



**UNIVERSITY OF GUAM
UNIBETSEDĀT GUÅHAN
Board of Regents**

Resolution No. 25-24

**RELATIVE TO APPROVING THE REVISED UOG COMPREHENSIVE FACULTY EVALUATION
SYSTEM DOCUMENT**

WHEREAS, the University of Guam (UOG) is the primary U.S. Land Grant and Sea Grant institution accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Senior College and University Commission serving the post-secondary needs of the people of Guam and the region;

WHEREAS, pursuant to 17 GCA § 16112, the Board of Regents (BOR) Articles of Incorporation, and the BOR Bylaws, the BOR is authorized to adopt rules and regulations governing the selection, compensation, promotion, performance evaluation, disciplinary action and other terms and conditions of employment affecting academic personnel, defined as faculty and administrators;

WHEREAS, the Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System (CFES) Document is essential to guide decisions in the evaluation of the performance of faculty in various endeavors for purposes of increments, promotions and the granting of tenure;

WHEREAS, the last CFES document update was made more than two decades ago, adopted on December 16, 1999;

WHEREAS, there is a need to periodically update the original CFES document to incorporate new areas of academic focus and initiatives undertaken by faculty;

WHEREAS, the revisions to the CFES document were developed by various CFES Work Groups made up of Faculty Senate members, Faculty Union members, and academic administrators, groups formed at different times in the development process:

Initial CFES Work Group (2020-2021): Dr. Troy McVey, Dr. Monique Storie, Dr. Velma Yamashita, Dr. Gena Rojas, and Dr. Nate Habana

Faculty Union Work Group (2021-2022): Dr. L. Robert Barber, Dr. Arun Swamy, Dr. Gena Rojas, Dr. Iain Twaddle, and Dr. Irena Keckes

CFES Joint Faculty-Administrator Work Group (2022-2024): Dr. L. Robert Barber, Dr. Arun Swamy, Dr. Gena Rojas, Dr. Monique Storie, Dr. James Sellmann, and Dr. Mary Cruz

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate's Standing Committee on Evaluation has reviewed this action, and on the Standing Committee on Evaluation's recommendation, and having met the Senate's criteria for Endorsement, the full Faculty Senate endorsed the Revised CFES document on January 25, 2024, with document edits completed on January 30, 2025.

WHEREAS, the UOG Administrative Council has reviewed this action and recommended that it be sent to the President for consideration to forward to the BOR Academic, Personnel and Tenure committee;

WHEREAS, the BOR Academic, Personnel and Tenure committee has reviewed this action and recommends this be sent to the full BOR for approval.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the BOR approves the attached revised University of Guam Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System Document for all work plans beginning after the adoption of this document.

Adopted this 25th day of November, 2025



Agapito "Pete" A. Diaz, Chairperson

ATTESTED:



Anita Borja Enriquez, D.B.A., Executive Secretary

REVISED CFES DOCUMENT
Finalized January 30, 2025

COMPREHENSIVE FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM

The Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System set forth below was originally developed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee for approval by the Board of Regents in 1999, utilizing information provided by those who will be directly affected by its use -- the faculty.

The 2020 revisions were developed by a CFES Work Group, a group of six were drawn from faculty and administrators, enacted under the implementation section (Article XIII) of *Agreement 2018*. An extensive consultation period with various faculty was undertaken in the Fañomnåkan 2020 semester and a series of town hall sessions in Fanuchånan 2020 Semester. The revised policy was submitted to the Faculty Senate Standing Committee on Evaluations initiating the formal review process leading to Board of Regents approval in 2021. The Committee recommended to the full Senate that the document be submitted to the Faculty Union for revision. The full Senate voted in favor of this recommendation and the Union received the document for review in December 2021. The Union Board formed a working group in February 2022 which met regularly, discussing every section, and making changes during Fañomnåkan 2022. Certain sections that required outside input, like CSR, Library and Extension were completed in Fanuchånan 2022. What follows below is the product of this exhaustive review.

Throughout this chapter, the Board of Regents/ Faculty Union *Agreement* will simply be referred to as *Agreement*, and unless otherwise noted, shall refer to the current *Agreement* in force.

Purpose and Application

The faculty and the administration of the University of Guam agree that successfully fulfilling the University's mission depends on maintaining and developing high quality faculty work. Faculty evaluation is an essential part of that process.

One of the reasons for the existence of an evaluation process is to assist individual faculty members in assessing their professional performance and plan for future faculty development. Another is to provide a clear picture of a faculty member's performance based on various types of information to be evaluated by those responsible for guiding the faculty's development and performance.

The document may be used for four evaluative purposes:

- 1) to identify areas where the faculty member is effective;
- 2) to identify areas where the faculty member may need improvement;
- 3) to assist the University in developing a written, long-range plan to support the faculty members in their development and remediation needs; and
- 4) to make decisions about salary increment, merit bonuses, reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post tenure review.

The data generated by the evaluation process require soundly reasoned interpretations within a framework of basic fairness and professionalism. This evaluation process is a tool, and like all other tools it does not have a life apart from the people who use it. This system is intended to provide a consistent conceptual framework for all types of faculty evaluations.

General Assumptions

1. Faculty members are professionals who desire to perform well. Thus, the evaluation system is formative in nature and should be viewed as a positive experience for all concerned. The instrument should be used for professional development and attaining high standards and should not cause alarm or anxiety.
2. Evaluation cannot be separated from faculty development. If faculty members are to maintain, as well as to improve performance, they must be afforded opportunities for professional development as well as receive guidance and support from their dean or director. Professional development that the University requires shall be provided or paid for by the University.
3. Individual faculty members are most effective in contributing to the mission of the University when they can specialize to some extent. Consequently, outputs in endeavors will vary for individual faculty depending on the type of faculty appointments, their various specialties, and how percentages of effort are allocated in each endeavor.
4. While the faculty evaluation process will be used uniformly throughout the University, it is flexible enough to allow faculty in the various schools and colleges to address specific concerns and goals of their divisions and programs if so desired.
5. It is recognized that any instrument of evaluation must be subject to modification, adjustment, and perhaps major change. The Faculty Senate Standing Committee on Evaluation will continue to monitor and recommend improvements for the consideration of the Faculty Union and Administration to include in subsequent Agreements.
6. The University of Guam is committed to academic freedom. As Standard One in the institutional standards of the WASC Senior College and University Commission states, "There is no norm of greater value for educational institutions than academic freedom." Academic Freedom is defined in the *Agreement*.
7. All faculty will complete a CFES Annual Plan of Work, as described in the *Agreement*.
8. All faculty should complete a CFES Load Information Form every semester, if required by the Dean. This is a tool deans and directors may use to determine adherence to full-time and overload compensation and other administrative purposes. It is not an artifact of the evaluation process nor intended to be a substitute for an Annual Plan of Work or annual Report.

Evaluation Standards

Within each endeavor, faculty are evaluated on the quality of their work product. The evaluation standards that may be used are outstanding, commendable, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory, as explained below.

Deans and directors conduct annual increment reviews, but the other types of review articulated in section “Faculty Review Procedures” also include peer evaluation in the process. To earn an increment in an annual review, an *overall* evaluation of at least “Satisfactory” is required. The standards for Promotion and Tenure are based on progressive attainment of “Commendable” and/or “Satisfactory” in primary and secondary endeavors as required depending on status/rank applied for, as discussed below.

Outstanding: Demonstrating a level of engagement and achievement “above and beyond” the call of duty. The cumulative faculty record in this endeavor demonstrates a level of achievement that significantly exceeds what is expected in the plan of work. Work is characterized by high quality outcomes and consistent productivity, that demonstrates positive impact to the program, University, profession, and community. It is a standard to aspire to and recognize but not to require.

Commendable: Goes beyond the objectives in the plan of work. Demonstrating a level of engagement and achievement that reflects credit on the faculty, program, and institution. Commendable work advances knowledge and supports the advancement of the human condition. Commendable work is acknowledged by academic peers, experts in the field, or community-recognized cultural masters and knowledge experts as having a positive impact on the workforce, economy, or society, especially locally and in the region.

Satisfactory: Satisfactory work is characterized by completion of projects, meeting stated and agreed upon goals in annual work plans as well as meeting all required criteria set forth in this document and the *Agreement*. Demonstrating a level of engagement and achievement sufficient to meet the immediate objectives of the faculty, program, and institution and to earn an increment.

Unsatisfactory: Demonstrating a level of engagement and achievement that falls short of what is required to meet the immediate objectives of the faculty, program, and institution, needs development. Unsatisfactory work is characterized by goals regularly not completed, or work completed substantially beyond deadlines or work that is substantially below the standard expected of the academic ranks. When assessing for improvements, administrators are to consider environmental and contextual conditions that may impede progress to goals, faculty should clearly state impediments they may have encountered during the review period. When an area of performance is identified as needing improvement, the faculty member and the appropriate administrator must work together to develop and implement a mutually acceptable written plan to address the deficiency. The areas identified as needing improvement must be reflected in the list of assigned endeavors for evaluation during the subsequent cycle, and the faculty member must state a specific development plan as part of the Annual Plan of Work until the deficiency has been appropriately addressed. The faculty member is expected to work

energetically toward improvement, and the administrator is expected to provide the necessary guidance, counseling, and support.

Since the standard of “Commendable” performance is most pertinent for promotion and tenure, this will be defined more specifically for each endeavor. For “Satisfactory,” “Outstanding” and “Unsatisfactory” these general guidelines should suffice.

Faculty Review Procedures

All evaluations of full-time faculty, including but not limited to increments, continuing employment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews shall be conducted by the process outlined in this document.

1. Annual (Increment) Review
2. Reappointment Review (also known as Continuing Employment)
3. Voluntary Peer Review
4. Promotion Review
5. Tenure Review
6. Post-Tenure Review
7. Voluntary Peer Review

A summary of procedures based on Article V of the Agreement is found in the Appendix. However, this is subject to revision and being updated to reflect current Agreements.

Endeavors

In determining the endeavors that faculty will carry out for the evaluation period, they may choose among instruction; creative/scholarly activity or research; extension and community activities; university and community service; or library and academic support, with their primary role being the role articulated in their original contract of hire. A faculty member may not normally choose university and community service as a primary endeavor for promotion and tenure except for one year when serving as an academic administrator. When the individual has been selected or authorized by the President to fulfill a task of significant/momentous service to the university or regional community, such as serving on a commission for the Government of Guam, they may elect service as a primary endeavor only if the time involved is greater than fifty percent (50%) and the work involved clearly does not fit under creative, scholarly and research or extension and community activities.

