

The University of Guam Faculty Senate Handbook



- Initially adopted by the 1st Faculty Senate on 7 February 2002
- Includes subsequent amendments
- SEC certified complete & current as of 21 March 2019
- SEC updated as of 7 November 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. The Mission of the UOG Faculty Senate.....	3
II. The Vision of the UOG Faculty Senate.....	3
III. Faculty Senate Logo Design and Explanation.....	3
IV. Traits of Effective Faculty Senates.....	4
V. Roles and Responsibilities: Senate, Senate Academic Review Committees, and Faculty Union.....	5
A. The Senate’s Responsibility for the Greater Good of the Whole	5
B. The Senate’s Responsibility to the Academic Review Committees.....	5
C. Partitioning of Responsibilities between the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Union	6
D. Summary	6
VI. Senate Actions	6
A. Approval, Adoption, and Endorsement.....	6
1. Approval	6
2. Adoption	7
3. Endorsement	7
B. Amendments to Documents Acted on by the Senate	7
1. Documents taken for approval or adoption.....	7
2. Documents taken for endorsement.....	8
C. Certification of Senate Actions	8
D. Transmittal of Senate Actions.....	8
E. Procedures for Action on Academic Proposals and Reports	8
VII. Senate Administrative Procedures	10
A. Communications	10
B. Management of Documents.....	10
1. Management of Correspondence to and from the Senate	10
2. Accounting for Documents	10
3. Logging and Transmission of Documents	10
4. Management of Documents Supporting the Senate Agenda	10
C. File Maintenance.....	11
1. The Faculty Senate File	11
2. Removal of Senate File Documents for Photocopying.....	11
VIII. Preparation of the Senate Agenda	11
A. Agenda Format.....	11
1. Opening.....	12
2. Reports	12
3. Actions	12
3A. Scheduled Actions	12
3B. Items Pending Action.....	12
4. Presentations	13
5. Other Business	13
B. The Agenda Preparation Cycle.....	13
1. Preparation and Presentation of Semester and Annual Agenda.....	13
2. Introduction of Items of Business to the Senate	13
3. Scheduling of Formal Distribution on the Senate Agenda	14
4. Withdrawal or Rescheduling of Agenda Items	14
5. Preparation of Monthly Agenda.....	14
5A. Senate Executive Committee Meetings	14

5B. Senate Agenda Planning Meetings	14
IX. Senate Meeting Procedures.....	15
A. General Procedures	15
1. Quorum Requirement.....	15
2. Fundamental Principles of Robert’s Rules of Order.....	15
3. Common courtesies of civil discourse	15
4. Fundamental of democratic decision-making.....	16
X. Preparation of Senate Minutes	16
A. Content.....	16
B. Preview of the Minutes	16
C. Approval of the Minutes.....	16
XI. Senate Representatives and Liaisons to other Organizations.....	17
XII. Missions, Roles, and Procedures of the Senate Standing Committees.....	17
A. Standing Committee on Institutional Excellence (SCIE).....	17
1. Mission Statement.....	17
2. Vision Statement.....	18
3. Roles and Responsibilities	18
B. Standing Committee on Faculty Excellence (SCFE)	22
1. Mission Statement.....	22
2. Vision Statement.....	22
3. Roles and Responsibilities	23
4. Procedures.....	23
C. Standing Committee on Evaluation (SCE)	27
1. Mission Statement.....	27
2. Vision Statement.....	27
3. Roles and Responsibilities	27
4. Procedures.....	28
D. Standing Committee on University Budget and Planning (SCUBP).....	29
1. Mission Statement.....	29
2. Vision Statement.....	29
3. Roles and Responsibilities	29
4. Procedures.....	30
XIII. Missions, Roles and Procedures of the Senate’s Academic Review Committees	31
A. The Mission of the Academic Review Committees	31
1. Specific Areas of Responsibility of the Academic Review Committees.....	31
B. Roles of the Academic Review Committees, Senate, and SVP in the Academic Review Process.....	32
C. General Procedures of the Academic Review Committees	32
1. Routine Scheduling and Reporting	32
2. Review, Recommendation, And Endorsement of Academic Proposals And Reports....	32
XIV. Ceremonies.....	34
XV. References.....	35



The Senate and The Senate Committees

I. THE MISSION OF THE UOG FACULTY SENATE

The mission of the University of Guam Faculty Senate (See History of the Faculty Senate, Appendix A) is to be the vehicle by which the Faculty exercises its responsibility for the academic leadership of the university¹. Specifically, the Faculty Senate

- protects and promotes the fundamental principles of the academy, including academic freedom and institutional integrity², institutional and individual autonomy³, and shared academic governance;
- provides the Faculty with a unified, substantial, and independent voice in matters of educational programs and other matters that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise⁴;
- empowers and protects the prerogatives of its Academic Review Committees and individual members of the Faculty to carry out their respective roles in maintaining the educational purpose and character of the university and the quality of its academic programs⁵;
- promotes an environment favorable to the professional activity and development of the Faculty⁶, both as individuals and as a body; and
- discharges other specific responsibilities set forth in the *Bylaws of the University of Guam Faculty Senate* (See Appendix B).

II. THE VISION OF THE UOG FACULTY SENATE

The UOG Faculty Senate is a proactive and vigorous advocate of the rights and responsibilities of the Faculty for the academic leadership of the University. It is a committed partner with the university administration, student leadership, the other governance bodies of the university, and the community of Guam in promoting academic excellence and in achieving the full potential of the University of Guam. The Senate conscientiously practices and promotes the arts of civil discourse, negotiation, compromise, and other essentials of democratic governance.

III. FACULTY SENATE LOGO DESIGN AND EXPLANATION

The design of the University of Guam Faculty Senate logo is based upon the star constellation Uliul (Orion's Belt), with the three central stars exaggerated beyond their normal brightness. This constellation is one of the principal directional stars used by traditional navigators in Carolinian celestial navigation, because it rises and sets about 8 degrees north and passes directly over the great east-west archipelago of the Caroline Islands. The design illustrates the rising of the star constellation Uliul in an early dawn above the Pacific horizon. The constellation is in that position every year in mid-August, at the beginning of the new academic year. The shape of the logo

¹ WASC Standard 3. WASC Integrated Standards, April 2000, p. 19.

² WASC Standard 1.A. WASC Handbook of Accreditation, January 1988, p. 9.


³ WASC Standard 1.B. WASC Handbook of Accreditation, January 1988, p. 10.

⁴ WASC Standard 3.C.2. WASC Handbook of Accreditation, January 1988, p. 21.

⁵ WASC Standard 3. WASC Integrated Standards, April 2000, p. 19; WASC Standard 5A. WASC Handbook of Accreditation, January 1988, p. 55.

⁶ WASC Standard 5.C. WASC Handbook of Accreditation, January 1988, p. 57.

represents the slingstone of ancient Chamorro culture and thus pays respect to the original people of the island of Guam, consistent with the shape of the logo of the University of Guam and the Great Seal of the Territory of Guam. The Faculty Senate logo is intended to connote the wisdom and guidance of the ancient Micronesian navigators who piloted their people to safety. It symbolizes the dawning of a new era of shared academic governance and faculty leadership embodied in the establishment of the UOG Faculty Senate in 2001, and renewed annually at the beginning of each academic year. The logo also expresses the fervent hope of Faculty Senate that the university's star will ever continue to rise.



IV. TRAITS OF EFFECTIVE FACULTY SENATES

The following is a list of traits of effective faculty senates developed by the American Association of Higher Education and National Network of Faculty Senates and posted on the website of the American Association of University Professors. This list provides benchmarks for ongoing organizational and managerial improvement, and guidance for setting the long-term agenda of the Senate (See Appendix D). The Senate Executive Committee maintains an ongoing assessment of the status of the UOG Faculty Senate with respect to each item on the list.

