn't think that when COVID is over, believes that this arrangement will remain in some fashion
  - K. Alexa: It also seemed like there was more engagement in the Chat where people may not feel comfortable in person.
- IX. [Written Committee Report Quick Questions](#) (3-5 minutes)
- A. Cody: Banner 8 unavailable via 9/1: OIT may have communicated through Banner work teams. Question to Banner users: were you aware that it would go away?

- B. Deb Rydman: Would have missed it if it were not for Mae Delcastillo. Deb got help with Mae to get up to speed on Banner 9
  - C. Jon Lasinski: pre-pandemic, 8/1 was to be the sunset of Banner 8, provided that items and forms worked. The protocol wasn't communicated well (items on a Google Sheet were fixed).
  - D. Cody: Is banner 8 still accessible?
  - E. Jon: It may be accessible to certain teams (Julie Vigil in Budgeting, etc.) Doesn't feel that OIT did a great job of figuring out if everything is usable and accessible. Feels that they could have done a better job in communicating changes.
  - F. Cody: Offered to amplify system messages which intersect with IT
- X. Adjourn (2-3 minutes)
- A. Motion: Gwenna Richardson
  - B. Second: Denise Carl
- XI. Parking Lot