At the start of each evaluation period, the individual faculty member and the appropriate administrator will consult to determine the particular endeavors that will be evaluated and what percentage each endeavor will carry in the total evaluation process. The agreed-upon percentages will be specified in writing as the CFES Annual Plan of Work and will form the framework within which any evaluation takes place.

The primary evaluation must be in the area of the faculty member's primary endeavor, as indicated in the faculty member's original contract of hire, unless modified in writing through

some arrangement agreed to by the individual faculty member and approved by the President after consultation with the division and the dean/director. Instruction will be the primary endeavor for most faculty; but research, extension, or library and academic support will be primary endeavor for some faculty. The combination of evaluation percentages will total 100%. Each faculty member must be evaluated in at least three endeavors. Minimum percentages for promotion and tenure are in the Agreement.

Note that percentages for evaluation are not equal to overall full-time equivalencies (FTE) and overloads. The evaluation process recognizes the multiple roles of individual faculty members by reflecting differing responsibilities. The individual faculty member and the appropriate administrator will consult to determine the particular roles that will be evaluated and what weight each role will carry in the total evaluation process. The agreed-upon weights, noted as percentages, will be specified in writing and will form the framework within which evaluation takes place. CFES percentages reflect the value of the main three faculty endeavors relative to the faculty member's overall output. The faculty member chooses these percentages within the constraints required for each promotional step in this document.

The Promotion & Tenure process is based on progressively higher achievement in various ranks. Evaluators will use the following benchmarks for candidates at various levels:

- for a promotion to Instructor/Extension agent II, satisfactory performance in the candidate's primary role and at least satisfactory performance in all other roles being evaluated will be required;
- for a promotion to Assistant Professor/ Extension Agent III, satisfactory performance in the candidate's primary role and at least satisfactory performance in all other roles being evaluated will be required;
- for promotion to Associate Professor/Extension Agent IV, commendable performance for the primary and secondary endeavor and at least satisfactory accomplishments in the third role being evaluated will be required;
- for promotion to Professor/Extension Specialist, commendable performance in all endeavors is required.

In addition, all candidates for promotion must have attained the minimum educational qualifications for the rank they are applying for. A Bachelor's degree is required for Assistant Instructor/Extension Agent I. Master's degree is required for Instructor/Extension Agent II and a terminal degree is required for all higher ranks.

Likewise, faculty are required to engage in progressively higher percentages for the Creative/Scholarly Activity or Research endeavor. Refer to the BOR/Union Agreement Art. V for criteria.

Collegiality

Collegiality is a professional responsibility of all academic personnel, faculty and administrators alike. It is comprised of actions and behaviors that reflect a shared responsibility, cooperation, and respect among colleagues in creating an engaging work environment at the University of Guam.

Collegiality is essential to the effective and efficient operation of the University. As a colleague and a member of the profession, the professional employee has obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars and teachers. Collegiality is the ability to work amicably with one's associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas, the professional employee shows due respect for the opinions of others, strives for objectivity in professional judgement of colleagues, and accepts an equal share of responsibilities for the academic operation and governance of the University.

Faculty members recognize that academic freedom brings with it academic responsibility. Faculty accept the obligation to exercise self-discipline and critical judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge and to practice intellectual honesty.

The concerns expressed by the American Association of University Professors' (AAUP) [2016 Report](#) "On Collegiality as a Criterion for Faculty Evaluation" are important to keep in mind.¹

[C]ollegiality is not a distinct capacity to be assessed independently of the traditional triumvirate of teaching, scholarship, and service. Evaluation in these three areas will encompass the contributions that the virtue of collegiality may pertinently add to a faculty member's career. The current tendency to isolate collegiality as a distinct dimension of evaluation, however, poses several dangers....

[C]ollegiality may be confused with the expectation that a faculty member display "enthusiasm" or "dedication," evince "a constructive attitude" that will "foster harmony," or display an excessive deference to administrative or faculty decisions where these may require reasoned discussion. Such expectations are flatly contrary to elementary principles of academic freedom, which protect a faculty member's right to dissent from the judgments of colleagues and administrators.

Collegiality should not be confused with sociability or likability. Collegiality is a professional, not personal, criterion relating to the performance of a faculty member's duties with the University. The expectation that a candidate should demonstrate collegiality does not license any member of the university community to expect conformity to their views, engage in tone policing² or enforce groupthink.³ The espousal of a minority or unpopular view or one contrary to the wishes of administrators should not be deemed uncollegial. However, in the expression of contrary ideas, the professional faculty member is expected to engage in respectful dialogue or debate; and shall not abuse the right to academic freedom by shrouding abusive language or harassing behaviors under the guise of free expression. At all times, collegiality requires

¹ <https://www.aaup.org/report/collegiality-criterion-faculty-evaluation>

² <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/tone-policing>

³ <https://www.simplypsychology.org/groupthink.html>

willingness to work towards solutions that serve the best interest of the program, unit, and institution.

For this reason, collegiality should not be used as a distinct criterion for faculty evaluation. If collegiality is addressed in CFES evaluations, emphasis will be placed on recognizing and encouraging faculty contributions to an atmosphere of positive collegiality, while recognizing that collegiality is a non-evaluative factor. Examples of positive collegiality may include:

- **Working collaboratively on joint endeavors.** Positive collegiality includes contributing to joint efforts in research, instruction, and service.
- **Acting in a supportive way.** Positive collegiality includes encouraging each other, acknowledging each other's contributions, and being willing to step up and lend a hand when others need help, including sharing non-proprietary knowledge and resources to assist colleagues perform their professional duties.
- **Respecting the views of others.** Positive collegiality includes communicating in a manner that respects the views of others while recognizing that freedom of expression, informed debate, and disagreements are necessary to a vibrant and healthy university environment.
- **Giving each other the benefit of the doubt.** Positive collegiality includes assuming we are all trying to do the right thing, seeing things from the other person's perspective, and being patient and flexible with others.

These examples of positive collegiality represent ideal goals that faculty are encouraged to strive towards, not standards by which faculty will be measured. Hallmarks of collegiality include, but are not limited to, open and honest communication that shows respect for the views and opinions of others even when disagreeing; interpersonal interaction that avoids language that is insulting, name-calling, intimidating, demeaning or exclusionary; mutual support and trust of others; working collaboratively on joint endeavors; and willing participation in institutional, college, and unit mission and goals.

Concerns regarding collegiality should be shared with the faculty member as soon as they arise rather than solely during the CFES review. Any determination of a "lack of collegiality" must be the result of a due process investigation, and not based entirely on unsubstantiated third-party complaints or on the feelings of an aggrieved party. Administrators have a responsibility to treat all complaints of collegiality fairly by treating concerns of faculty equally and undertaking a proper investigation of the circumstances before correcting or disciplining faculty.

Misunderstandings arising from personality conflicts, or differences of culture or personal style should be treated with compassion and respect for all parties with a view to resolving the differences, preferably by referral to mediation. Infrequent/isolated incidents should not necessarily be designated as non-collegial behavior, but, following due process, should be brought to the attention of the faculty for personal awareness as well as to be provided with the opportunity to correct the behavior.

The annual CFES review should document concerns relevant to emerging as well as persistent patterns of uncollegial behavior, such as but not limited to acts of omission, acts of commission, or egregious solitary acts that affect the ability of other faculty, administrators, staff, or affiliated

employees at UOG to do their jobs or that detract from the mission of the University and the unit, provided that these instances have been properly investigated following due process. Unsubstantiated hearsay, anonymous accusations or one-sided subjective characterizations have no place in the CFES review. The CFES review should also document plans to remedy these inappropriate actions. Examples of non-collegial behavior may include the following:

- Continual lack of involvement in faculty meetings, university events, and other shared employment responsibilities.
- Continual unwillingness to offer minimal assistance to other faculty members, the unit, or college when expertise, help, or advice is requested.
- Continual hostile or intimidating behavior towards others.
- Continually denigrating other faculty, students, administrators, staff, or other university partners.

Behavior that violates faculty rules as described in the current Agreement will be addressed in accordance with the disciplinary procedures outlined in the Agreement. Behavior that violates criminal statutes will be reported to the appropriate legal authority and addressed via proper legal channels.

Criteria and Evidence in Each Endeavor

No criteria described below (or under the heading of collegiality discussed above) shall be interpreted in a way that violates a faculty member's rights to academic freedom or freedom of expression as defined in the Agreement (currently in Article IV.A.1,2,3):

Additionally, it is important that the definitions of the faculty's performance measures provide a clear articulation of the standard faculty must reach. Candidates must know what constitutes commendable performance and submit each piece of evidence in a way that clearly speaks to that standard. With this in mind, the following guidelines should be read with two questions in mind:

1. Are they being used for annual reviews for increments or for Promotion and Tenure?
Many items that are useful for annual reviews may not be for Promotion or Tenure.
2. Are the criteria (and recommended evidence) concrete enough that evaluators can assess them without resorting to highly subjective interpretations? A good guideline here is to think of the process of evaluating faculty as analogous to assessment of student learning outcomes: the criteria must be measurable and meaningful in practice, not vague, aspirational, and subjective.

The benchmark to be used for promotions is "Commendable" performance for most endeavors. This will be defined for each endeavor below. Criteria for judging performance to be "Outstanding" is best defined by the individual schools and colleges to which the faculty member is assigned with reference to disciplinary standards where applicable.

Instruction

In judging the effectiveness of teaching, the reviewers should consider such points as the following: Command of the subject; ability to organize material and to present it with conviction and logic; the linking of course objectives to student evaluation techniques; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; sensitivity to and ability to interact effectively with students from diverse cultural backgrounds; ability to foster critical thinking skills in students; spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize learning; ability to provide student assignments which are relevant and which allow students to apply their knowledge; ability to facilitate progressive improvement in student class work; personal and professional attributes which advance teaching and demonstrate concern for students; skill and amount of participation in the general guidance and advising of students; and ability to lead and to assist students in extracurricular activities. Honors conferred on students may be applied to any of the instructional activities.

Criteria: The areas of instruction that may be evaluated are: 1) instructional design and curriculum or program development; 2) instructional delivery including instructional technology development and use of technology in the classroom/distance education initiatives; 3) evidence of student learning; 4) mentorship of a student thesis or capstone project; and 5) undergraduate student advisement. Faculty need not provide evidence in all areas, or every kind of evidence listed below, but instructional design and instructional delivery must be well-documented.