1. Permanent office space.
2. Annual budget (e.g., travel, telephone, supplies, and equipment).
3. Secretarial assistance.

4. Reduced load for officers.
5. Regular meetings with the university president.
6. Consulted on creation of all non-senate committees.
7. Senate president presides at senate meetings.
8. Bylaws specify areas where senate decisions are normally determinative, co-determinative, or advisory.
9. Meetings and activities are advertised in advance and records of actions are widely published.
10. Attracts both junior and senior faculty who are esteemed as academic leaders.
11. Is regarded by the campus as dealing with crucial issues.
12. Has effective representation on other key governance groups.
13. Leadership plays a visible role in the ceremonial and symbolic affairs of the campus.
14. Initiates a major portion of its agenda items.
15. Defends the core values of academic freedom; determines curriculum.
16. Provides an effective forum for controversial issues.
17. Is seen as an agent for necessary institutional change.
18. Grounds its practices in parliamentary procedure and published and endorsed principles of governance.

V. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: SENATE, SENATE ACADEMIC REVIEW COMMITTEES, AND FACULTY UNION

A. The Senate's Responsibility for the Greater Good of the Whole

The Faculty Senate is a unifying body that represents the University Faculty as a whole to the rest of the university community and to the broader community outside the university. Although it combines people with various interests and perspectives from within the Faculty, its members serve not to guard or promote the particular interests of their respective units, but to work together to fulfill the Faculty's collective responsibility to the university and the broader community. Edmund Burke, in counsel to his contemporaries laboring to establish democratic institutions in 18th century Britain, articulated this concept well:

Parliament is not a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests; which interests each must maintain, as an agent and advocate, against other agents and advocates; but parliament is a deliberative assembly of one nation, with one interest, that of the whole; where, not local purposes, not local prejudices, ought to guide, but the general good, resulting from the general reason of the whole. You choose a member indeed; but when you have chosen him, he is not a member of Bristol, but he is a Member of Parliament. (Speech to the Electors of Bristol, November 3, 1774.)

B. The Senate's Responsibility to the Academic Review Committees

The Senate (See Appendix E) is the sole organ for the collective voice of the entire Faculty. The Academic Review Committees (See Senate Bylaws, Article IX, Appendix B.1) are specialized instruments of the Senate for providing *objective, independent peer review* of faculty proposals and reports. The primary function of the Senate with respect to review of academic proposals and reports is to ensure the integrity of the process. A majority vote of the Senate to endorse a proposal or report constitutes Faculty support for it (see VI.A.3, below). It is the responsibility of committee leaders to ensure that their respective committees prepare products or recommendations that are fully researched, critically reviewed, complete, and have the support of a majority of the Faculty Senators

before bringing the product or recommendation before the Senate for action. Conversely, the Senate is responsible for supporting the work of the committees.

C. Partitioning of Responsibilities between the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Union

The Union has exclusive purview over all matters related to salaries, employment status, personnel actions, and working conditions and labor-management grievances. It represents the labor interests of the Faculty as a whole, and protects the rights and prerogatives of faculty members as specified in the Board–Union contract. The Senate, on the other hand, attends exclusively to academic matters. It provides the Faculty with the substantial and independent voice in academic affairs mandated by the WASC standards, and constitutes the vehicle through which the Faculty fulfills its collective responsibility to shape the academic character and ensure high academic quality of the university. It does not interject itself into labor issues except to advise the Union on aspects affecting academic matters, nor does the Union involve itself in academic issues except to advise the Senate on aspects affecting labor issues (See Senate Charter, Appendix A4).

D. Summary

The role of the Senate in university governance at UOG may be summarized as follows:

- protect and promote the basic principles of higher education;
- articulate institutional (i.e., university-wide) faculty positions on key issues affecting the university;
- serve as the organ for faculty endorsement of Academic proposals and reports; and
- coordinate with College Academic Affairs Committees and Senate Academic Review Committees to ensure that academic proposals and reports are ready to receive Senate endorsement before they are brought to the Senate.

Seen from the opposite perspective, it is *not* the role of the Senate to:

- immerse itself in the detailed work of the Academic Review Committees; and/or
- retrace and redo the work of the committees (Senate Standing Committees, Senate Academic Review Committee, or College Academic Affairs Committees).

VI. SENATE ACTIONS

A. Approval, Adoption, and Endorsement

In accordance with Article IX of the Senate Bylaws, the Senate recognizes three basic types of action on recommendations and proposals sent to it and on items originating from within it: *approval, adoption, and endorsement* (See Senate Bylaws, Article VIII).

1. Approval

Approval denotes official consent on the contents of a document for which the Senate has sole authority, and which has no standing in the absence of Senate action. For example, only the Senate can approve changes to its Bylaws; changes to the Bylaws proposed by any other organization have no standing until and unless the Senate approves them. To cite a second example, the Senate must approve the contents of a memorandum prepared by a Senate committee that wishes to transmit the memorandum to the faculty or others as a Senate Memorandum, on which the President of the Senate signs “for the Senate” (See Appendix F.1).

2. Adoption

Adoption implies acceptance of a recommendation or document as the Senate's own. Items put before the Senate for adoption may originate from within or outside of the Senate. For example, the Senate may adopt a resolution (See Appendix F.3) prepared by one of its Standing Committees, or even by another assembly entirely independent of the Senate (*e.g.*, the Administrative Council). In the latter case, the independent assembly will have collaborated with the other committee or assembly to prepare and place the action on the Senate agenda.

3. Endorsement

Endorsement implies the lending of the Senate's support to a recommendation or document that already has, and will retain, some standing of its own whether or not the Senate endorses it. Endorsement certifies that the Senate is satisfied that the work it has endorsed has been well researched and critically examined; that it is complete and of high quality; and that it is compatible with the broad inter-collegiate interests of the university, as seen by the Faculty. Senate endorsement also implies that the Senate is satisfied that the work has been prepared with due respect to the University's rules and procedures, and that the Faculty has played its appropriate role in the development process. The Senate need not, indeed should not, conduct detailed debate on specific aspects of items that come to it. It should simply satisfy itself that the work is worthy of Faculty endorsement, based on the criteria above. If the Senate is not thus satisfied, it withholds endorsement and sends its concerns back to the organization from which the item originated, so that Senate concerns can be resolved before the item is submitted again.

Items put before the Senate for endorsement normally originate from the College Academic Affairs Committees or other assemblies external to the Senate itself. An Academic Affairs Committee, for example, may send recommendations or documents that it has approved or adopted to the Senate for its endorsement. (A document previously approved or adopted by a separate organization stands approved or adopted by it, regardless of whether the Senate endorses it. In practice, however, the Academic Affairs Committees and Senate should work together throughout the development of proposals so that when they are ready for approval or adoption by the originating committee they will also be ready to receive subsequent endorsement by the Senate.) As a second example, one of the Senate Standing Committees may ask the Senate for endorsement of an action that it is empowered to undertake on its own, but for which it wishes to have the full endorsement of the Senate. If the Standing Committee on Faculty Excellence, for example, were to propose far-reaching changes in Faculty Development activities—over which the Bylaws give it purview—it may ask the Senate for endorsement of all or some part of its plan to mobilize or ensure broad support before proceeding. Nevertheless, the committee could proceed on its own under the authority vested in it by the Bylaws, in this case the authority to organize and conduct Faculty Development activities.

