

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
HOUSE EDUCATION STANDING COMMITTEE**

March 6, 2020

8:03 a.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Representative Harriet Drummond, Co-Chair  
Representative Andi Story, Co-Chair  
Representative Chris Tuck  
Representative Tiffany Zulkosky  
Representative DeLena Johnson  
Representative Mike Prax

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Representative Grier Hopkins

**COMMITTEE CALENDAR**

HOUSE BILL NO. 236

"An Act relating to education; increasing the base student allocation; and providing for an effective date."

- MOVED HB 236 OUT OF COMMITTEE

HOUSE BILL NO. 180

"An Act relating to the Board of Regents of the University of Alaska."

- HEARD & HELD

**PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION**

BILL: HB 236

SHORT TITLE: INCREASE BASE STUDENT ALLOCATION

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) STORY

02/05/20	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
02/05/20	(H)	EDC, FIN
02/26/20	(H)	EDC AT 8:00 AM DAVIS 106
02/26/20	(H)	Heard & Held
02/26/20	(H)	MINUTE(EDC)
03/04/20	(H)	EDC AT 8:00 AM DAVIS 106
03/04/20	(H)	Heard & Held
03/04/20	(H)	MINUTE(EDC)
03/06/20	(H)	EDC AT 8:00 AM DAVIS 106

BILL: HB 180

SHORT TITLE: ADD FACULTY MEMBER UNIV BOARD OF REGENTS

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) WOOL

01/21/20	(H)	PREFILE RELEASED 1/10/20
01/21/20	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/21/20	(H)	EDC, FIN
03/06/20	(H)	EDC AT 8:00 AM DAVIS 106

**WITNESS REGISTER**

REPRESENTATIVE ADAM WOOL  
Alaska State Legislature  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Introduced HB 180 as prime sponsor.

ASHLEY CARRICK, Staff  
Representative Adam Wool  
Alaska State Legislature  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Presented HB 180 on behalf of Representative Wool, prime sponsor.

MARIA WILLIAMS, PhD, Chair  
Faculty Alliance  
University of Alaska  
Anchorage, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified in support of HB 180.

MAX KULBERG  
Anchorage, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified in support of HB 180.

STACEY LUCASON  
Anchorage, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified in support of HB 180.

LUANN PICCARD, Associate Professor  
University of Alaska, Anchorage  
Anchorage, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified in support of HB 180.

**ACTION NARRATIVE**

[8:03:22 AM](#)

**CO-CHAIR ANDI STORY** called the House Education Standing Committee meeting to order at 8:03 a.m. Representatives Drummond, Johnson, Zulkosky, Tuck, Prax, and Story were present at the call to order.

[8:04:25 AM](#)

**HB 236-INCREASE BASE STUDENT ALLOCATION**

CO-CHAIR STORY announced that the first order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 236 "An Act relating to education; increasing the base student allocation; and providing for an effective date."

CO-CHAIR STORY recalled that during its 2/26 and 3/4 meetings, the House Education Standing Committee had heard testimony on HB 236 from the Association of Alaska School Boards (AASB), the Alaska Council of School Administrators (ACSA), and the National Education Association of Alaska (NEA-Alaska). She noted that 43 individuals had testified from 13 communities, and an additional 14 individuals were unable to testify due to time constraints. She stated that the committee had received over 80 letters, emails, and resolutions. She said 260 Anchorage residents had submitted written opposition to budget cuts proposed at the Anchorage School District. She noted that all but two invited, written, and public testimony supported HB 236.

[8:05:59 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX suggested that alternatives to public schools, such as home schools and charter schools, are more cost-effective than public schools, and he asked whether there exists a strategic plan for public schools that includes cost savings.

[8:07:02 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR STORY indicated that the Department of Education & Early Development (DEED) has developed "Alaska's Education Challenge" as its strategic plan.

[8:07:26 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR DRUMMOND added that public education funds a significant number of alternative schools, including home schools, and thousands of students. She added that home school

students receive nearly the same base student allocation (BSA) as do public school students.

[8:08:11 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX acknowledged the number of alternative schools is increasing, which he said he endorses.