Commendable performance in the Instruction endeavor will be characterized by

- a. Thoughtful *instructional design* that reflects expertise in and ongoing engagement with the discipline or subject matter, and alignment with course, program, and institutional learning outcomes
- b. Pedagogical expertise as reflected in *instructional delivery* materials and evidence of effective oral and written communication
- c. *Evidence of student learning* that demonstrates high standards of student engagement, mastery of requisite skills and critical thinking
- d. Where applicable, evidence of active faculty contribution to the progress of *theses*, or special or capstone projects
- e. Where applicable, evidence of active faculty engagement in student progress through *advising*.

In all these areas, the burden will be on faculty to provide evidence beyond the student evaluation which, as noted above, may not constitute more than 25% of the weight of the evaluation of instruction. For examples of acceptable evidence see below.

1. Instructional Design

In such matters as developing new courses, performing research for teaching, etc., the faculty member should present concrete evidence such as written texts, expanded syllabi, bibliographies, outlines, reports, and similar original material. These may include

- Syllabi
- Handouts
- Assignments

- Lab exercises
- Practicum experiences
- Exams
- Examples of proposals for new or changed curriculums or programs
- Reports or assessment information on newly developed or revised curriculums or programs

3. *Instructional Delivery*

- PowerPoint slides used in lectures
- Student evaluations of the courses (may not count for more than 25% of instruction evaluation)
- Peer review of teaching
- Critiques or reviews of student assignments or activities
- Recordings of teaching
- Field activity evaluation survey
- Examples of instructor feedback to students

4. *Evidence of Student Learning*

- Examples of student work in courses, with student identity kept anonymous, unless permission has been obtained from the student to share their work with identifying information or the product is part of the public record, such as a master's thesis
- Practicum evaluations by cooperating department or agency
- Completed thesis, senior project, or other capstone products
- SLO/PLO assessment reports
- Team participation in assessment activities
- Records of online discussion or other work
- Student publications, exhibitions, performances
- Student success in service-learning projects or other public student work
- Student success in national/disciplinary or other extramural examinations that can clearly be attributed to the instructor's courses

5. *Mentorship of a student thesis, special or capstone project*

Coaching, advising, and encouraging a student engaged in a substantial project are all recognized components of student mentorship. Faculty mentor research assistants and prepare them for their future careers. Ongoing mentorship of student thesis research is also considered.

Thesis committee chairs, in their role as main thesis advisor, generally provide most of the graduate student instruction and guidance on the thesis, while committee members usually mentor on specialized topics, but also review manuscripts, and suggest final edits and comments. Committee members, as co-authors on technical reports and publications, are encouraged to note their contributions in their comprehensive statements. Capstone and project advisors should, likewise, note and document their contributions to the final product.

In the evaluation of this activity, the following are examples of acceptable evidence:

- Evidence of feedback provided on proposals and manuscripts
- Completed thesis or project proposals
- Working drafts of technical reports, theses ,or projects
- Final thesis document
- Awards for thesis
- Technical reports
- Conference or workshop presentations
- Published conference abstracts, proceedings papers, and peer-reviewed journal articles

6. *Undergraduate Student Advisement*

- Documented individual student academic advisement such as advisement forms or other record of meetings
- Student Club Advisement
- Student testimony

Student Evaluations: Approved instruments must be used to elicit routine student evaluations of teaching. These evaluations will be used as one of several elements of evidence in this comprehensive faculty evaluation system and should be reviewed for each faculty member. The appropriate administrative supervisor shall receive the student evaluations to complete the faculty member's file. The student evaluation summaries will be given to the faculty member. It is noted again that student evaluations may not count for more than 25% of the evaluation of instruction.

Peer Evaluation: In judging the effectiveness of teaching, classroom visitations or other suitable observations are encouraged. Classroom visitations or other suitable observations must be coordinated between the faculty member and the evaluator. Reviews from those with content or skill knowledge in the discipline is recommended.

- Peer reports and documentation from faculty observations
- Committee members' evaluations of faculty performance as chair or member of graduate committee
- Letters of support

The reviewer should clearly indicate the sources of evidence on which the appraisal of teaching performance has been based. It is the responsibility of the reviewers to submit an evaluation, accompanied by evidence from a number of sources, concerning the teaching effectiveness at lower-division, upper-division, and graduate levels of instruction, as appropriate.

The reviewers should pay due attention to the variety of demands required by the types of teaching called for in various disciplines and at various levels and judge the total performance with proper reference to assigned teaching responsibilities.

A faculty member may not use the same activities, materials, or evidence to fulfill both this role and other roles.

Creative Activity, Scholarship, and Research

Creative Activity, Scholarship, and Research is required at some level of all UOG faculty. Faculty members are encouraged to conduct and lead creative, scholarly and research projects that contribute to either regional or global enlightenment. It is recognized that there are many paradigms, including but not limited to Micronesian and Western ones that are capable of generating knowledge and insight. Faculty are free to work within any paradigms appropriate to their discipline and topic.

As UOG faculty members are hired into specific academic disciplines based on their expertise, most of their work should contribute to those field(s). Creative activity, research, or publications outside one's field of appointment or expertise, that does not draw on one's professional skills, cannot be used primarily to satisfy the requirements of this endeavor. This noted, it is recognized that certain fields and topics call for multi-disciplinary and multi-author works more than others. This should be recognized and encouraged where appropriate as long as due weight is given to relative contribution of the respective faculty member as described below. Being a co-author on a multi-author work often is not equivalent to being a single or first author, although there are exceptions.

It is recognized that there is no one uniform set of standards applicable to all fields. Where the professional associations set standards for tenure and promotion purposes, these may be referenced or utilized. Where such standards are not available programs may submit criteria supported by evidence of standards at similar institutions.

Creative Activity is appropriate for those hired in creative disciplines, such as art, communication, film/video, media, music, and theatre. It is important to note that faculty creative activities are not confined to the arts, but a faculty member outside of the arts needs to contextualize the relationship of the creative activity to their respective discipline. UOG faculty members who are hired with research (CSR) as their primary endeavor are expected to produce substantial, peer reviewed outputs. There is the general expectation that these faculty will focus on the production of peer reviewed journal articles and funded competitive grant applications, appropriate to their discipline and allocated FTE commitment, even in early stages of their careers. Alternately, UOG faculty hired to work primarily in instructional, extension or library endeavors should still produce research/creative/scholarly outputs but are not expected to complete the same requirements or volume of scholarship as faculty hired primarily to conduct research.

All UOG faculty members, including those for whom CSR is a secondary endeavor, are highly encouraged to publish their work in peer-reviewed venues that have great potential to influence change or contribute to the growth of knowledge of their field. Faculty are equally encouraged to publish their work in venues that contribute to the promotion and preservation of indigenous, native, local, and regional knowledge. It is recognized that there is likely to be a trade-off between these two goals – i.e. of local relevance and global reach - in some disciplines. Faculty members are encouraged to articulate in their comprehensive statement how their work(s)

address one or both of these goals as well as how the work relates to their role at the University. It is important, in either event, for faculty to demonstrate ongoing engagement with scholarship in their field.

Local Production of Knowledge: The University is committed to the production of locally relevant knowledge, and further, acknowledges the added difficulties and challenges faced in the completion of discipline-specific, applied, local, and regional products in creative work, scholarship, and research publications. Due credit should be given to faculty who undertake the daunting tasks of generating knowledge about our island and the surrounding region, and the influences of outside entities in our region. These products, especially those validated by academic peers, shall be given equitable consideration under the CFES process.

Joint Effort Work: When the work product is the result of joint effort, the applying faculty member shall make a written statement concerning her or his contributions, verified by other contributors or the faculty member's supervisor. Faculty members may refer to journal statements describing the role of each author if such description exists and is available. One role of the appropriate administrative supervisor is to validate as clearly as possible the role of the faculty member in the joint effort.

Faculty are encouraged to provide information from a particular profession/discipline that can be used to assess the value of a particular product (such as impact factors, citation impact, letters from distinguished scholars in the field, or other metrics), when available, to be utilized by the reviewers.

Peer Review: Work products which are formally reviewed or assessed by professionals in the field (i.e., *peer-reviewed*) are to be valued over those which are not. In the traditional academic journal or book, some aspect of blind or double-blind review occurs before a product is accepted for publication. Peer review may occur in a variety of other ways, such as when editorial boards for journals, technical reports, or university presses may not require blind review, but do request review by an invited expert. The work may also be rigorously reviewed after the fact by a faculty member at a peer or aspirant institution. Ideally, the reviewer should hold the academic rank the applicant is seeking or higher, or equivalent background and experience for the review to be considered. This review may be publicly disseminated, or it may be submitted as a solicited letter in the promotion or tenure application

University Publication of Research: The University is committed to the local dissemination of knowledge, and as such, hosts the UOG Press, and several academic journals in a variety of academic disciplines. The University requires that in-house academic publication venues maintain diverse editorial boards composed of published scholars at UOG as well as other institutions and maintain rigorous peer review selection procedures. Publication, therefore, at UOG sponsored venues will be accepted as peer reviewed. This noted, publication in national and international venues are strongly encouraged as well.

Commendable performance in the creative activity, scholarship, or research endeavor, commendable work includes many of the following characteristics:

- is creative, original, and innovative

- contributes to the knowledge and understanding of a chosen topic
- positively responds to community needs
- is undertaken with a methodology consistent with standards in the discipline
- is recognized by peers or by discipline experts during, or after the completion of the work
- receives positive reviews from funding agencies
- produces reasonably explained results that are verifiable and reproducible

Responsibility of Reviewers: Reviewers in the Evaluation process, as defined in the Agreement shall evaluate evidence of consistent output in the faculty member's scholarship for their selected weight of the CSR endeavor. These products may be examined using established criteria, below. For reviewers from other disciplines, articulating the type and quality of products normally expected in the faculty member's discipline should be carefully explained.

Relevant activities and evidence for all three components of CSR are described below. Where professional associations and other institutions set standards for the discipline, these may be referenced or utilized. With appropriate documentation, programs may submit criteria based on best practices from peer and aspirant institutions with allowance for the teaching load at the University of Guam compared to other institutions. Only finished products will be given equitable consideration in the Promotion and Tenure process.

A faculty member may not use the same activities, materials, or evidence to fulfill both this role and other roles.