B. Amendments to Documents Acted on by the Senate

1. Documents taken for approval or adoption

The Senate can amend documents sent to it for approval or adoption, since approval or adoption make the document the Senate's own, and the Senate therefore may assume the prerogative to modify the document as necessary to secure approval or adoption. Amendments, however, are appropriate only when changes are necessary to secure approval or adoption of a document, and when such changes are minor. Should the Senate conclude that major changes are necessary, it should refer the document to committee (either the originator or another appropriate committee)

with instructions to address the Senate’s specific concerns before returning the document to the floor for action.

2. Documents taken for endorsement

The Senate cannot amend documents sent to it for endorsement because documents sent for endorsement are not the Senate’s own and therefore cannot be modified by the Senate. The Senate can, however, make its endorsement provisional or attach qualifications to its endorsement.

C. Certification of Senate Actions

After the Senate has approved, adopted, or endorsed an item submitted to it for action, the Senate President certifies the action by signing the appropriate transmittal form and/or a memorandum informing the appropriate offices of the action taken by the Senate. On such correspondence, the Senate President annotates the signature line with the words, “*for the Senate,*” and signs immediately next to or below the annotation. The Senate President signs for or speaks for the Senate only when certifying an action or articulating a position that has been formally taken by a majority vote of the Senate. At all other times, even when signing or speaking in his or her official capacity as Senate President, he or she signs or speaks only for himself or herself.

D. Transmittal of Senate Actions

Upon certification of Senate action, the Senate President provides the certifying document (See Appendix F.4) to the Senate Secretary, who assigns it a log number (see Section VII.B.2 below) and records the transmission of the document in the Senate correspondence log before sending it to the addressees.

E. Procedures for Action on Academic Proposals and Reports

The following are the procedures by which academic proposals are recommended to the university administration from a college Academic Affairs Committees (AAC) or Curriculum Committee and reviewed by the Faculty Senate’s Academic Review Committees (ARC), in accordance with the principles established in Article IX of the Senate Bylaws.

- (1) The dean is the college-level approving authority for academic proposals for undergraduate or graduate courses, programs, and program self-studies.
- (2) The Senior Vice President (SVP-ASA) is the university-level approving authority for the academic proposals.
- (3) Items ultimately going to the SVP-ASA for approval must be documented on the appropriate University transmittal form, which is attached to the packet of materials. These may be obtained from the Dean’s or Senate office. A contact person for consultation or to answer questions should be identified on the form.
- (4) The originator of the proposal also prepares a brief cover memorandum containing a 100- to 200-word background statement that explains the purpose and essential aspects of the proposal in abstract style. The cover memorandum should also identify the proposed timeline for implementation and the consequent desired date for approval. For complex “package” proposals containing multiple separate component proposals, each component proposal within the package should be documented on the appropriate form(s). The entire package should carry a single cover memorandum containing the background statement, the proposed timeline for implementation, and the consequent desired date for approval. The cover memorandum of complex packages should also list the individual components of the package in a table of contents.

- (5) Originators of a proposal within a college should work informally with the administrative chair, the dean, and the college AAC, as the proposal is prepared to ensure that it will have the support of each by the time it is presented to them for formal action. The dean consults or coordinates with the SVP as necessary to ensure the SVP is aware of the proposal and any concerns are addressed in the proposal.
- (6) After college-level approval is certified by the dean, who signs the form(s), initials the cover memorandum, and may attach his or her statement concerning the proposal, the proposal is hand-carried to the Faculty Senate secretary (SBPA Bldg. 2nd Floor, Rm. 243, Ext. 2998), who prepares a dated receipt in duplicate, assigns a log number, retains the originals until Senate action is complete, and makes the necessary number of copies for the appropriate Academic Review Committee.
 - (a) Proposals relating to undergraduate curricula/programs go to the Undergraduate Curricula Review Committee (UCRC).
 - (b) Proposals relating to graduate curricula/programs go to the Graduate Curricula Review Committee (GCRC).
 - (c) Proposals relating to general education go to the General Education Review Committee (GERC).
 - (d) Proposals relating to University-wide procedures or policies other than curricula go to the Senate Executive Committee, which forwards them to the appropriate standing committee or academic committee.

The Senate Secretary delivers the review copies to the chair of the Academic Review Committee within three (3) workdays of receipt from the AAC and retains a signed receipt from the chair of the committee. The Review Committee has two (2) workweeks from receipt of the materials to conduct a formal review and deliver it to the Senate Secretary. During this time, reviewers are encouraged to correspond informally with the originators and AAC members as necessary and appropriate to clarify and resolve questions or make suggestions for incorporation into the final draft of the proposal or report. Should the review committee determine that more time is needed, it may request an extension from the Senate Executive Committee. Otherwise, at the end of the two (2) workweek review period the Review Committee must provide its completed review to the originators and the associated AAC, by way of the Senate Secretary, who logs the review, delivers one copy each to the originators and AAC, and retains a receipt from each.

- (7) Upon receipt of the completed review, the AAC works with the originators to prepare a final response to the completed review, which it delivers to the Senate Secretary within one (1) workweek for attachment to the original package. The final package thus contains the original materials, including the transmittal forms, the Review Committee's completed review, and the AAC/originator response to it. The Senate Secretary delivers the completed package to the Senate Executive Committee at its next scheduled meeting.
- (8) The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) distributes the final package electronically and schedules it for presentation, and action at successive sessions of the Senate. The associated AAC designates representatives to explain the package to the Senate at the session at which it is up for presentation. When the Senate Executive Committee is satisfied that the package is ready for action, it schedules it for action and submits a motion for endorsement, normally at the next scheduled Senate session.
- (9) Once the Senate has endorsed the proposal, the Senate President signs the associated form(s) and certifies Senate endorsement in a Letter of Transmittal of Senate actions to the SVP.

Throughout the process the originator thus works first with the College Academic Affairs Committee and dean (who updates and informs the SVP on appropriate aspects, as necessary) and then with the Academic Review Committee and Senate leadership to resolve concerns or objections *before* the proposal is recommended for endorsement. By the time the proposal is brought before either the Senate or administration, discussions should already be concluded and questions answered. Conscientious observance of these principles and application of the above procedures will help to eliminate misunderstanding and facilitate timely academic decision-making.

VII. SENATE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

A. Communications

The official spokesperson for the Senate is the President. For the Senate standing committees and the review committees, it is the chairperson of each committee. All official correspondence from the committees or from the Senate must be routed through the chairpersons of the committees or their designee if it is a matter that concerns the committee only and through the President of the Senate or her or his designee if it concerns the whole Senate.

Statements being published for University-wide or island or region-wide dissemination should receive the approval of the Senate body or appropriate committee if the name of either the Senate or committee is invoked and especially in the following cases: if the statement to be published concerns (1) a weighty matter, such as policy-setting statements, (2) negative statements, or (3) specific names of individuals or groups. This majority approval must be documented and may be received via e-mail or mail and reported at the next meeting or through a called meeting. Publication of summaries of Senate or committee sessions or actions does not need Senate or committee approval before publishing.

B. Management of Documents

1. Management of Correspondence to and from the Senate

Under the Bylaws, the Senate President is responsible for informing the Senate with copies of official correspondence addressed to the President. The Secretary is responsible for coordinating information and actions coming from the various committees, and for archiving Senate documents. The Secretary thus consults with the Senate Executive Committee to determine the appropriate courses of action (e.g., discard, forward, respond, log, file) for the various Senate correspondences.

2. Accounting for Documents

To manage the transmittal and archiving of Senate documents, the Senate Secretary maintains a *Faculty Senate Log*, a centralized *Faculty Senate File*, and a notebook for copies of each log, to become the permanent *Senate Archives*.

3. Logging and Transmission of Documents

Documents coming to the Senate are normally received by the Senate Secretary. The secretary administers procedures established and managed by the Senate Executive Committee. These include ensuring accountability for documents and correspondence by assigning log numbers, issuing receipts for them, copying, tracking, distributing, and archiving them.

