MOTION PASSED AS AMENDED (unanimous approval)

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend Section IV.B.3.c. of the UAF Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty as follows:

- (()) = deletion CAPS = addition
- IV. B. 3. c. Levels of Review. The faculty member shall submit the completed application file to department head. The department head, ((in)) AFTER consultation with faculty ((in the unit)), STUDENTS, AND OTHER INDIVIDUALS WHO CAN MAKE LEGITIMATE INPUT INTO THE EVALUATION PROCESS, will evaluate the file and prepare a written recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure. The recommendation, along with the candidate's response, if any, shall be forwarded with the file to the unit peer review committee.

[The remaining portion of Section IV.B.3.c. remains unchanged.]

EFFECTIVE: Upon Chancellor's Approval

RATIONALE: The intent of the original regulation was to encourage the department head to consult widely and was not meant to limit her/his consultation to the unit. The unit will be making its own substantive recommendation after the department head.

Wareha 156/09

President, UAF Faculty Senate

MOTION PASSED (unanimous approval)

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to confirm the faculty membership for the Joint Faculty-Administration Task Force on Administrator Evaluation as follows:

Ron Gatterdam Professor, Computer Science College of Liberal Arts

Dorothy Jones Associate Professor, Computer Applications School of Career and Continuing Education

Nagabhushana M.S. Rao Professor, Sociology College of Rural Alaska

Brent Watkins Associate Professor, Geophysics Geophysical Institute College of Natural Sciences

Frank Wooding
Professor, Agronomy
School of Agriculture and Land
Management Resources

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

President, UAF Faculty Senate

sm/14

RESOLUTION PASSED AS AMENDED (unanimous approval)

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt the following resolution relating to the Regents' action on a new residence for the president of the University of Alaska:

- WHEREAS, The quality of education and the academic environment at the University of Alaska are severely limited by the availability of resources; and
- WHEREAS, Funding for instructional equipment and supplies, building maintenance, library acquisitions, and facilities for research and scholarly activities are inadequate to support our needs and aspirations; and
- WHEREAS, This environment of limited resources requires careful consideration of priorities for new funding requests; and
- WHEREAS, The proposal to invest limited resources in construction of a new residence for the president of the University of Alaska has never been subjected to open discussion and evaluation of its merit and priority vis a vis other academic needs; now
- THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the Faculty Senate of the University of Alaska Fairbanks opposes the proposal from the president of the University of Alaska to build a new residence for the next university president. We urgently request that the Board of Regents of the University refrain from action in support of the proposal until it has been considered in an appropriate public forum within the University, and endorsed by the University community as a project deserving of priority relative to other academic needs of the University.

President, UAF Faculty Senate

senmin3/14

MOTION PASSED (unanimous approval)

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to endorse the proposed revisions to University Regulation 06.01.01, Artwork for University Facilities.

President, UAF Faculty Senate

senmin3/14

MOTION (unanimous approval)

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Faculty Affairs Committee recommendation that a student not be placed on the University-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee.

RATIONALE: A great deal of credibility and weight is placed on the students' evaluation of faculty in the promotion and tenure process. It is not an exaggeration to say that these evaluations are one of the central teaching benchmarks used in the evaluation process at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. Also, the Senate has just approved changing the regulations (Section IV.B.3.c.) specifically allowing department heads to consult with students in preparing their evaluations. With this level of input from the students, given such weight, it is felt that the student concerns and evaluations are adequately addressed in the existing promotion and tenure process.

In addition, since promotion and tenure are conferred by the faculty, honors bestowed by faculty upon other faculty deemed worthy, consideration of the students' evaluation is sufficient to give the student an adequate voice in the process.

Thirdly, promotion and tenure is evaluated as a peer process. Therefore, it would be inconsistent and inappropriate to put the student, who is not a peer of the faculty member, in the peer role of evaluating the faculty member for promotion and tenure.

President, UAF Faculty Senate

APPROVED | Saturation | Date |

cs/