Evidence of Creative Activity: Concrete evidence of creation and/or performance is required in the areas of the visual arts (e.g., publicly exhibited paintings, prints, ceramics, sculptures), music and dance (composition and/or public/concert performance), drama (script writing, performance, design, or direction), and literature (publication or reading). These should be judged/reviewed by professionals competent in the respective field. Evidence of professional peer evaluation should be presented by the faculty member. Examples of creative activity include:

- Photographs, images, or videos produced
- Photographs, images, or videos documenting production of exhibits, plays, musicals, recitals, concerts, art displays/exhibits, play scripts, film scripts, TV shows or guest appearances, or PSA videos
- Music scores
- Novels
- Short stories
- Magazine and newspaper articles
- Poems
- Book-length non-fiction
- Substantial collection of journalistic writing (or published journalism writing)
- Online digital resources, websites, videos, and public databases
- External recognition of student creative work, with evidence it was guided by faculty member

The following guidelines shall be used in evaluating artistic or creative work:

- 1) The peer reviewed creative work product should be viewed as a peer reviewed publication/output
- 2) If the exhibited creative work product is not peer reviewed, the work should be viewed as a non-peer-reviewed output
- 3) When the creative activity is a cooperative venture, the applying faculty member shall make a written statement concerning her or his contributions, verified by other contributors or the faculty member's supervisor.

Inevitably there will be cases in which the value of a creative work cannot be measured by customary standards. In these cases, professional judgment and fairness must be the measure, subject to due process and review.

Evidence of Scholarship/Scholarly Activity: Evidence of scholarship for the purposes of faculty review shall include scholarly investigations, strategic plans, annotated bibliographies, critical essays, book reviews, serving as a reviewer (publications and grants), serving as editor (of books, journals, etc.), proposals (submitted to funding agency, funded or not-funded) grounded in scholarly investigation, interpretation or analysis; translations; the popular exposition of scientific or technical knowledge; development of materials for training professional or paraprofessional staff; supervision of academic projects; administration of grants; presentation of papers or posters (of scholarly content) at professional meetings and conferences; and/or documented, purposeful development of classroom-specific techniques and materials.

For P&T evaluation of Scholarship/Scholarly Activities the weight of evidence is based on the reviewer's review of the work, its rigor and quality, and assessment of effort and impact. These work products should be suitably disseminated via publication, presentation, internal reports, or uploading onto appropriate websites. Products that have been submitted and are under review may be considered with suitable documentation.

The areas of scholarship that may be evaluated are (1) general scholarship; (2) professional activities; (3) leadership of research/scholarly programs; (4) production of Professional Expert Reports (see below); and/or (5) scholarship of teaching and learning;

1. *General Scholarship* – Activities/evidence in this area include the professional contribution and service to the academy and the production of knowledge.
 - Editorial work of peer-reviewed conference proceedings
 - Editorial work for peer-reviewed academic books or special academic journal issues
 - Peer reviewer of conference proceedings, edited books, special journal issues, manuscripts, regular journal review panel, grant review panel
 - Conference papers or electronically recorded presentations of a scholarly nature (e.g. keynote address)
 - Scholarly publications such as book reviews; non-refereed articles; books and monographs; reports and occasional papers, chapter(s) in conference proceedings; articles, monographs, or books or book chapters submitted; published bibliographies; published abstracts; maps; illustrations; atlases
 - Articles, monographs, or books completed

- Critical Essays
 - Computer programs
 - Online digital resources, websites, videos, and public databases
 - External recognition of student creative work, with evidence it was guided by faculty member
 - Complete unpublished manuscripts and working papers, submitted for programmatic use
 - Documentation of data collection instruments, equipment, or methods
 - White papers
2. *Professional Activities.* These activities/outputs include advanced scholarly development as well as activities/products that often provide local agencies and partners with reliable expertise to support informed decisions for the island's benefit. Applied extramural work is in keeping with the University's interest in expanding the entrepreneurial initiative by the faculty. Professional activities may be evidenced by:
- Transcript of further coursework for professional development
 - Certificate, conferred credential, or license
 - Evidence of service as reviewer of publications, grants, etc.
 - Evidence of program accomplishment or completion of program reports and analyses, white papers, community reports, fact sheets, and posters
 - Academic or Non-academic conference papers or electronically recorded presentations
 - Leadership in professional organizations; officer, board, or committee membership, workshop, or meeting organizer
 - Curated online databases
 - Supporting testimonials of faculty professional activity
 - Citations by other scholars, researchers, or policy makers of your work.
 - Peer or client evaluations of faculty work
 - Evaluation reports, reviews, or audits of faculty work
 - Documents showing continued funding for grants
 - Certificates or awards recognizing contribution to the field
 - Professional expert reports (including those generated via consultancy) which may apply qualitative or quantitative methods or contain the following: analysis, interpretation, expert opinions, and recommendations.
3. *Scholarly Program Leadership:* Any university-affiliated, funded program requiring faculty leadership, such efforts may include but are not limited to the following:
- conducting and supporting research or other scholarly activity
 - leading a laboratory, studio, or resource demonstration center
 - managing/administering a funded program for developing facilities
 - managing/administering a repository for curating and preserving valuable information (databases, libraries) and scholarly work collections
 - maintaining media for dissemination (e.g., a website on a uog.edu domain), providing displays, and producing materials and reports available to users utilizing repositories or central information sources.

In the role of managing program activity/facility/repository/other information resources, the faculty member organizes and designates assistants and staff to develop and produce information products, including annual reports, technical reports, summaries of activities, and other outreach materials.

4. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*: The scholarship of teaching and learning involves the public sharing and dissemination of professionally rigorous study of student learning, instructional design, pedagogy, or learning interactions. This type of scholarship may include:
 - a. Student and program learning outcome assessment; community and market assessments for program needs relative to student learning outcomes.
 - b. an examination of classroom practice, with appropriate documentation and analysis of successes and failures to facilitate reflection and the professional development of other practitioners
 - c. Publication of textbooks, journals, conference proceedings, and related materials either University-sponsored or other publishers.
 - d. Classroom research which may include experimenting with, and analyzing, teaching techniques, activities, student learning, and student outcomes.

Acceptable methodologies include, but are not limited to, reflection and analysis, interviews and focus groups, questionnaires and surveys, content analysis of text, secondary analysis of existing data, quasi-experiments (e.g., comparison of two sections of the same course), observational research, and case studies.

Evidence of Research: Faculty claiming works under the research endeavor are encouraged to actively contribute to local, regional, and global knowledge. Knowledge about Guam and Micronesia developed through place-based and (when possible) indigenous research may be published in local peer-reviewed journals and publications. It is recognized that, just as there are multiple paradigms, there are multiple methodologies in use among the various scholarly disciplines and fields (e.g., qualitative, quantitative, interpretive, indigenous, and multiple variations and versions of each). Research should follow accepted methodological practices of the associated disciplines or fields. As it is difficult for reviewers to evaluate work of other disciplines, it is important for faculty to provide evidence, such as peer review, that their work meets standards of the discipline/field. Some research may be applied in nature, focusing on research questions of importance to our local area; a reviewer's review of such work should consider the scientific rigor of the methods, its quality, and assessment of effort and impact. Evidence of research activity may include:

- Refereed articles, books, book chapters, or monographs
- Peer-reviewed technical reports, occasional papers, bulletins
- Digital or electronic media with a research focus
- Published annotated bibliographies
- Funded competitive grant proposals
- Unfunded competitive grant proposals (with reviewer comments if provided)
- Funded grant reports, or evaluation/assessment reports,
- Technical reports/bulletins/factsheets of author's applied research

- Citations by other scholars or researchers
- White papers with evidence of use, application, review or citation, where available.
- Requested/invited commentary in peer-reviewed conference proceedings, edited books, special journal issues, manuscripts
- Research on teaching and learning in published in textbooks, journals, conference proceedings and related materials.
- For annual review unpublished manuscripts and working papers, reports of research in progress, and field and research notes

Extension and Outreach

Extension faculty members will pursue Extension and Outreach as their primary endeavor, but the endeavor is not limited to these faculty members, as others may pursue Extension and/or Outreach as a non-primary endeavor.

The extension and outreach endeavor encompasses a broad range of educational activities and products for diverse communities, organizations, and individuals. There are many roles that extension faculty can pursue. The basic roles include designing, conducting, and evaluating community needs assessments to determine local needs. These assessments should then drive the design, implementation, and evaluation of programs, workshops, and other activities the faculty under Extension implements to meet these needs. For many this also involves the preparation and submission of grants and proposals to other funding sources to fund these efforts. Work in this endeavor often involves collaborating with community, nonprofits, government, and other groups (including volunteers); teaching extension and community workshops; and using evidence-based research to shape educational programs and/or advise on policy development.

Successful extension or community teaching will include the ability to identify appropriate evidence-based research, organize this into materials that make it engaging and accessible to target audiences. Faculty should demonstrate an ability to use a variety of teaching methods and materials. Handouts used should be accurate, clear, and easy to read. Audio visual and other media used should be at the appropriate level for the audience and contribute to learning objectives. The extension faculty member should demonstrate a command of the subject matter and be proficient in leading hands-on activities and demonstrations.

Evidence of extension activity effectiveness will vary depending upon the program objectives. In some programs, evidence of success may lie in the quality of the problem solution and the degree to which individuals, groups, and communities adopt the solution or develop problem-solving skills to develop alternative solutions. In other programs, effectiveness will be measured by the degree to which the clients have mastered the content or desired outcomes. In others still, effectiveness will be gauged by the number of persons reached, the amount of information distributed, the accuracy of the information, and measurable changes in awareness, knowledge, attitude, and behavior. The Extension efforts can also be measured by individuals or groups adopting recommended practices or policy change that impacts communities on a wider scale.

Other extension activities may include interagency coordination or service on, or advising of government or community boards, committees, and commissions. Working with volunteers and community groups is often a part of an extension faculty member's job. The faculty member should be able to motivate and manage group and/or volunteer activities to the advantage of all - the institution, the community, and the volunteer. Accomplishment may be documented by activity reports, evaluations or feedback by peers and public representatives, and/or coordinated project outcomes or reports.

Criteria: Some of the basic areas of Extension and Outreach that may be evaluated are: 1) non-degree credit bearing and/or community instruction, 2) community publications; 3) direction or coordination of extension programs, projects, or grant activities; 4) public speaking, workshops or coordination of public displays, 5) interagency coordination at local, regional, and national levels, 6) service on government or community boards, committees and commissions, 7) Needs assessment, evaluation, and/or other data collection, and 8) conference presentations.