4. Management of Documents Supporting the Senate Agenda

Documents submitted for the Senate agenda should be given to the Secretary no later than the agenda-planning meeting (see Section VIII.C.5B below) that precedes the Senate session for which

the associated agenda item is to appear on the agenda. The Secretary provides the Executive Committee with copies of submitted documents and their log numbers. The Senate President identifies the documents as formal distribution on the forthcoming agenda, after consulting with appropriate committee chairs and the other Senate officers, as required by the Bylaws (Article VII, Section 1.b.). (This is normally done during the regular Senate Executive Committee meetings and the agenda planning meetings, which are described in Section VIII.B.5 below.) The Secretary reproduces sufficient copies of the documents for the forthcoming Senate session. Log numbers are cited on the Senate agenda and minutes wherever references are made to documents that have been assigned a log number. When a previously distributed document is revised and redistributed, the revised document carries the original log number with a letter suffix appended, “a” for the first revision, “b” for the second revision, and so forth. The history of the appended log numbers, with the date of each previous revision, is annotated on the document, as well (See Special Rules, Article I, Section 4 at Appendix D.1, and Sample Header at Appendix F.5). The log number history is carried on Senate agenda, minutes, and other working materials that refer to the document.

C. File Maintenance

1. The Faculty Senate File

Documents in the *Faculty Senate File* are kept in chronological order based on the date when each document is entered into the *Faculty Senate Log*. Originals or designated copies, with the affixed Faculty Senate Log Number and header, remain in the file until the end of each academic year. In April of each academic year, the Recorder, as Senate archivist, identifies documents to be discarded, and after consulting with the Executive Committee and other appropriate persons to make final determination, purges them from the file. The remaining documents are archived in digital form on CD or other electronic media to aid in recovering information and reducing long-term storage space.

There is also to be a permanent archive of Faculty Senate documents kept in the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library Reserve Collection. During the year, copies of each log are put into notebooks kept in the Faculty Senate office. At the end of the year, all the notebooks for the year are transferred to the University Library for permanent archiving.

2. Removal of Senate File Documents for Photocopying

The intent of these procedures is to safeguard Senate documents from being lost or misfiled; therefore, original materials are not to be removed from the vicinity of the storage area except by the Senate Secretary or Senate officers. Photocopying should be done at a machine close to the storage area, and the document removed for copying must be returned to the file immediately afterward. No materials are to be removed from Faculty Senate File without consulting with one of the Senate officers. The person who takes custody of a document temporarily removed from the file must place a note in the file identifying it (by log number) and providing the contact numbers at which the person can be reached. Only in extraordinary cases should a document be removed for more than 24 hours.

VIII. PREPARATION OF THE SENATE AGENDA

A. Agenda Format

The order and contents of the sections of the Senate agenda are described below and shown in the example agenda template at Appendix F.6.

1. Opening

The opening of the meeting includes the call to order, acknowledgement of guests, approval of the minutes of the previous session, the review of the present agenda by the chair, and consideration of the consent agenda. *Robert's Rules of Order* provides for using a consent agenda to dispose of non-controversial business. To expedite the conduct of Senate business, the Senate President schedules items for the consent agenda whenever it is reasonable to do so, based on consultation with the Senate Executive Committee and applicable committee chairs. Items on the consent agenda are approved by consensus, unless one or more members of the body requests that an item be removed from the consent agenda. In the latter case, the item is moved to the portion of the agenda for the present meeting or to the agenda for a subsequent meeting, as agreed upon by the Senate at the suggestion of the Chair.

2. Reports

Following the opening, the Senate Executive Committee reports on (1) the follow-up actions taken as a result of the previous session, (2) ongoing follow-up activities from earlier actions, (3) recent correspondence in and out of the Senate, and (4) other items of general interest to the Senate. The Senate Executive Committee's report is followed by reports from the Senate's Standing Committees and the Academic Committees. These reports are followed by invited reports from the Senior Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs (SVP-ASA) and any other non-members. The parliamentarian may also deliver a report. Committee reports may be delivered by submitting written reports and/or delivering a concise (5 minutes or less) oral report regarding recent committee decisions and important ongoing or anticipated activities. Requests from the floor for clarification or correction of fact are in order, but discussion or debates are not. Motions for action are not in order while reports are being delivered. New concerns that surface during committee reports are treated like any other new concern, *i.e.*, they are brought to the attention of the appropriate committee or individual at the appropriate time and place, and if necessary, placed on the Senate agenda at a subsequent date, according to the rules of the Senate.

2. Actions

Following the delivery of reports, the Senate takes action on scheduled items. The first section contains the motions for action on completed work. A second sub-section identifies items presented at a previous session, which are therefore eligible for action, but which remain pending because the SEC, after consultation with the originator, has determined that they are not yet ready to be submitted for action.

3A.Scheduled Actions

Action items are normally placed on the agenda in the order received, but the order may be modified at the discretion of the Senate President, in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee and applicable committee chairs. When an item is ready to be placed on the Action section of the agenda, the originator provides the Senate President with the exact wording of the motion that will be placed on the floor of the Senate. The motion must refer to the appropriate supporting document(s) and include the log numbers assigned to them. The Senate President places the motion on the agenda verbatim and attaches the supporting document(s) to the agenda.

3B.Items Pending Action

If the originator or SEC determines that an item is not yet ready to be submitted for action, but anticipates eventually submitting it at a subsequent session, the item is carried as "pending" in this sub-section.

4. Presentations

This section of the agenda is divided into three sub-sections. The first is for presentation of items that are anticipated to be scheduled for action at the next session. The second sub-section is for presentations of items for which the committee submitting them has requested that the Senate take immediate action (see Section Article I, Section 5 of the Senate's Special Rules, Appendix D.1). The third sub-section is for items that have been formally distributed at a previous session but are not yet ready for presentation. Items in these sections are normally listed in the order in which the supporting documents were listed for distribution on the previous agenda, but the order may be modified at the discretion of the Senate President, in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee and applicable committee chairs.

5. Other Business

This portion of the agenda is for the introduction of non-routine or non-scheduled business, either by committees or individual members of the Senate.

B. The Agenda Preparation Cycle

1. Preparation and Presentation of Semester and Annual Agenda

The Senate agendas, both long-term and short-term, are largely driven by the agendas of the Academic and Standing committees. Therefore, at each Faculty Assembly the Academic and Standing Committees are given the opportunity to present their semester and/or annual agendas to the Faculty. The Academic Committees are subsequently also given the opportunity to present their semester agendas in a special report to the Senate at one of the Senate sessions early in each semester. Standing Committees may present their semester agendas to the Senate early in each semester as part of their routine committee report. At the beginning of each semester, the Senate President asks each committee (Academic and Standing) to provide the Senate with a written outline of its long-term agenda, which is used to guide the preparation of the Senate agenda over the course of the semester. The Senate President shall also ask the Senior Vice President to share a list of recommended priorities with the Senate at the beginning of each semester.

2. Introduction of Items of Business to the Senate

Items are submitted for routine action by or through the Senate Standing Committees, Academic Committees, and other bodies (*e.g.*, Colleges) as provided for in the Senate Bylaws and bylaws of the originating body. Non-routine items of business may be submitted as provided for in the Special Rules of the Senate (Appendix D.1). Academic Committees may choose to submit an item of business to the Senate directly or through one of the Standing Committees. In the former case, the Academic Committee submits the item for distribution through the Senate Secretary (see Section VII.A.1 above), sends a representative to the Senate to make the presentation, and provides the Senate President with the formal motion for action to be placed on the agenda when the item is scheduled for Senate action. In the latter case, the Academic Committee collaborates with a Standing Committee, which may distribute, present, and schedule the item for action on behalf of the Academic Committee. In such collaborative efforts, the Academic Committee may send a representative to make the presentation and participate in the discussions associated with the proposed action. Individual senators should generally introduce business to the Senate by way of one of the committees, but may introduce urgent or short-notice business to the Senate as necessary when the Senate reaches the "Other Business" portion of the agenda, in accordance with *Robert's Rules of Order* and the Senate's Special Rules.