[8:08:49 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR DRUMMOND shared that her experiences as a school board member and legislator has resulted in significant interaction with members of the public regarding public education and its funding. She recalled her prior experience as a member of the Anchorage School Board as having been required to implement drastic budget cuts over a number of years. She suggested that further cuts are unsustainable. She offered that public education funding is necessary to attract families and an educated workforce to live, stay, and thrive in Alaska. She urged support of HB 236.

[8:10:40 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR STORY suggested that passage of HB 236 would be a step in the right direction for education policy and an advance toward goals of creating certainty and predictability in public education funding. She noted that HB 236 is a two-year funding mechanism which results in flat funding next year and inflation proofing the following year. She suggested that the proposed increase is modest, and failure to pass HB 236 would result in a net cut of \$30 million to education. She indicated there is a perception that education costs are disproportionately high in Alaska. She pointed out that when adjusted for cost of living and other unique attributes of funding education in Alaska, public education funding is within the mean of national spending on education on a per-student basis. She urged support of HB 236 and heralded investment in education as investment in the future of Alaska.

[8:12:36 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR DRUMMOND moved to report HB 236 out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal notes. There being no objection, HB 236 was reported out of the House Education Standing Committee.

[8:13:05 AM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 8:13 to 8:15 a.m.

[8:15:28 AM](#)

**HB 180-ADD FACULTY MEMBER UNIV BOARD OF REGENTS**

[Contains brief mention of HB 195.]

[8:15:33 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR STORY announced that the final order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 180 "An Act relating to the Board of Regents of the University of Alaska."

[8:16:14 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE ADAM WOOL, Alaska State Legislature, introduced HB 180 as prime sponsor. He explained that HB 180 would establish a voting faculty member representative on the University of Alaska (UA) Board of Regents. He noted that five states' universities include a faculty member on their boards. He drew a comparison to boards such as those for hospitals and banks that include doctors and bankers as a part of their respective stakeholder representation for decision-making processes. He noted that UA Board of Regents includes student representation.

[8:17:38 AM](#)

ASHLEY CARRICK, Staff, Representative Adam Wool, Alaska State Legislature, presented HB 180 on behalf of Representative Wool, prime sponsor. She began a PowerPoint presentation [hardcopy included in the committee packet], entitled "HB 180 Supporting Document - Intro Presentation." Slide 2 depicted the membership structure of the UA Board of Regents and the current role of faculty to the board. She added that faculty maintains speaking rights but does not maintain voting rights. Ms. Carrick then drew attention to slide 3, entitled "STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEMS OVERVIEW," and noted that only public institutions are represented on the map; however, there exists faculty representation on 15 percent of private university boards across the nation. She exemplified how the state of Oregon is represented differently on the map due to more than one public university system in Oregon, both of which include faculty representation on its board with full voting rights.

[8:21:05 AM](#)

MS. CARRICK drew attention to slides 4 and 5, which depict the composition of public university boards in Oregon, Pennsylvania, Florida, Kentucky, and Tennessee that include faculty representation. She made note that no standard for university board membership composition exists. She offered clarification that Kentucky State University's governing councils elect members rather than establishing membership by gubernatorial appointment. She concluded that a variety of composition of boards exists along with a variety among the way members are appointed or elected on boards throughout the nation, and variety exists also among boards that do not include faculty representation.

[8:23:39 AM](#)

MS. CARRICK drew attention to slide 6, entitled "HB 180: HOW IT WORKS," to the second bulleted point, "Nominees from the Faculty Senate of each of the three main campuses are put forward." She explained that two nominees from each of the three campuses are put forward for gubernatorial consideration. She noted that under HB 180, as currently written, a term consists of four years; however, following stakeholder engagement, consideration is being made to amend the length of the term to two years. She then drew attention to slide 7, entitled "HB 180: BENEFITS OF A FACULTY REGENT," and explained that faculty currently do not enjoy a voting privilege while the student regent does. She highlighted the standard of professionalism that exists, in particular for the student regent member, and she said the proposed faculty member would be held to the same high standard.

[8:26:43 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR DRUMMOND asked for an explanation of the selection process of the student member.

MS. CARRICK answered that up to two students may be elected from each campus for gubernatorial consideration through a petition process.