Commendable Extension Performance:

Central to Extension is that it links the University to the community by addressing assessed needs. Commendable performance will follow the national model of Extension programming that ensures this. This model starts with assessment of local needs and issues, identifying local partnerships and human resources to address these issues, development of program plans and securing of resources (grants, etc.) to implement, plan implementation, program evaluation, impact assessment and program modification. The cycle is renewed regularly or new issues identified and targeted. Applied qualitative and quantitative research methods are employed in this cycle for assessment, solution development and evaluation. Commendable performance would exhibit evidence of most of the above and not just a series of one-off programs run because funding convenience (funding available) or faculty interest.

Faculty members working under Extension must regularly anticipate and respond to critical and emerging issues of the communities they serve. In these responses they may establish sustainable partnerships and meaningful collaborations and engage community clientele to plan, implement, and evaluate programs. Ideally, they will identify, develop and utilize community expertise to facilitate individual and/or community change that contributes to economic, social, and environmental impact. They may leverage their programs by utilizing volunteers as teachers to enhance and extend education. Finally, they should demonstrate skill in acquiring, managing and leveraging funds and other resources for program implementation.

Possible Evidence:

1. *Community Instruction* (non-degree/credit bearing)
 - a. Instructional Design, Curriculum or Program Development
 - Syllabi or course/workshop outlines
 - Handouts
 - Assignments or culminating experiences
 - Lab or hands on or field exercises
 - Selection and/or development audio visual and other media
 - Program/workshop assessment such as pre/posttests/evaluations/surveys
 - Selection and development of curriculum materials

- Proposals for new or changed curriculum or program
 - Reports or assessment information on current and newly developed curriculums or programs
 - Needs assessments, surveys, focus groups findings
 - Strategic plans
 - Grants and other mechanisms of program/project funding support
 - Participant and/or Program Evaluations and assessments tools
 - b. Instructional and Program Implementation
 - Peer reports and documentation from faculty and/or community partner observations
 - Participant evaluations of instruction
 - Videos, podcasts, web presses, blogs, lecture notes, and other sources of instruction
 - Field activity evaluation survey
 - Participant and/or Program Evaluations and assessments and other feedback from participants
 - Letters of support
 - Examples of participant work and related instructor feedback to participants
 - Self-evaluation
 - External evaluations of impact
 - Collated results of questionnaires, surveys
 - Formal program or grant/project annual or closing reports
 - c. Content Expertise
 - Instructional, field, and lectures notes
 - Instructor developed supplemental materials
 - Peer reports and documentation from faculty observations, participants and letters and evaluations of content expertise.
 - Evidence of publications or other scholarly contributions related to instructional content, strategic plans, white papers, policy brief, research publications (posters, conference abstracts), community publications (fact sheets, posters), and other forms of publication evidence
 - Evidence of certifications or trainings completed
 - Letters of Appreciation from Community Stakeholders
 - d. Instructional Coordination on Conferences, symposium, workshop, training series and activities
 - Reports of coordination, conference activities and/or proceedings
 - Participant or peer evaluation
2. *Community Publications or Government and Non-governmental Reports*
- Pamphlets, brochures, fact sheets, posters, and technical guides
 - Radio, television, or virtual programs or scripts
 - Web presses
 - Blogs
 - Podcasts

3. *Direction or Coordination of Local, Regional, and Federal Programs or Projects*
 - Program or project plan and evaluation, participant, client or peer evaluation, feedback, or comments
 - Financial reports and reports of income generated
 - Program reports
 - Grants and other forms of funding
 - Recruitment and Coordination of Volunteers, and associated reports and evaluations
4. *Public speaking or Coordination of Public Displays*
 - Client letters of feedback or appreciation
 - Peer evaluations
 - Displays, posters, lectures, or paper presentation
5. *Interagency Coordination*
 - Mechanisms of interagency agreements (examples include but not limited to MOAs, MOUs, sub-contracts, etc.)
 - Reports of coordination activities
 - Evaluation from other agencies
 - Recruitment and Coordination of Volunteers
 - Report of volunteer recruitment and coordination activities
 - Evaluation by volunteers
 - Evaluation of volunteers' activities
6. *Service on Government or Community Boards, Committees, and Commissions*
 - Report of activities
 - Evaluation from community or government representatives or other members
 - Evaluation by peers or public
 - Strategic plans
 - Programs planning documents, and/or implementation documents
7. *Data collection using quantitative or qualitative methods*
 - Data collection, analysis, management, and associated tools
 - Summary report or publications
 - Evaluation from other agency(s) and partners when data is collected on their behalf.
8. *Conference Presentation*
 - Reports
 - Technical reports
 - Refereed journal articles
 - Non-refereed journal articles
 - Commendations
 - Honors conferred – may be applied to any of the extension and community activities
 - Proceedings

A faculty member may not use the same activities, materials, or evidence to fulfill both this role and other roles.

University and Community Service

Faculty are expected to contribute service both to the University and to the island and regional communities. Examples of appropriate service include formal and informal activities of high quality in faculty governance, committee work, policy improvement, program creation, aid to external constituencies, and the like. Service activities may emphasize one area or the other but must include some service to both the University and larger community.

Service includes productive contributions in meeting the needs of one's program, school/college, institution, and academic and regional communities or to the stakeholders of the broader island communities that UOG as a Land Grant University serves. Faculty members may serve the university, their departments or programs, and their disciplines in a variety of ways, guided by the overall aim of directing, organizing, and/or enhancing the life and work of the university, their field of study and practice, and/or the communities of Guam and Micronesia.

In the Community and University Service endeavor, commendable performance may be characterized through: collaborations across boundaries both internal and external, engagement beyond our specific programmatic roles and activities that have impact on the institution and the communities it serves.

University Service

All full-time faculty members are expected to participate in the operation of the University in such ways as formulating, revising, and enforcing policies. Recognition should be given to those faculty members who actively participate in governance of the University, the college, or the work unit. Similarly, faculty members' contributions to faculty or student welfare should be recognized. In all years, all faculty must elect at least 5% of their CFES plan to be in service.

Possible criteria for evaluating performance in University Service are:

- Election, appointment, candidacy for or voluntary service as an officer, representative, or advisor of a group.
- Support and completion of specific projects (e.g., program reviews, academic master plans, accreditation initiatives, etc.)
- Regular attendance at and contributing to scheduled meetings.
- Effective participation in group discussions such as providing imaginative recommendations and suggestions.

Service on committees at the University, the College, or the unit level shall be documented by reports, records, and evaluations, where consistent with privacy and confidentiality concerns as described below.

Service to faculty and to students shall also be documented, as well as special assignments to service, as described below.

In evaluating the candidate's performance within these University service areas, the reviewer should exercise reasonable judgment. Service on a particular committee may be more demanding of time and effort than service on another committee. Special consideration should be given to candidates who are elected by their colleagues to positions of responsibility while recognizing that some Colleges are more difficult to get elected from than others owing to their size. Reviewers must be flexible in applying criteria to each candidate's endeavors; however, high standards for service activities, as recognized by the professional organizations in each discipline, and in community organizations shall be maintained.

The basic areas of university service that may be evaluated include: 1) University committees, 2) college or unit committees; 3) responsibilities as division or program chair; 4) mentoring; 5) University policy and procedure development; 6) special assignments; 7) student recruitment; and 8) University/college fundraising activities.

1. University Committees (Faculty Senate, Promotion and Tenure, Senate standing committees, Academic Review Committees, Faculty Union, search committees, Research Council, Graduate Council, University Assessment Committee, General Education Review Committee, Undergraduate Curriculum Review Committee, Graduate Curriculum Review Committee, University Assessment Committee and others as appointed by senior administration on behalf of the University)
 - Evaluation by the chair or other members
 - Report of committee activities and faculty member's responsibilities
 - Reports produced or recommendations made
 - Evaluation by membership
 - Record of attendance
 - Contracts negotiated
 - Accomplishments
 - Other evidence of substantive contribution
2. College Committees (college, division, ad hoc, search committees, peer evaluation, continuing employment, conference organizing, curriculum, AAC, other)
 - Evaluation by the chair or other members
 - Report of committee activities and faculty member's responsibilities
 - Reports produced or recommendations made
 - Record of attendance
3. Division or Program Chair
 - Unit's or program's progress; reports of new and continued activities; course schedules
 - Budget developed and approved during term
 - Reports and minutes of unit or AAC meetings
 - Evaluation by unit members
 - Mentoring colleagues

- Program deliverables like annual progress report, assessment inventory, program review, schedules, or course changes.
4. Mentoring students or youth in a university-affiliated program
 - Informal feedback from collaborators
 - Formal evaluation by project director
 5. University Policy and Procedure Development
 - Report of policy or procedures developed
 - Evidence of substantive engagement contributing to improvement of policies or procedures
 6. Special Assignments
 - Report of activities and faculty member's responsibilities or findings
 7. Student Recruitment
 - Report of activities and faculty member's responsibilities and results
 - Evaluation by the faculty member's dean, the Dean of Enrollment Management & Student Success or other recruiters including fellow faculty
 8. Supervising student extracurricular activities
 - Serving as faculty advisor to clubs and associations funded by Student Government
 - Organizing occasional student activities for special events or within the program
 - Advising or organizing disciplinary honor societies
 9. Support of University/college fundraising activities
 - Coordination of specific fundraising events
 - Solicitation of donors to college or university activities

Community Service

Faculty leadership and service by faculty members to community service programs, community groups, non-profit organizations, cooperative programs with other institutions, and agencies or units of business, industry, and government are recognized as community service.

The most valued community service activities shall be those in which the faculty member uses his or her professional expertise to the benefit of the community. Appropriate consideration should be given in the evaluation of such service when it contributes to one of the University's community or public service programs, or contributions to local or regional groups, agencies, or governments.

Voluntary non-profit activities beyond the faculty member's regular duties at the University (and which are not detrimental to them) also deserve recognition when these activities constitute an exceptional contribution to the well-being of the community as a whole. Membership on condominium or other private boards shall not be considered unless the faculty member served as an officer or can document significant impact or professional contribution.

It should be noted that some service activities may in fact be compensated. The faculty member will need to explain the nature of the compensation and clarify whether any conflicts of interest of commitment exist and explain how any apparent conflicts were managed or resolved.

The basic areas of community service that may be evaluated include: 1) public surveys and questionnaires; 2) service on or advisement to government or community boards, committees, or commissions; 3) nonpolitical community fundraising; 4) development of professional training materials and the organizing on behalf of the University or other local or regional bodies; 4) conducting of workshops, seminars and conferences with a public interest focus ; 5) development of special studies and research projects for public and private organizations; 6) consulting for public and private organizations; 7) policy and program development and evaluation of public and private organizations; and 8) other community involvement such as competitions, coaching, or performances.