3. Scheduling of Formal Distribution on the Senate Agenda

When an item of business and its supporting documents are submitted to the Senate, the committee or member submitting the item provides the Senate President with a brief (200 words or less) background statement describing the item of business and the supporting documents (as applicable), the anticipated action that will be requested, and the reason Senate action is needed. The Senate President places this explanatory information in the Distribution section of the agenda, beneath the listed agenda item (see Appendix F.6). The background statement travels with the item as it moves through successive agendas, and is used to describe the item on other correspondence as well, especially memoranda of transmittal that convey the results of Senate actions to the Administration or others.

4. Withdrawal or Rescheduling of Agenda Items

The committee or member submitting an item may withdraw it from the agenda or ask for it to be rescheduled at any time up until the formal motion submitted for action has been read back to the Senate by the Chair, and thus formally placed on the floor for action. After that point, the motion must be disposed of in accordance with *Robert's Rules*. Such withdrawal or rescheduling must be recorded in the minutes.

5. Preparation of Monthly Agenda

The Senate usually meets on the third Thursday of each month, in accordance with the Bylaws (Article VI, Section 1). In coordination with the office of the Senior Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs, the Senate Executive Committee prepares the annual schedule of Senate meetings for the forthcoming academic year in time for it to be incorporated in the University Academic Calendar for the forthcoming academic year. The following regular meetings are scheduled between each session to prepare the agenda for the forthcoming session:

5A. Senate Executive Committee Meetings

During the week following each Senate session and the week of the Senate Agenda Planning Meeting, the Senate Executive Committee usually meets to review the minutes of the preceding session, identify the necessary follow-up actions, review incoming documents, and identify new items of business coming to the Senate. The Executive Committee may invite the SVP-ASA to participate in these meetings to coordinate the flow of business between the Senate and the Administration, in accordance with the Administration—Faculty Senate Memorandum of Agreement (See Appendix B.4) as established under the Senate Bylaws. Based on this meeting, the Senate President prepares the initial draft of the agenda for the forthcoming Senate session.

5B. Senate Agenda Planning Meetings

Following the Senate Executive Committee meeting described above, and no later than the end of the week preceding the forthcoming Senate session, the Senate President convenes an agenda planning meeting with the SEC and chairs of the Standing Committees to review the emerging agenda and modify or add to it as needed, based on the outcomes of the various committee meetings that have occurred since the previous Senate session. Standing committee chairs must send a representative to the agenda-planning meeting if they are unable to attend. Chairs or representatives of the Academic Committees may attend the agenda-planning meeting at their discretion to coordinate items their committees are submitting for the agenda. Committee chairs must submit any final or follow-up items for the agenda to the Senate President by 3:00 PM on the first business day of the following week, *i.e.*, the week in which the Senate session is to be convened. The Senate President then finishes the agenda and distributes it to the Senate by the end of the second business day of the week in which the Senate session is scheduled.

IX. SENATE MEETING PROCEDURES

A. General Procedures

All meetings of the Senate and its committees are conducted in accordance with *Robert's Rules of Order* and the Special Rules of the Senate (see Appendix D.1). The fundamental points are highlighted below:

1. Quorum Requirement

A quorum (*i.e.*, 50% plus 1) must be present to conduct business.

2. Fundamental Principles of Robert's Rules of Order

The following principles embodied in *Robert's Rules* form the core of parliamentary practice as it evolved in the 17th, 18th, and 19th Centuries. Some of the specific rules below have their origins in the United States Constitutional Convention of 1787:

A. *Every member is entitled to speak twice on each issue, but after everyone who desires to do so has spoken twice, debate must cease and the vote must be taken.* This principle ensures that every member of the assembly has an opportunity to present his or her position once and respond once to the positions of the others. It puts a premium on speakers being brief, clear, and staying on the subject, and it ensures that timely action is taken after everyone has an opportunity to contribute. Three specific rules follow from this principle:

- (1) *Everyone is entitled to a fair share of the available time; no one may take more than their fair share of the time. The assembly therefore sets a time limit for each turn of speaking.* The time limit for the Senate is two minutes per turn. (See Article II, Section 2, Special Rules of the Senate, at Appendix D.1). The Senate Vice President serves as the timekeeper for each session (See Article VII, Section 2d of the Senate Bylaws). It is the responsibility of the chair and each member of the Senate to see that the time limit is respected.
- (2) *Members may speak for a second time on each issue only after each one who wishes to speak at least once has done so.*
- (3) *Formal deliberation continues until one of the following conditions is met, at which point debate ceases and the chair calls for the vote:*
 - (a) Everyone has spoken twice on the question before the assembly.
 - (b) No one who is still entitled to speak (*i.e.*, has not already spoken twice) desires to take the floor.
 - (c) A motion to cease debate and vote on the question before the assembly (*i.e.*, a “call for the previous question”) is entered, seconded, and agreed to by two-thirds of those present.
 - (d) The Senate reaches the scheduled time limit for deliberation of the item, and there is no motion made to extend deliberation. (See Article II, Section 4, Special Rules of the Senate, of Appendix D.1).

B. Motions (other than simple procedural motions) and amendments to motions not already on the agenda are written out and passed to the chair. The motion is formally entered when the chair reads the written motion aloud to the Senate.

3. Common courtesies of civil discourse

A. Each speaker must be recognized by the chair before speaking.

- B.** Only one person may speak at a time; “side-conversations” while the recognized speaker has the floor are disruptive and discourteous.
- C.** Personal remarks, sarcasm, shouting, or other discourteous behaviors are always out of order.

4. Fundamental of democratic decision-making

- A.** Minority views must be given an opportunity to be heard, but the assembly agrees to follow the will of the majority when a decision is taken.
- B.** “Silence is consent,” *i.e.*, abstaining from a vote implies that one agrees to support the will of the majority without participating in the vote. Abstention therefore does not constitute dissent; only a “no” vote constitutes dissent.
- C.** Approval by two-thirds of those voting is necessary when limiting rights (such as terminating discussion) or changing something that has previously been decided (such as amending bylaws or modifying an agenda). Otherwise a simple majority of those voting, so long as a quorum is present, suffices for a decision.
- D.** Some procedural motions are not debatable and require an instant decision by the group, but debatable motions must be given time for discussion according to the rules of the Senate.

X. PREPARATION OF SENATE MINUTES

A. Content

Minutes are the official record of attendance, reports, and decisions. The minutes also make record of all materials (by log number) that relate to Senate actions. Documents that relate directly to Senate decisions may be attached to the minutes at the discretion of the Senate Executive Committee. Typical documents attached to the minutes include reports adopted by the assembly, long and complicated motions, and resolutions or other documents adopted by the Senate. Under *Robert’s Rules*, when a committee report or other report is of particular importance, the assembly can also order it (by majority vote) “to be entered in the minutes or attached to the minutes,” but restraint should be used in attaching documents to the minutes. Rather, related documents may usually be simply cited by their log number. It is neither necessary nor desirable to attempt to produce detailed or verbatim records (*i.e.*, transcripts) of reports or discussions; rather care should be taken to make the minutes a precise and accurate record of important information disseminated, motions entered, and actions taken.

B. Preview of the Minutes

A copy of the draft minutes of the previous meeting is provided by the Senate Recorder to each of the Senate officers and committee chairs at each agenda planning meeting (See section VIII.B.5B). The Recorder then makes whatever modifications to the draft are appropriate before distributing the final version of the minutes to the Senate for approval at the upcoming session.