CO-CHAIR DRUMMOND asked whether the six agricultural members of the Pennsylvania State University Board of Trustees were faculty of an agricultural program.

MS. CARRICK offered her understanding that the six agricultural members represent the agricultural industry. In response to a

follow-up question, she confirmed that they could be members of the business community.

CO-CHAIR DRUMMOND referred to slide 6 and asked whether an amendment is anticipated to reduce the term from four years to two. She asked for additional information on the bullet point "Tiebreaker vote of the full board can be broken by a vote of the President," whether the president of UA is an employee of the board comparable to a superintendent of a school district who is hired by the district's board.

[8:29:46 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL answered that the president is an employee of UA and serves at the pleasure of the Board of Regents.

CO-CHAIR DRUMMOND expressed concern regarding the president, as an employee of the board, holding a tiebreaker voting privilege. She suggested that since the increase in regents proposed in HB 180 would result in 12 voting members, perhaps a vote of 7 could be required to eliminate the need for a tiebreaker vote.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL offered the possibility that members absent from a meeting could create challenges should a vote of seven be required. He noted that there exists a simple majority of members present.

CO-CHAIR DRUMMOND referred to Alaska State Legislative Uniform Rules requiring either a simple majority of members present or a full majority depending on the issue being voted upon. She asked which rules of order govern the process for the board.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL offered that the board has adopted Roberts Rules of Order, and he expressed his belief that issues requiring a vote require only a majority of those members present.

[8:32:23 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE TUCK expressed concern regarding the interest between the president and the [proposed] faculty member. He suggested that the president could apply pressure to a subordinate faculty member in the case of a contentious issue. Of the other states described in the presentation, he asked how the states with an even number of board members function in the event of a tie vote.

[8:33:29 AM](#)

MS. CARRICK indicated that she would conduct additional research and inform the committee.

REPRESENTATIVE TUCK asked who has advocated for voting privileges for a faculty representative as proposed under HB 180.

[8:33:53 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL stated that over the prior five years he has fielded increasing requests from faculty members who have expressed concern for lack of faculty representation on the board, and he indicated the perceived concern had recently increased due to budget cuts. He noted that the concept of faculty representation on the board had been met with resistance and that potential conflict of interest exists for faculty members; however, he suggested that potential conflict exists also for the student representative when votes on matters such as tuition or program cuts are contemplated. He suggested that should a genuine conflict of interest arise, the member should recuse him/herself from the vote. He remarked that all political appointees carry an inherent risk of potential for conflict of interest. He suggested that students and faculty bring a vital perspective to the board.

[8:36:29 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE TUCK noted that professional trade groups may prohibit employees from participating in governance due to pay and benefits decisions. He contrasted student representation and faculty representation due to the amounts paid by the state to subsidize students' tuition. He expressed concern regarding the uncertainty of future funding for UA.

[8:37:51 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR DRUMMOND asked whether adding a second student member had been considered to alleviate the need for a tiebreaker by the president.

[8:38:22 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL said he had not considered another student but had considered adding a staff member in addition to the student and proposed faculty member. He suggested the

possibility of allowing a term of another regent to expire and subsequently filling that position with a faculty member. He expressed his hope that issues brought before the board would generally result in more decisive voting outcomes [rather than tie votes].

8:39:23 AM

CO-CHAIR DRUMMOND said that the Anchorage Assembly was in the process of considering whether to add a member, which would result in an even number of representatives, and that some assemblies allow for a mayor to serve as a tiebreaker vote. She encouraged more information be provided to the committee regarding the rules of order and how the president as a tiebreaker would function once implemented, including how other state university systems may operate with the same.

8:40:24 AM

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL offered that regardless of whether the board procedurally operates in accordance, Roberts Rules of Order prescribes that the board chair is not a voting member unless a tiebreaker vote is needed. He agreed to conduct further research as requested.

8:41:05 AM

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON noted the vote weight distribution in the state systems referenced in the presentation and asked whether the proposed faculty member would carry an 8 percent weight with his/her vote. She then asked for clarification that currently the faculty member representation cannot vote nor participate in executive session, and she asked whether the proposed legislation would allow for that participation.

8:42:42 AM

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL confirmed Representative Johnson's assessment and compared faculty member participation to that of Puerto Rico or Guam [in the United States Congress].