1. Public Surveys and Questionnaires
 - Reports and summaries
 - Survey or questionnaire instruments
 - Evaluation by clients
2. Service on Government or Community Boards, Committees, or Commissions
 - Report of activities
 - Evaluation from community or government representatives or other members
 - Evaluation by peers or public
 - Record of attendance
3. Nonpolitical Community Fundraising
 - Report of activities
 - Evaluation from community representatives
 - Record of attendance
4. Development of professional training materials and the organizing and conducting of workshops, seminars, and conferences on behalf of the University or other local or regional bodies.
5. Development of special studies and research projects for public and private organizations.
6. Consulting for public and private organizations.
7. Policy and program development and evaluation of public and private organizations.
8. Contribution of expertise in the form of written or verbal commentary on local media, in public lectures, to the legislature or other government bodies, or school visits.
9. Organizing educational, community, outreach or civic engagement workshops and events.

10. Other community involvement such as competitions, coaching, or performances.

A faculty member may not use the same activities, materials, or evidence to simultaneously fulfill both this role and other roles.

Library and Academic Support

Library faculty members will pursue Library and Academic Support as their primary endeavor.

Library faculty provide services that support the academic pursuits and the informational needs of the university and the region. In order to carry out the University Libraries' primary services, librarians may have a specialized area of responsibility, or they may engage in a range of duties, including but not limited to, instruction, reference and research assistance, reader's advisory, collection maintenance, acquisitions, cataloging, electronic resource management, web and instructional technology development, embedded librarian assignments, as well as conservation, preservation, and archival work.

Librarians teach in a variety of subject areas and in a variety of contexts, such as classroom-based instruction, reference desk interactions, one-on-one consultation, seminars, guest lectures, professional development workshops for faculty, students, staff or other specialized audiences, internships & practicums, virtual lectures, as well as asynchronous information literacy lessons located in the university's course management system and through tutorials and lib-guides maintained on the library websites.

Quality work as librarians is demonstrated by fulfilling patron informational needs in a timely manner, while consistently exhibiting positive characteristics such as approachability, flexibility, and willingness to assist and guide patrons. It is exhibited by managing multiple reference inquiries and skillfully prioritizing requests for information. Quality work as librarians is also demonstrated by effectively organizing material for storage and retrieval, designing digital resources that respond to patron expectations, engaging in collegial and cooperative relations both within the unit and the University community, increasing public awareness of the library's resources and services, conducting archival work and collection care using best practices for the region's environmental conditions, and developing and improving interlibrary networks. Finally, quality work has an immediate impact on student and faculty learning and discovery; a positive impact on library objectives; and ultimately furthers University and library mission, goals, and initiatives.

Commendable performance in the field of library and academic support shall be characterized by skillful delivery of library services and/or teaching; application of principles of librarianship; and effectiveness in librarianship. The criteria for evaluation will be as follows.

1. Skillful delivery of library services and/or teaching:

- Demonstration of current content knowledge in academic disciplines and area(s) of responsibility
 - Employment of customer service and teaching methods while engaging patrons
 - Demonstrated use of innovative practices or creative initiative to engage patrons
 - Skillful prioritization of multiple assignments and reference queries
 - Demonstrated leadership and creative initiative in problem-solving
2. Application of principles of librarianship:
 - Creation and delivery of services, instructional programs, collections, and technologies that have a positive impact on student learning and academic pursuits
 - Creation and delivery of services, instructional programs, collections, and technologies that promote the use of information and collections
 - Contributions that advance the university's mission, goals, and strategic initiatives
 - Contributions to policies and procedures that improve the quality and efficiency of services and programs within the University Libraries.
 3. Effectiveness in librarianship:
 - Feedback by students, faculty, and university community
 - Documented evidence of successful assistance to client request for information (ex. annotated bibliographies, reference list, request counts, etc.)
 - Administrator evaluation
 - Peer evaluation

Outstanding performance within this endeavor meets the criteria for commendable articulated above and is further characterized by actions and activities that demonstrate⁴:

- creativity and innovation in meeting the informational needs of the academic community or specific sections of the academic community
- creativity and innovation that expands access to regional information
- leadership in developing and implementing exemplary programs that expand information services or that contribute to information sharing within the region
- substantial and productive relationships with teaching faculty, students, researchers, and community partners.

The basic areas of library academic and research support that may be evaluated include: 1) direct services and support of library users; 2) collection development and acquisition work, archival management, and serials control; 3) indirect reader's advisory; 4) library automation; 5) review and maintenance of optical information products; 6) media design, production, and coordination; 7) library staff development, training, and supervision; and 8) bibliographic instruction, classroom instruction assistance, library orientation, and guest lecturing.

1. Direct Services and Support of Library Users (examples: reference assistance; manual or electronic searches; identification of resources; conference support; technical processing; training and support for electronic mail; interlibrary loan assistance; library tours; reserve

⁴ Derived from the ACRL Excellence in Academic Libraries award criteria

service; bibliographic instruction; classroom instruction assistance; library orientation; guest lectures; academic support programs)

- Report of activities
 - Evaluation from user groups, peers, or supervisor(s)
 - Evidence of innovation
 - Evidence of impact
 - User statistics
2. Collection Development and Acquisition Work; Archival Management; Serials Control
 - Report of activities
 - Collection development statistics
 - Evidence of bibliographic records creation and maintenance
 - Evaluation from user groups, peers, or supervisors
 - User statistics
 - Evidence of impact
 3. Indirect Reader's Advisory
 - Photographs or copies of the library exhibit and the accompanying didactic text
 - Report and photographs of the library display or exhibition
 - Reports and screenshots of LibGuides and other academic support presentations
 - Evaluation from user groups, peers, or supervisors
 4. Library Automation (analysis of automated systems; coordination within unit, UOG, and region)
 - Report of activities
 - Evidence of innovation
 - Evaluation by user groups, peers, or supervisors
 5. Review and Maintenance of Digital Information Products
 - Report of activities
 - Evidence of innovation
 - Evaluation by user groups, peers, or supervisors
 - Usage statistics
 6. Media Design, Production, and Coordination
 - Evidence of innovation
 - Report of activities
 - Portfolio presentation of media
 - Evaluation by user groups, peers, or supervisors
 - User statistics
 - Evidence of Impact
 7. Staff Development and Training; Staff Supervision
 - Report of activities
 - Outlines of training presentations

- Evaluation by staff trained or supervised, peers, or supervisors
8. Information Literacy and Research Instruction (examples: bibliographic instruction, classroom instruction assistance, library orientation, guest lecture presentations)
- Syllabi or outlines
 - Online course development
 - Handouts
 - Assignments
 - Selection of A.V. support materials
 - Participant evaluations
 - Documentation of material selection and development
 - Peer evaluations
 - Evidence of Impact (e.g. Information Literacy skills testing scores)

A faculty member may not use the same activities, materials, or evidence to simultaneously fulfill both this role and other roles.

NOTE: “Appendix I: Review Procedures for Full-Time UOG Faculty” below should be revised after new Agreement is signed.

APPENDIX 1: REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR FULL-TIME UOG FACULTY

The procedures given below were compiled in the past, from various locations in past Agreements. Some items may be out of date, and all will need to be revised after each new Agreement or revision is signed.

Definitions

Annual (Increment) Review: For increment purposes progress toward the agreed-upon CFES Annual Plan of Work will be assessed annually. Individual faculty shall propose their preferences for assignments in endeavor in their Annual Plan of Work for their dean or director's approval. Annual performance evaluations by the appropriate administrative supervisor of the College and the evaluations by peer review committees shall constitute important evidence of the quality of a faculty member's performance.

Reappointment Review (also known as Continuing Employment): Reappointment is a prerogative of the administration. Tenure track faculty undergo reappointment review to determine how well faculty are performing and what potential they have to contribute to the University of a long-term basis. Evaluation by the reappointment committee may count as a peer review.

Promotion : A faculty member may be considered for promotion only by self-application. Many faculty may apply for promotion and tenure at the same time, but the granting of promotion and tenure are considered separately. Promotion procedures are specified in the *Agreement*. The UOG Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System approved by the Board of Regent shall provide a framework for promotion and tenure decisions. Minimum Criteria for Promotion can be found in the current *Agreement*. Common Criteria include degree and time in rank requirements as specified in the *Agreement*.

Tenure: A faculty member may be considered for tenure only by self-application. Tenure procedures are specified in the *Agreement*. The UOG Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System approved by the Board of Regent shall provide a framework for tenure decisions. Minimum Criteria for Tenure can be found in the current *Agreement*. Common Criteria include degree and time in rank requirements as specified in the *Agreement*.

Post-Tenure Review: Post tenure review may be voluntary or mandatory. If a faculty member receives two negative annual reviews, the post-tenure review process will be initiated by the institution. The process for the post-tenure review is specified in the *Agreement* and in a later section here. Further information and consequences resulting from the post-tenure review process are available in the *Agreement*.

Voluntary Peer Review: For professional development purposes, faculty may elect to have peers offer formal advice/evaluation of professional progress. This is best undertaken prior to a

higher-stakes promotion or tenure review to identify gaps in the evidence and clarify purpose and context in the comprehensive statement.

Reviewers in the Evaluation process and their Responsibilities in the Review Process

(Arranged according to encounter within the review process)

Division Chair: Because of the *Agreement* provision that faculty will not supervise faculty, division chairs have a limited role in the evaluation process. They are involved in identifying division representation to reappointment committees, voluntary peer review, post-tenure review, and they mentor junior faculty. Because of the Division Chair's extensive involvement in course scheduling, receiving student and faculty complaints, and coordinating division and college service activities, division chairs are highly credible peer reviewers.

Peer Reviewers: An integral component of faculty evaluation is recommendations from peers. The *Agreement* specifies two letters from colleagues within the academic unit or division at the University of Guam. Applicants will include reviews from faculty of similar or higher rank at peer or aspirant institutions to establish greater external credibility of a faculty members expertise within the discipline. Reviews will also be included from widely respected community and regional leaders who can speak to the impact of the faculty work.

Dean or Director: The appropriate administrative supervisor shall evaluate the evidence in support of each category as "at least" satisfactory or in need of improvement. A narrative shall accompany the administrative supervisor's evaluation detailing areas of strength and identifying any areas for improvement. For purposes of later promotion and tenure decisions, areas of major accomplishments should be noted, and the standards used for this appraisal cited. Specific steps to be taken to remedy any identified deficiency must be included. The final paragraph will provide an overall evaluation according to the percentage assigned to each role. Promotion and tenure recommendations are not grievable.