C. Approval of the Minutes

Normally, approval is made by general consent at the beginning of each session, although a formal motion to approve the minutes or to have them read is not out of order. The minutes are read aloud only if a motion to do so is made, seconded, and approved by majority vote. The President and Recorder sign the approved minutes, which are preserved in the Senate archive and posted on the Senate website.

XI. SENATE REPRESENTATIVES AND LIAISONS TO OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

The primary responsibility of the Senate leadership, most especially the President of the Senate, is to facilitate the work of the committees and promote direct involvement of the committees in the shared governance activities of the university. To this end, the Standing Committees of the Senate are the primary stewards of the Senate’s responsibilities to the university and the faculty.

The Senate is also directed or invited by certain organizations outside of the Senate to send a representative or liaison to participate in or attend meetings of certain external organizations. The total time required for attending, much less contributing to the work of each of these bodies, precludes any single faculty member, especially the Senate President, from being able to represent the Senate effectively at all of them. It is the sense of the Senate, therefore, that the Senate and hence the UOG Faculty will be more effectively served by the senate president delegating or assigning these functions to those whose position most directly relates to the mission of each outside organization requesting Senate representation. To this end the Senate advises, by means of these Standing Rules, that the Senate President shall appoint representatives or liaison members to external bodies as listed in the following table. Committee chairs may, in turn, delegate their roles to members of their committees unless otherwise specified.

Officer or Committee Chair	Designated representative or liaison to:	Role
Senate President	Rules, Regulations and Procedures Manual (RRPM) Review Committee	Represents the Senate.
Chair, Senate Standing Committee on Institutional Excellence	Regent Nominating Council	Represents the Faculty Senate, as required by Public Law 26-24. The SCIE Chair may not delegate this role.
Chair, Senate Standing Committee on Faculty Excellence	UOG Employee Development Council	Represents the Senate President.
	Faculty Travel Grant Committee	Represents the Senate.
	Faculty Awards Committee	
	BOR Subcommittee on Academic Personnel and Tenure	Attends, observes, and reports.
Chair, Senate Standing Committee on University Budget & Planning	University Planning & Budget Committee	Represents Senate President
	BOR Subcommittee on Facilities	Attends, observes, and reports.
	University Technology Advisory Committee (UTAC)	Represents the Senate.
Chair, Senate Standing Committee on Evaluation	University Assessment Committee	Attends, observes, reports

XII. MISSIONS, ROLES, AND PROCEDURES OF THE SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Standing Committee on Institutional Excellence (SCIE)

1. Mission Statement

The mission of the Standing Committee on Institutional Excellence is to preserve and promote the essential attributes of the academy for the University of Guam. Particular vigilance is paid to safeguarding institutional and individual autonomy, institutional integrity, academic freedom, and professional ethics. The mission of the committee, however, extends to all institutional characteristics generally acknowledged in university accreditation standards as essential to institutions of higher learning, such as effective shared governance and faculty leadership in academic matters.

2. Vision Statement

The SCIE plays a leading and visible role in the protection of the University's autonomy and integrity, the preservation of academic freedom, and the promotion of shared governance and faculty leadership in the academics affairs. It continually monitors these matters, and mobilizes action by the Faculty and others whenever necessary to protect the University from outside or internal threats to these or related fundamental institutional standards. It takes the leading role within the faculty for defining standards for professional conduct.

3. Roles and Responsibilities

The SCIE meets twice a month and makes maximum use of electronic media to conduct business and coordinate work between meetings. Specific roles and responsibilities, consistent with the committee's mission and each of the functions prescribed in the Senate Bylaws include:

A. Reviewing and making recommendations relative to the University's compliance with the standards prescribed by WASC and other accrediting institutions

(1) Roles and Responsibilities:

- (a) The SCIE provides the linkage between the Senate and the Administration on fundamental accreditation-related matters, other than assessment for which the SCE has primary responsibility. The SCIE's purview with respect to accreditation is primarily, but not exclusively, focused on matters related to institutional and individual autonomy, institutional integrity, academic freedom, and professional ethics.

(2) Procedures:

- (a) The SCIE appoints one of its members as the Senate liaison with the SVP on institutional and individual autonomy, institutional integrity, academic freedom, professional ethics, and other important accreditation matters, other than assessment.
- (b) The SCIE liaison meets with the SVP at least once each semester to identify issues of concern and appropriate corrective courses of action on which the faculty leadership and the administration might collaborate or coordinate their responses.

B. Developing standards for and promoting adherence to academic and professional ethics. (See Appendix H, Code of Faculty Ethics)

(1) Roles and responsibilities:

- (a) Serves as the Senate's custodian of the Code of Faculty Ethics and works with the Faculty Union and administration to ensure that appropriate procedures are in place for handling allegations, documenting, and taking action for ethical violations.
- (b) Maintains a library of academic and professional standards that apply to the university community (e.g., university standards for academic honesty for both faculty and students, the Code of Faculty Ethics, and codes of conduct adopted by other university bodies, such as the Faculty Senate or Board of Regents).

(2) Procedures:

- (a) Conducts ongoing research into standards and practices at other institutions and identifies best practices applicable to the University of Guam.
- (b) Conducts an annual review of standards and practices at the University of Guam and recommends expansion or modifications, as experience indicates may be appropriate.

- (c) Meets annually with the SVP and Faculty Union leadership to review and recommend appropriate policies to promote adherence to standards.

C. Making recommendations on issues pertaining to institutional integrity and academic freedom

(1) Roles and Responsibilities:

- (a) The SCIE independently monitors the state of institutional and individual autonomy, institutional integrity, academic freedom, and professional ethics at the University of Guam. When it ascertains that any of these are compromised, threatened, or that there is any other reason for concern regarding them, it documents the facts of the incident and mobilizes the faculty leadership to take appropriate actions.

(2) Procedures:

- (a) At the Senate meeting in May, the SCIE prepares a “State of the Institution” report, in which it evaluates the status of institutional and individual autonomy, institutional integrity, academic freedom, and professional ethics. It submits this report to the Senate and Administration. This report includes documentation of specific problems that have been identified in these areas during the past year, actions taken, and recommendations for further addressing them, as required.
- (b) Upon discovering or being alerted to an alleged breach of the University’s autonomy or integrity, or an assault on academic freedom, the SCIE will investigate the incident and reach its own judgment of the facts, and report them to the Senate. Based on the advice of the Senate, it will then take the actions it deems appropriate to defend the university, its leaders, or faculty, as necessary. Such actions may include proposing a resolution of censure or other appropriate statement for Senate adoption; alerting, consulting, or calling upon with the Administration, Board of Regents, or the accrediting authority, to take combined or additional action, as appropriate; preparing and releasing of a statement of its own to the media, and/or proposing a statement for Senate approval and release.

D. Promoting and supporting the Senate Code of Professional Conduct

- (1) Works with members of the Senate and the Senate Executive Committee to ensure that appropriate procedures are in place for processing allegations of violations of the Code.
- (2) Performs roles, tasked to it by the Senate, required to support the Code of Professional Conduct within the Senate and its subcommittees.

E. Performing other necessary functions relative to its area of responsibility

(1) Representation of the Senate on the Regent Nominating Council (RNC)

(a) Roles and Responsibilities:

- (i) The chair of the SCIE serves as the Senate’s representative to the Regent Nominating Council (see Appendix I, Public Law 26-24, Regent Nominating Council By-Laws and Procedures).
- (ii) As representative to the RNC, the chair of the SCIE works to ensure that the Council seeks candidates who are committed to ensuring institutional integrity, academic freedom, university autonomy, and other prerequisites of a healthy and vigorous academic institution.