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON stated that the conflict of interest might occur should a faculty member participate in the hiring and evaluation of a president, and she asked how that and other potential conflicts, such as personnel issues being discussed during executive session, would be managed.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL noted that student representatives are exposed to sensitive information and potential conflicts of interest and there exists a professional standard of conduct to which they are held, such as self-recusal, based on trust. He answered the question of a faculty member participating in the hiring of a president, adding that the University of Alaska Faculty Senate provides a position of support on the hiring of the president. He noted that the faculty member vote weight as proposed would be one-twelfth of the whole on hiring and other matters brought to a vote, and he expressed his hope that the board would not be divided by a tie vote in hiring a president but rather maintain more of a consensus for a matter of such consequence. He reiterated that the student representative currently enjoys the privilege of voting on this [and other matters] and suggested that the lack of faculty representation results in imbalanced representation.

[8:45:44 AM](#)

MS. CARRICK offered that there could be a perception of limited powers held by a student regent whereas, in practice, the student regent is held to a rigorous standard of professional conduct. She described anecdotal experiences related to her by current and previous student regents who have participated in program decisions and other sensitive matters for decision that are subject to public scrutiny. She explained that student representatives serve on the board to the benefit of UA as a whole and not for the campus from which they were nominated or for the particular program in which the student is enrolled. She suggested that a faculty regent would reasonably be capable of serving UA as a whole similarly, professionally, and in a nonpartisan manner.

[8:47:22 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL added that UA had recently eliminated its education program with a vote of six yeas to five nays, and the student regent voted in favor of the elimination of the program. He suggested that as evidence that the student regent participates in major decisions and is not a token member.

[8:48:27 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX asked whether the student regent is elected or whether his/her name is forwarded to the governor for appointment.

[8:48:46 AM](#)

MS. CARRICK explained that among the three main campuses a student may choose to solicit petition signatures to award the opportunity of consideration of gubernatorial appointment to the board. She added that there exists a trend of rotating the student representation among the different campuses, with some exceptions. She added that students are evaluated for appointment based on qualifications.

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX asked how a faculty member would be selected and whether the faculty union would participate in the nomination process.

MS. CARRICK reiterated that the UA Faculty Senate at each of the three main campuses would appoint two nominees, for a total of six nominees to be considered for gubernatorial appointment to the board. She stated that the faculty union would not be involved in the process.

[8:51:41 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE TUCK said he did not see where Section 4 refers to "Faculty Senate," and he asked for an explanation of how the Faculty Senate works.

[8:52:47 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR DRUMMOND offered that on page 2, line 12, the bill states "three faculty senates".

REPRESENTATIVE TUCK asked for an explanation of the composition and function of the faculty senates.

[8:53:03 AM](#)

MS. CARRICK explained that each faculty senate conducts annual elections to appoint members on rotating terms. She conjectured that no term limits exist. She offered to provide additional information to the committee including terms of service.

REPRESENTATIVE TUCK asked what function the faculty senate serves.

[8:53:57 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR STORY asked whether a representative from UA was present and available to provide information to the committee.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL indicated that the witnesses present did not include invited testimony at the current hearing; however, one or more invited testifiers would be offered at a future hearing on the bill.

CO-CHAIR STORY referred to a letter in the committee packet, entitled "UNAC Support Letter," which includes a reference to a two-year term rather than a four-year term due to workload considerations for the appointee. She cited a statement in the letter which read that "the faculty regent be chosen in rotation from UAF, UAA, UAS and Extended Campuses to ensure balanced representation from the campuses." She asked whether the sponsor intended to include the suggested language in an amended version of the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL stated that he intentionally did not include such language to mitigate regionalism in faculty representation. He suggested that regionalization could politicize the board. He expressed his intent that faculty and student representatives work in the best interest of the UA system as a whole. He suggested that the trend of rotating regional student representation had occurred inconsequentially, and the appointees were selected based only on their qualifications.

CO-CHAIR STORY asked whether the sponsor had obtained feedback from the current board of regents regarding adding a faculty member.