Promotion & Tenure Committee: The University P&T Committee is a duly elected committee of faculty across campus, charged with evaluating all promotion and tenure actions using the criteria in this document and the *Agreement*. Promotion and tenure recommendations are not grievable.

From the Agreement: To assist the Administration in determining whether an individual Faculty member should be promoted, or granted tenure, or both, there shall be a University Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee. The Committee, as an advisory body, does not promote or tenure Faculty members. It shall only receive, act upon, and make objective recommendations regarding all Faculty

requests for promotion or tenure in accordance with the criteria established by the Board of Regents.

Senior Vice President & Provost: As the chief academic officer of the University, the SVPP carefully evaluates all recommendations from the P&T committee and makes a considered recommendation to the President. The SVPP's promotion and tenure recommendations are not grievable. The SVPP is also the appellate authority for the CFES annual recommendations and the SVPP's decision on annual evaluation appeals is final.

President: The President is the approving authority for all promotion decisions and presents tenure recommendations to the BOR. Promotion and tenure decisions by the President are not appealable nor grievable.

Academic Personnel and Tenure Committee: The academic personnel and tenure committee of the Board of Regents reviews tenure recommendations as presented by the President and makes recommendations to the full board.

Board of Regents: The Board of Regents awards tenure.

Annual CFES increment review

Policy from Agreement: The Deans/Directors shall call for faculty to submit CFES plans for the coming year and reports for the previous year. Deans/Directors shall choose an appropriate time for the start of the call period no later than twenty (20) business days before the date the increment is due to begin. The call period shall end twenty (20) business days after the date the increment was due to begin. The Dean's/Director's office must provide documented confirmation to the faculty member of receipt of CFES materials. If the faculty member submits these materials within the call period, and the evaluation is positive, the applicable increment shall become effective at the start of the semester appropriate to the initial hire date of the faculty member, or on the anniversary date of initial hire for twelve-month faculty.

If the faculty member fails to submit the corroborative materials required for his or her CFES review within the call period, the faculty shall receive a negative CFES evaluation and any applicable increment shall be forfeited.

If the Dean/Director fails to submit the completed forms to the Human Resources Office (HRO) within forty-five (45) business days of the date the applicable increment was due to begin, and the faculty member provides HRO with evidence that he or she submitted materials within the timeline, the increment shall become automatic and HRO shall process the increment.

Process from Agreement:

1. Individual faculty shall consult with the appropriate administrative supervisor to develop the CFES Annual Plan of Work.
 - Review individual preference for role assignments and CFES Annual Plan of Work
 - Determine the scope of the assigned duties that will be evaluated.
 - Determine assigned duty roles, which are to be subject to evaluation and what will be used as evidence of accomplishment. Elements may be chosen from the list of possibilities; others may be used if agreed to by the faculty member and appropriate administrative supervisor. An over-reliance on any one element should be avoided.
 - Assign an evaluation percentage to each role.
2. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to assemble the evidence that demonstrates the fulfillment of the identified roles in the plan of work. This should be a continuous process throughout the evaluation period. This evidence should include a self-evaluation. The faculty member may collect evidence and evaluations from peers, clients, or service recipients.
3. Assignment of endeavors may be periodically reviewed and modified as necessary to reflect changing assignments or percentage values. The faculty member and appropriate administrative supervisor must agree to the changes.
4. The faculty member forwards the evidence to the appropriate administrative supervisor at the end of the evaluation period.
5. The faculty member and appropriate administrative supervisor meet to review and discuss the evaluation, ratings, evidence, and the supervisor's recommendations, as well as to develop evaluation priorities for the next cycle.

Preparing for Promotion or Tenure: [from *Agreement*]

Concurrently with the annual increment review, the Dean/Director and each Faculty member eligible for promotion shall discuss the Faculty member's development and fitness for the position held by the Faculty member, and the Faculty member's plan for working toward promotion. The Dean/Director shall summarize the discussion, in writing, and make specific recommendations regarding activities for achieving promotion. The Dean/Director shall then provide a copy of this statement to the faculty member.

Archival of completed work products: The dean will discuss with the faculty member which evidence is ready to be submitted to the RFK Library and ORSP repositories for creative activity, scholarship, and research. These works will be maintained in archival form only and the intellectual property will be retained by the faculty member. Deans will provide instructions to faculty in the annual call for CFES reports for how to submit these artifacts. Deans will also submit a summary sheet of work produced by faculty to ORSP on an annual basis.

Disputes over CFES Annual Plan of Work: If the faculty member and the Dean cannot establish a mutually agreeable CFES Annual Plan of Work, the faculty member may attach any objections to the end of year self-evaluation, which will be noted during future evaluations.

Appeals of Evaluations: If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the annual evaluation, the faculty member may appeal to the Senior Vice President & Provost. The Senior Vice President & Provost shall meet with the Dean and the faculty member and try to resolve the appeal. If the appeal is not successful, this will be noted during-future evaluations, but the Senior Vice President & Provost's decision is final.

Reappointment Review (also known as Continuing Employment)

Policy from the *Agreement*: Reappointment is a prerogative of the administration and; therefore, the procedure for reappointment shall be created by the administration. During the faculty member's first year of employment, the administration will inform her or him, in writing, of the procedure to use in applying for reappointment.

If the faculty member has applied in accordance with the procedures as distributed by the Dean/Director, the faculty member will be notified of the administration's decision, to reappoint or not, at least twelve (12) months prior to the expiration of the faculty member's initial employment contract.

The decision not to reappoint the faculty member is not an adverse action, as defined in Article X of the *Agreement*, and therefore the provisions of Article X shall not apply. Failure to reappoint is not grievable, and Article IX of the *Agreement* shall not apply to these cases.

Process: The peer review process for reappointment of tenure track faculty shall be conducted as follows:

1. Faculty reappointment applications will be completed and reviewed in the fourth consecutive semester of tenure-track service. A faculty member will submit a request for reappointment to the appropriate supervising administrator in the first month of the fourth consecutive semester of their appointment. Twelve-month faculty members hired outside regular academic semesters will submit the application in their nineteenth consecutive calendar (19) month of employment.
2. An ad hoc reappointment committee shall be formed consisting of three (3) full-time tenured faculty members, at least two of whom will be in the same academic unit, mutually agreeable to the appropriate administrator and faculty member. The appropriate administrator determines the chair of the reappointment committee. When there are not enough tenured faculty members in a unit, the Senior Vice President & Provost may approve an alternate committee composition.
3. The faculty member shall submit a reappointment review packet to the ad hoc reappointment committee within ten (10) business days of the convening of the committee. The review packet will include a copy of at least the following items:
 - a. a current curriculum vitae of the faculty member;

- b. the approved CFES Annual Plans of Work for both years of employment;
 - c. the annual CFES Self-Evaluation report submitted by the faculty member;
 - d. the administrator's CFES Evaluation for the first year; and
 - e. student course evaluations for all classes.
4. The ad hoc reappointment committee shall evaluate the reappointment review packet. In the course of this review, the faculty member shall have the following rights:
 - a. The right to be evaluated only on substantiated information;
 - b. The right to have the ad hoc reappointment committee consider only materials that by their content honor the University's legal and moral commitment to nondiscrimination; and
 - c. The right to have access to all evidence that the ad hoc reappointment committee may consider in fulfilling its mandate.
5. The committee will provide a copy of its preliminary draft report to the faculty member thirty (30) business days following receipt of the review packet. If the faculty member wishes to discuss the report with the committee, he or she may request to do so, and the committee shall honor the request. After meeting with the faculty member, the committee may alter the report within ten (10) business days if it feels such a change is appropriate.
6. The ad hoc reappointment committee shall make a recommendation and forward the evaluation packet to the appropriate administrator at least thirty (30) business days prior to the end of the fourth semester, or by the end of the 23rd consecutive calendar month of employment, for 12-month faculty hired outside the regular semester. If the faculty member disputes the committee's final report, he or she may do so, in writing, and attach the comments to the report within five (5) business days. The faculty member's written response shall then become an attachment to the committee's report.
7. The appropriate supervising administrator shall attach a written evaluation and recommendations to the ad hoc reappointment committee's final report within five (5) business days and forward the recommendation, the report, and the evaluation package to the Senior Vice President & Provost. The faculty member may also respond to the administrator's evaluation within five (5) business days.
8. The Senior Vice President & Provost, in consultation with the appropriate administrator, shall determine if reappointment should be recommended and shall so advise the President within ten (10) business days. The faculty member may also respond to this recommendation within five (5) business days.
9. The President makes the final decision on reappointment within ten (10) business days.
10. If the faculty member requests reappointment following the timelines above, the faculty member will be informed of the administration's decision, to reappoint or not, at least twelve (12) months prior to the expiration of the faculty member's initial employment contract.
11. Extensions of time may be approved in advance by the dean/director if a compelling need is justified in writing. Faculty members who request reappointment after the deadline are not automatically reviewed but may be considered at the discretion of the Senior Vice President & Provost after consultation with the Dean/Director. Faculty members who do not request reappointment will complete their contracts according to the end date on their UG-1.

Promotion & Tenure Review

The Promotion and Tenure process shall be conducted in accordance with Article X of the *Agreement* in force. The language below is meant to be instructive in nature, and the language of the *Agreement* supersedes anything found below.

Major points about eligibility can be summarized as follows:

1. Faculty may not apply for promotion during their first two (2) consecutive years at the University of Guam.
2. Faculty members become eligible for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, or from Extension Agent III to Extension Agent IV, after four (4) years in rank. They may apply in their fourth year.
3. Faculty members become eligible for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, or from Extension Agent IV to Extension Specialist, after five (5) years in rank. They may apply in their fifth year.
4. Faculty members are eligible to apply for tenure after completing four (4) consecutive Academic Years of probationary service. The earliest they can apply for tenure is the Fanuchanan semester of their fifth consecutive Academic Year, and the latest they can apply is the Fanuchanan semester at the start of their sixth consecutive Academic Year. Only employment under a tenure-track contract shall be considered in determining the length of probationary service.
5. Non-tenure-track faculty members hired below the rank of Assistant Professor become eligible for promotion from Assistant Instructor to Instructor, or from Extension Agent I to Extension Agent II, or from Instructor to Assistant Professor, or from Extension Agent II to Extension Agent III, after three (3) years in rank. They may apply in their third year.
6. Faculty whose initial appointment began in the Fañomnakan (January – May) semester, the sequence of their years of academic service is Fañomnakan/Fanuchanan (January – December), rather than Fanuchanan/Fañomnakan (August – July). Therefore, depending on the rank sought, they can first apply for promotion in the Fañomnakan semester at the start of either their third, fourth, or fifth year of academic service. The earliest they can apply for tenure is the Fañomnakan semester of their fifth consecutive Academic Year, and the latest they can apply is the Fañomnakan semester at the start of their sixth consecutive Academic Year of service.
7. At least three (3) years of the time-in-rank requirement must be in full-time employment at the University of Guam.
8. Eligibility is confirmed by the Senior Vice President & Provost.