- (iii) Committee members actively support the chair in his or her role as representative to the RNC by helping to identify and recruit highly qualified members of the community as potential regent nominees.
- (b) Procedures:
- (i) The SCIE ensures that its chair is appointed each year as the Senate's representative to the RNC.
 - (ii) The SCIE maintains a list of outstanding potential regent applicants and meets each to encourage him or her to put an application into the RNC's standing pool of candidates.
 - (iii) Should the chair report a matter of concern or dissent from a decision of the RNC, he or she shall consult with the committee to determine whether further action is appropriate. Such action may include preparing a statement of concern or dissent by the committee, or drafting a proposed resolution or statement for the Senate. If a violation of statute or ethics is or may be involved, the committee may recommend to the Senate Executive Committee that it seek legal counsel and/or alert the appropriate authority.

(2) Management of the Faculty Senate's Palulap Medallion Award

The University of Guam Faculty Senate awards the *Palulap Medallion* to a member of the community of Guam who has made extraordinary contributions to the *protection and promotion of the fundamental principles of the academy, including academic freedom and institutional integrity, institutional and individual autonomy, and shared academic governance for the University of Guam*⁷. Under the terms of Faculty Senate Resolution 5- and the *Concept Paper for the Palulap Medallion* (Appendix D.2) approved by the Faculty Senate upon its adoption of the resolution, the SCIE is responsible for developing appropriate procedures for the nomination, selection, and presentation of the Palulap Medallion in accordance. The attendant roles, responsibilities, and procedures of the committee regarding the Palulap Medallion are listed below.

- (a) Roles and Responsibilities:
- (i) The SCIE will be responsible for publishing every three years the call for nominations for the award, including deadlines and eligibility criteria.
 - (ii) The SCIE will receive nominations, determine eligibility according to established criteria, select recipient/s, and organize and implement the ceremony for the awarding of the medallion.
- (b) Procedures:
- (i) The triennial nomination and award processes remain expressly apolitical and free of any other influence that might compromise the integrity or value of the award.
 - (ii) Procurement of the Award Materials:

The award includes a medallion and plaque, each engraved with a figure of Palulap standing near the prow of a canoe, with the guiding stars in the sky and an island on the horizon. The reverse side of the medallion and the lower left corner of the plaque display the Faculty Senate logo. The name of the recipient is engraved on the plaque. The award also includes a citation that refers to the

⁷ In accordance with the first point of the *Mission of the Faculty Senate*. See *Faculty Senate Handbook*, page 5.

recipient by name and summarizes the extraordinary contributions of the recipient.

(c) Eligibility criteria:

- (i) The Palulap Medallion is given only to an individual or organization not employed, contracted, or enrolled at the University that has gone well beyond the requirements or duties of office to defend or promote academic freedom, institutional integrity, institutional and individual autonomy, and shared academic governance through service or actions external to the University.
- (ii) Particular consideration is given to individuals or organizations that have protected these values when they have been in jeopardy or who have persevered in the face of strong opposition to protect or promote these fundamental and defining principles of the University.
- (iii) Consideration may also be given to individuals who by sustained dedication to these principles over an entire career or major portion of one have made an extraordinary contribution to the institutionalization of academic freedom, institutional integrity, institutional and individual autonomy, and shared academic governance at the University of Guam.
- (iv) Nominees may not be university faculty, staff, administrators, or students.
- (v) Former members of the faculty, staff or administration, or former students may be eligible but only for service or actions taken in roles they performed while not employed or enrolled at the university.
- (vi) Individuals holding or standing for election to public office in the Territory of Guam are not eligible for nomination.
- (vii) Current Board of Regents members are not eligible for nomination; however, former regents are eligible for nomination based on service or actions performed during their tenure on the Board.

(d) Nomination procedures:

- (i) Nominations are solicited triennially, but the award is granted only when the case presented with the nomination unequivocally reflects an extraordinary contribution. The triennial call for nominations is drafted by the SCIE and issued under the signature of the Senate president between 15 October and 15 November of the nominating year beginning in Fanuchånan, 2022. The deadline for nominations is 15 February of the following year.
- (ii) Any number of nominations may be made every three years, but no more than two awards may be granted in each cycle. The SCIE collects the nominations as they are submitted and reviews each package.
- (iii) Nominees who are not selected may be re-nominated for consideration in subsequent cycles. There is no limit to the number of times a person can be nominated, but subsequent nominations must be appropriately updated and justified each time they are submitted.
- (iv) The identities of all nominees remain confidential; only the names of those to whom the award is granted will be released.
- (v) An award may be granted posthumously.

- (vi) The award is presented by the Senate at a formal event of suitable decorum and solemnity. The identity of the recipient(s) is confidential until the moment that the award is announced by the sitting President of the Faculty Senate.
- (e) Receipt of applications and selection process:
 - Step 1—All hand-carried applications shall be submitted in a sealed envelope to the Senate Office or alternate designated office. The applications shall be checked for proper sealing (signature on the sealing line and tape placed over the signature) timed in, and a receipt given to the person delivering the application. If delivered by e-mail, then confirmation of receipt shall be sent immediately; if by postal service, then all attempts shall be made to deliver a confirmation receipt.
 - Step 2—All application packets shall be stored in a locked file in the Senate Office or in an alternate designated office.
 - Step 3—At the appointed meeting for selection of awardees, all the members of the SCIE must be present for the selection process to begin.
 - Step 4—The applications shall then be opened and the reading of the recommendation essay(s) and letters shall begin followed by the discussion of the candidates.
 - Step 5—The Committee chair shall as much as possible present each applicant’s name for discussion. Committee members shall then receive the opportunity to provide arguments in favor of or against the selection of each applicant based on the eligibility criteria and the evidence presented in the application packet.
 - Step 6—Should the Committee request an interview, and then the chairperson of the Committee will arrange for the interview as soon as possible. Selection discussions will resume after the interview(s) are concluded.
 - Step 7—After discussions are concluded, selection of the awardees will be made by group consensus. All members of the SCIE must agree on the names selected as awardees.
 - Step 8—The name(s) selected shall be brought to the Senate for approval.
 - Step 9—The ceremony to present the award will be a Faculty Assembly. The ceremony will include the presentation of the medallion and the plaque. It will be accompanied by a reading of the achievements of the awardee(s). There should also be a small brochure describing the Palulap Medallion Award and its purpose as well as listing the contributions of the awardees, as resources permit.
 - Step 10—The awardees’ portfolio of accomplishments will be kept in the University of Guam Library in a Palulap Medallion Recipients file.

B. Standing Committee on Faculty Excellence (SCFE)

1. Mission Statement

The mission of the Standing Committee on Faculty Excellence is to foster academic excellence and achievement in teaching, research, and service by the Faculty of the University of Guam.

2. Vision Statement

The SCFE is a proactive and creative force for professional development and recognition of the Faculty. As the university’s primary agent for peer recognition, it continually seeks new and better ways to foster Faculty interest, commitment, and achievement in academic endeavors. It is the

Faculty's chief advocate and partner with the administration for the development and institutionalization of incentives and policies to foster Faculty quality and improvement.