[8:56:51 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL indicated that he had engaged informally with some current board and faculty members, and he said he thinks - especially considering the faculty felt underrepresented over the summer - that while they may not testify in support of [adding a faculty member to the board], they would not be opposed to it. He added, "I'm sure there are some that are opposed, and ... maybe, in a way, that speaks to: This isn't such a bad idea." He said faculty does have a voice, and he thinks faculty members, who are "just random faculty members," would be hesitant to come before the board and make a strong statement, because they are an employee. Whereas, if they were on the Board of Regents, then that would be their job and expected role.

8:58:52 AM

MS. CARRICK explained that she had been in contact with the Northwest Commission on Colleges (NCC), which had contacted UA the summer prior, taking issue with the fiscal state of UA. She indicated that NCC has stated its political neutrality on HB 180, has offered no public opposition to the bill, and has informally allowed for the merits of faculty representation on the board.

9:00:33 AM

REPRESENTATIVE TUCK expressed concern that a faculty member may be subject to undue pressure should the president enjoy the power of a tiebreaker vote since the faculty is employed at the pleasure of the president and could be terminated.

9:01:21 AM

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL stated that a tenured professor is protected from [capricious] termination.

9:02:03 AM

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON asked whether a recently retired professor would be considered qualified to fill the proposed faculty position.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL acknowledged that a retired professor may already exist by happenstance on the board and any retired professor would add value to the board.

9:03:04 AM

CO-CHAIR STORY opened public testimony on HB 180.

9:03:18 AM

MARIA WILLIAMS, PhD, Chair, Faculty Alliance, University of Alaska, testified in support of HB 180. She explained that the Faculty Alliance is the faculty governance group and consists of the Faculty Senates at each main campus. She added that Faculty Senate terms are for one year and the chair rotates among the campus representatives. She suggested that a four-year term could be too onerous considering faculty workload. She suggested that the current board makes decisions at a very high organizational level and may lack valuable input from faculty

and student perspective. She added that faculty members work on campus and are engaged directly in program activities, including curriculum.

[9:06:30 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX asked for an explanation of the activities and recommendations made by the faculty alliance.

[9:07:03 AM](#)

DR. WILLIAMS explained that the faculty alliance meets every two weeks for two hours. She added that its membership comprises elected representatives from a coalition of student leaders, staff alliance, and faculty alliance. She added that a presentation is developed for presentation to the board and voiced her concern that the board may not acknowledge the faculty at meetings and allow testimony.

[9:08:11 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR DRUMMOND asked Dr. Williams to detail the changes in UA administration during her tenure.

DR. WILLIAMS answered that since 2011, she had experience with: three deans, including a current interim dean; five provosts, the last three of whom have been interim provost; and two presidents. She explained that while it is not unusual for turnover, it is unusual for there to be extensive interim deans and provosts.

CO-CHAIR DRUMMOND opined that these administrative changes reflect a state of disorder at UA.

[9:09:22 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL remarked that turnover in administration is typical.

[9:09:59 AM](#)

MAX KULBERG testified in support of HB 180. He explained that the faculty alliance is invited to the board meetings to provide a presentation. He said that faculty members are subject to acknowledgement to testify at board meetings and suggested that they are regularly not acknowledged to speak. He said that during the most recent accreditation process of UA, the

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities determined two areas for suggested improvement in order to maintain accreditation. He stated the first was to delineate the roles for chancellor and president, and the second was to improve shared governance. He stated strong support for HB 180 as a means by which UA could improve shared governance. He noted that a faculty member as board member would provide perspectives currently lacking from the board discussions. He suggested that a quorum of seven, or a majority, be included under HB 180 as it is proposed under HB 195. He suggested reconsideration of the president as tiebreaker vote and recommended instead that a voting member should serve as tiebreaker.

[9:12:27 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX asked for clarification on the assertion that faculty members do not enjoy representation due to a lack of voting privilege despite enjoying the privilege of speaking to the board.

MR. KULBERG emphasized his primary reason for his testimony is to convey the concern that faculty do not enjoy the privilege to vote. He explained that faculty are invited as guests to provide faculty updates; however, faculty are not consistently invited to participate in discussions germane to their areas of expertise and shared knowledge.

[9:14:39 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR DRUMMOND asked Mr. Kulberg to provide additional information on nonvoting members as tiebreaker.