The Application process can be summarized as follows:

1. The Committee shall publicize a call for applications for promotion, or tenure, or both, no later than the fifteenth day of September. The faculty member may not submit his or her completed application package to the Committee until after the call for applications.
2. Application for promotion, or tenure, or both, is by self- application. Applicants shall send their completed application packages to the Committee in care of the Human Resources

Office. At the time of application, the applicant shall notify his or her Dean/Director, in writing, that he or she has applied for promotion, or tenure, or both.

3. The completed application package shall include:
 1. an application form indicating what action is being requested and what roles are to be evaluated in support of the requested action;
 2. a signed statement authorizing access to the applicant's Official Personnel File by members of the Committee;
 3. a comprehensive statement elaborating the applicant's roles;
 4. documentation supporting the comprehensive statement including an up-to-date vita;
 5. all CFES Plans since date of last promotion or date of initial tenure-track hire, whichever applies;
 6. the Dean/Director's annual CFES evaluative letters since date of last promotion or date of initial tenure-track hire, whichever applies; and
 7. a list of no fewer than five (5) persons from whom the Committee shall seek recommendations.
 - This list of names shall include at least two (2) current members of the applicant's Division or Other Assigned Area. At least one (1) of those two (2) names shall be a current member of the applicant's academic discipline at the University of Guam, except when the applicant is the only member of that academic discipline.
 - Applicants are encouraged to include in their list of references the names of academic or professional peers from outside the University.
4. The Faculty member is responsible for the development of the materials in the completed application package that are relevant to the review and evaluation for promotion. At any level of the review or evaluation, the Committee or Administration may request additional information and materials that are germane to the application package. A copy of such requests shall be provided to the applicant at the time the requests are made. The applicant has the right to comment in writing on any responses and replies at any level of the review or evaluation.
5. At all levels of review, criteria as defined, published, and approved by the Board shall be the sole basis on which judgment for promotion or tenure shall be made.

The P&T Committee review process and timelines can be explained as follows:

All completed application packages received by the Human Resources Office no later than 5 PM of the last day of the semester shall be guaranteed a recommendation by the Committee before the end of the following semester. In the event that the Committee fails to make a recommendation to the Senior Vice President within the time permitted under this *Agreement*, the Senior Vice President may nevertheless consider and act upon the application and forward a recommendation to the President.

The Committee shall request letters of recommendation from the individuals named in the list of five (5) or more names submitted by the applicant within five (5) business days of receipt of the completed application package,

The Committee shall announce to the University community the candidates' names, roles, and action(s) requested, and it shall accept recommendations and comments regarding each application following receipt of the completed application package. Recommendations and comments from the University community shall become part of the applicant's completed application package.

The Chair shall request a recommendation from the applicant's Dean/Director no later than twenty-five (25) business days after the completed application package is received by the Committee. The Dean/Director shall be provided access to the applicant's completed application package and letters from nominees and the University community in order to prepare the requested recommendation. The Dean/Director shall have ten (10) business days to supply the requested recommendation. If the Committee has not received the Dean/Director's recommendation within ten (10) business days, the Committee shall proceed to consider the application.

The closing date for material to be placed in the completed application package is ten (10) business days prior to the meeting where the applicant's package is scheduled for presentation before the Committee. The Committee Chair shall notify the applicant five (5) business days before the closing date.

Copies of all recommendations made about each applicant by the Committee, Dean/Director, the Senior Vice President, and the President shall, absent extraordinary circumstances, be sent to the applicant within five (5) business days of issuance.

When either the Committee, or the Senior Vice President, or the President, or the Board is reviewing the application package, the applicant and the appropriate party may, by mutual written agreement, extend the timelines specified in this Article. The written agreement shall specify the new extension date.

The committee reviews and verifies applicant packages and assigns committee members to present each package, in the order the applications were received. Prior to presentation, the Committee shall have at least ten (10) business days in which to study the material in each application package. For each applicant, the Committee shall assign at least two (2) members to be the applicant's presenters. They shall have the responsibility for substantiating evidence placed before the Committee.

In each case before the Committee, the decision to recommend shall be determined by secret ballot with at least seven (7) members voting. A majority of the votes cast must be affirmative votes before an application can be sent forward with a positive recommendation. The application and Committee recommendations shall be transmitted to the Senior Vice President upon a positive vote.

In the event that an application does not receive a majority of the votes cast as affirmative votes, the Chair shall provide the applicant a letter detailing the Committee's rationale for its vote and suggest that the applicant withdraw the application. The applicant who has received an initial negative vote from the Committee has the right to address the Committee at its next meeting. At

that meeting, the Faculty member will have the opportunity to present his or her reasons why the Committee should reconsider its initial negative recommendation. At the next Committee meeting following the applicant's request for reconsideration, the Committee shall re-vote on the applicant's completed application package. If any applicant does not withdraw his or her application, the Committee shall forward the applicant's completed application package, with the Committee's recommendation, to the Senior Vice President within five (5) business days after the Committee's final vote.

Following the procedures detailed above, the application and Committee recommendations, if forwarded, shall be transmitted to the Senior Vice President. If they are not forwarded, the Committee will notify the applicant to pick up his or her materials at the Human Resources Office.

The review process and timelines for senior administration can be explained as follows:

Upon receipt of a recommendation from the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Senior Vice President shall evaluate the application. The Senior Vice President shall act upon the application and forward a recommendation to the President within thirty (30) business days of receiving the Committee's recommendation. If the Senior Vice President misses this date, the Committee's recommendation is sustained and the application moves forward to the President.

Upon receipt of a recommendation from the Senior Vice President, the President shall evaluate the application. The President shall issue a decision within forty-five (45) business days of receiving the recommendation of the Senior Vice President. Beyond this date, the Faculty Union President will consult with the President.

Promotions approved by the President shall become effective upon the commencement of the first semester following the completion of the required time in service or rank, or the first semester following the approval of the President, whichever is later.

The Board of Regents shall consider applications for tenure and, absent extraordinary circumstances, render a decision within sixty (60) business days of receiving the President's recommendation. All Board discussions concerning the application shall take place in Executive Session. The Faculty member shall be notified of the Board's decision within five (5) business days of its being rendered.

The granting of tenure shall become effective as of the date of the Board's final decision. Faculty members awarded tenure by the Board shall enjoy all rights and privileges accorded to tenured Faculty. Tenured Faculty may not be terminated except for cause, and the tenured employment may not be interrupted except for lay off as defined in Article XI, section B, of this *Agreement*. Failure to be granted tenure by the end of the Faculty member's sixth consecutive Academic Year of full-time, tenure-track employment at the University of Guam, shall result in termination at the end of the Faculty member's seventh consecutive Academic Year.

Failure of the Promotion and Tenure Committee or any Administrator to notify an applicant of action taken regarding a promotion application shall not constitute grounds for automatic promotion or tenure.

No grievance concerning the promotion process may be filed or considered until the President has made the final decision regarding the promotion application. No grievance concerning the tenure process may be filed or considered until the Board of Regents has made the final decision regarding the tenure application.

Post Tenure Review Process: [From the *Agreement* as of January 30, 2025]

The peer review process for post-tenure shall be conducted as follows:

1. An ad hoc peer review committee shall be formed consisting of five (5) members, at least two (2) of whom must be from the faculty member's Division or Other Assigned Area, and the committee shall be constituted as follows:
 1. Upon direction from the Dean/Director, the faculty member's Division or Other Assigned Area will elect two (2) members from the Division, School or College, or Other Assigned Area, and the faculty member to be reviewed will name two (2) members from any Division or Other Assigned Area. These four (4) committee members shall name a fifth faculty member from the Promotion and Tenure Committee who shall serve as committee chair.
 2. Ad hoc peer review committee members must be full-time, tenured faculty members at the rank of Professor or Extension Specialist and must have been a faculty member for at least three (3) consecutive Academic Years at the University of Guam. If no full-time Professors or Extension Specialists are available, members from within the College or School shall be called upon to serve on the committee.
2. Deadlines for the Post-tenure reviews are as follows:
 1. The ad hoc peer review committee shall, at the direction of the Dean/Director, be established within the first 45 business days of the beginning of the Fanuchånan or Fañomnåkan Semester.
 2. The final report will be sent to the faculty member and the Dean/Director prior to the end of the semester during which the review took place.
 3. The ad hoc peer review committee may extend its work up to 30 business days beyond the end of the semester with the written concurrence of the Dean/Director and the faculty member under review. At the conclusion of this extension, the final report shall be sent to the faculty member and the Dean/Director.

Voluntary Peer Review Process [From the *Agreement* January 30, 2025]

The peer review process for voluntary peer review shall be conducted as follows:

1. An ad hoc peer review committee shall be formed consisting of five (5) members, at least two (2) of whom must be from the faculty member's Division or Other Assigned Area, and the committee shall be constituted as follows:

1. Upon direction from the Dean/Director, the faculty member's Division or Other Assigned Area will elect two (2) members from the Division, School or College, or Other Assigned Area, and the faculty member to be reviewed will name two (2) members from any Division or Other Assigned Area. These four (4) committee members shall name a fifth faculty member from the Promotion and Tenure Committee who shall serve as committee chair.
2. Ad hoc peer review committee members must be full-time tenured faculty members at the rank of Professor or Extension Specialist and must have been a faculty member for at least three (3) consecutive Academic Years at the University of Guam. If no full-time Professors or Extension Specialists are available, members from within the College or School shall be called upon to serve on the committee.

Deadlines for the Voluntary peer review are as follows:

- (1) At the direction of the Dean/Director, the ad hoc peer review committee shall be established at the next regularly scheduled Division or Other Assigned Area meeting.
- (2) The final report will be sent to the faculty member and the Dean/Director within 45 business days from the time the ad hoc peer review committee was formed.