MR. KULBERG noted that faculty have discussed and researched other boards and have not found an instance where a nonvoting or ex-officio member [such as the president] enjoys the privilege of a tiebreaker vote. He suggested that acceptable alternatives could include a change of majority vote to require seven, rather than six; the inclusion of an additional board member such as a staff representative; or the reduction in the number of regents when a term expires.

CO-CHAIR DRUMMOND reiterated her suggestion of including an additional student member and cautioned that adding a staff representative might result in a complex appointment procedure. She postulated that regardless of odd or even membership, issues should be meritorious enough to warrant persuasion to a consensus outcome by vote.

[9:17:00 AM](#)

MS. CARRICK referenced Representative Prax's earlier discussion regarding the existing role of faculty to the board and suggested that a disparity exists between the board's perception of faculty role and the faculty perception of the same. She added that faculty enjoys speaking privileges compared to a member of the general public who would not enjoy the privilege of speaking to the board; however, stakeholder feedback has indicated that the speaking privileges in practice are inadequate to that of voting privileges to represent the interests of faculty to the board.

[9:18:28 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX expressed his sympathy to the matter of non-voting interested party testimony in governance and asked for further clarification on what disparity exists.

[9:18:58 AM](#)

MS. CARRICK offered that while faculty are invited to present to the board, no certainty exists that faculty remain fully engaged in discussions. In practice, faculty are not invited to engage consequentially with the board following their initial presentation.

[9:19:37 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL explained that the configuration of the meeting room in practice is comparable to the configuration of a hearing such as this of the House Education Standing Committee, where faculty are invited to speak yet not engaged in the discussion.

[9:20:25 AM](#)

STACEY LUCASON testified in support of HB 180. She expressed her support as a former student regent and UA alumnus for consideration of an amendment to prescribe a two-year term due to workload management. She suggested that HB 180 would aid in compliance to findings which have jeopardized accreditation of UA as a whole. She lauded the value of faculty insight and perspective as necessary to effective governance and opined that faculty input as it exists is inadequate to meaningfully contribute to the process. She echoed previous concerns raised

regarding the president as tiebreaker, suggesting that the conflict which exists due to the employer/employee relationship between the president and the board is insurmountable. She expressed her support for the suggestion to require a seven-member majority vote as it would reflect a modernization in decision-making and would result in more consensus necessary when making consequential decisions on controversial matters. She suggested that professional standards apply to all members of the board. Recusal from matters where a conflict exists does occur, and faculty would not be unduly burdened to maintain the same level of conduct, she said.

[9:23:27 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR DRUMMOND asked Ms. Lucason to describe the training and support she received in her role as student regent.

MS. LUCASON answered that training and support are relatively minimal. She explained that her individual experience as student body president served as an additional benefit to the training she received. She described written materials were provided that covered matters of confidentiality, procedure, and calendar, among others. She stated that she also participated in a tour of the facility.

CO-CHAIR DRUMMOND asked whether any professional training had been provided.

MS. LUCASON added that she had also been introduced to the UA General Council around the time of her appointment.

[9:25:49 AM](#)

LUANN PICCARD, Associate Professor, University of Alaska, Anchorage, testified in support of HB 180. She provided her biographical information, including professional certification. She indicated that her expertise in management dictates that diversity of stakeholder input is vital to proper governance. She suggested that most public boards and commissions include members qualified with subject matter expertise. She challenged the committee to consider the effectiveness of governance bodies that do not include such expertise. She suggested that the current board composition does not require members possess such expertise, but the proposed addition of a faculty member would. She suggested that the areas of expertise lacking, which a faculty member would bring, include experience in teaching students, conducting research, knowledge of accreditation,

institutional knowledge, and active participation in shared governance. She suggested that faculty perspective is vital to effective governance, and inclusion of faculty would bring added integrity to the process.

[9:29:43 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR STORY recalled that the sponsor would provide additional information to the committee pertinent to how other state public universities address matters of voting and tiebreaking.

[9:30:05 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL affirmed that additional testimony and information would be forthcoming.

[9:30:28 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR STORY announced that HB 180 was held over.

[9:31:12 AM](#)

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the committee, the House Education Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 9:31 a.m.