3. Roles and Responsibilities

In accordance with functions specified in the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, the committee's roles and responsibilities in academic affairs of the University are to:

- A.** Organize, budget for, coordinate, and conduct university-wide Faculty development activities that facilitate the development and improvement of the scholarly competence and skills of the Faculty, and foster collegiality (See Section 4.A, below);
- B.** Promote recognition of the achievements of the Faculty by reviewing and recommending procedures and standards for the Senate to use in bestowing the university-wide Charter Day Faculty awards in teaching, research, and service (see Section 4.B, below);
- C.** Establish procedures and standards for granting Faculty travel funds, and make recommendations for awards (See Section 4.C, below);
- D.** Develop procedures for welcoming and mentoring new and continuing Faculty (See Section 4.D, below).
- E.** Identify outstanding members of the Faculty qualified to serve on the Promotion & Tenure Committee and nominate them for election in accordance with Article V, Section J, "Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Process," Board–Union Agreement (See Section 4.E, below).
- F.** Perform other necessary functions relative to its areas of responsibility, including
 - (1) making recommendations regarding nominees for emeritus status.
 - (2) making recommendations or reviewing candidates for honorary degrees.

4. Procedures

A. Faculty Development Activities

No later than the end of September, the SCFE appoints a Faculty Development Committee (FDC) of three to five members. Members may be re-appointed from the previous year's committee. Continuation of at least one member is encouraged to provide continuity. The SCFE advises and assists the FDC as requested. Prior to the end of each academic year, the SCFE meets with the FDC or its chair to review the accomplishments of the past year and consider suggestions for the coming year.

B. Faculty Excellence Awards in Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Service

- (1) **Purpose.** The purpose of these awards is to acknowledge outstanding accomplishments of Faculty in the three endeavors of teaching, research/creative work, and service.
- (2) **Criteria.** The criteria for evaluation are contained Article V of the *Rules, Regulations & Procedures Manual*: Teaching (Section C.1), Research or Creative/Scholarly Activity (Section C.2), and Public and University Service (Sections C.3–C.6). The awards may be based on significant recent contributions, or on sustained superior long-term contributions for which no award has previously been made. In either case, the documentation must present compelling evidence that the applicant's contributions are truly exceptional and noteworthy, i.e., that they *exceed* the level of effort and standards of excellence expected merely to meet the established standards for continuing employment, tenure, or promotion. Although applications will be solicited annually, awards will be granted in any given category only when at least one application for the category meets the aforementioned criteria. No more than one award will be given in

- any one category in any given year, and no applicant may apply for an award in more than one category in any given year. Applicants who are not selected may reapply in subsequent years. Previous recipients are eligible to apply for subsequent awards, providing the activities or actions on which the application is based are separate from and were performed subsequent to those for which the previous award was granted.
- (3) Each recipient is to be honored by the awarding of a certificate and plaque, by having his/her name engraved on a perpetual plaque located in the central administration office, and by being provided a reserved parking space of his/her choice for a period of one (1) calendar year. In addition, each recipient receives a \$1,000 professional development grant. The grant may be used for:
- (a) the purchase of a computer, supplies, and accessories;
 - (b) membership fees in professional organizations in the recipient's academic area;
 - (c) the services of a research assistant;
 - (d) travel to present or attend a conference in the recipient's academic area office equipment;
 - (e) books or journal subscriptions; and/or
 - (f) other professional development needs not limited to those listed, as approved by the SVP.
- (4) The grant must be used within one year after the award is received, with a possible extension not to exceed six months. A report outlining how the grant was used and its impact on the Faculty member and the institution should be submitted to the SCFE and the SVP as soon as the grant is expended.
- (a) **Call for Nominations.** The Chair of the Faculty Senate Standing Committee on Faculty Excellence issues the call for nominations no later than the first business day in October.
 - (b) **Nomination Deadline and Contents.** Nominations may be made only by current full-time Faculty members, and must be received by the Senate secretary no later than the first business day of December. Self-nomination is not appropriate. Nominations must consist of the current nomination form which can be obtained from the Faculty Election Commission and supporting documentation, as specified below.
 - (c) **Supporting Documentation.** Supporting documentation must fit in a 1-inch ring binder and be tabbed so that the supporting documents can be readily identified for each of the contributions cited in the previous two sections above. (If documentation includes a published book, of which the applicant is the author, co-author, or editor, a copy of the book may accompany the 1-inch binder. Authors of chapters in edited books should place a copy of the chapter in the binder, if they wish it to be part of the documentation for the nomination.) Documentation for the teaching award may include copies of student course feedback forms and letters from students or colleagues. Documentation for the research/creative work award should include copies of relevant publications and/or portfolio items, and may also include letters or statements by colleagues with expertise in the nominee's field. Documentation for service may include letters or statements by colleagues and other individuals with direct knowledge of the actions or activities cited in the preceding sections. It may also include documentation of awards for service, and a comprehensive description

of the nominee's contributions and accomplishments in service to the university and/or community.

- (d) **Selection.** The SCFE shall convene a four-member Faculty Excellence Awards Selection Committee, consisting of the Senate Vice President, who shall chair the committee, the chair of the SCFE, who shall function as secretary of the committee, and two previous award winners. These two may include emeritus as well as current members of the Faculty. Should two such members not be available, the SCFE will appoint members of the Faculty with appropriate expertise. The Awards Selection Committee shall examine each nomination package for completeness and eligibility, and return any packages that do not meet the criteria to the person who submitted the nomination. The Awards Selection Committee will then identify the packages in each category that meet the criteria for exceptional merit as specified in paragraph 4.B.(2) above. If none meet the criteria, no award shall be given in that category. If only one in a given category meets the criteria, it shall be recommended for the award. If more than one in a given category meets the criteria, the Awards Selection Committee shall select the one that, in its judgment, has the highest merit.
- (e) **Presentation.** The Senate President will present the awards on behalf of the Senate.

C. *Faculty Development Travel Awards*

Two types of Faculty development awards are available each quarter of the fiscal year to assist Faculty in pursuing opportunities to present research, participate in panels, or gain new information.

- (1) **University Travel Grants** provide up to \$2100 to cover the cost of travel, lodging, or registrations, at the discretion of the user.
- (2) **United Space-Available Travel Grants** are for airfare only and are subject to the conditions of the donor. Specifically, the grants are for non-peak space-available travel, so are subject to blackout dates and other restrictions, which United may change without notice.
- (3) Procedures:
 - (a) The Call for Applications is issued by the Employee Development Council as specified in the *University Rules, Regulations, and Procedures Manual*.
 - (b) Applications are available through HRO and through the UOG website.
 - (c) The Standing Committee on Faculty Excellence serves as the review committee.
 - (d) Priority is given to those who have been formally invited or who have already had a proposed presentation or paper accepted for the conference or meeting. *The application must include clearly marked formal documentation (e.g., letter of invitation or acceptance) of the invitation, acceptance, and authorship status of the applicant. Letters received after the application deadline may be included in the application package, provided they are received by HRO at least one day before the review committee meets.* Applications without such documentation will still be considered, but will be treated as for attendance only. Priority will thus be assigned as follows:
 - (i) Authors of invited presentations or papers (with proof of invitation).
 - (ii) Authors of proposed presentations or papers that have been accepted by the meeting organizers (with proof of acceptance):
 - a. sole or principal authors of presentations or papers,

- b. presenting authors,
 - c. participants on panels or round tables, and then
 - d. co-authors (other than principal or presenting authors) of presentation or paper.
- (iii) Authors of submitted presentations or papers (acceptance pending):
- a. sole or principal authors of presentations or papers,
 - b. presenting authors,
 - c. participants on panels or round tables, and then
 - d. co-authors (other than principal or presenting authors) of presentation or paper.
- (iv) Attending only (maximum award limited to \$1050).
- (v) No one may receive more than \$2100 in University Travel Grant awards in a single fiscal year.
- (vi) Within each of the above categories and sub-categories, qualified first-time applicants for the University Travel Grant will be given preference over those who have received the award in previous years, and junior faculty will be given preference over senior faculty.
- (5) The SCFE conveys the list of recommended awardees to the SVP. Notification of awards is made through HRO after review of recommendations and applications by Administration.

D. New Faculty Orientation

At the beginning of each fall semester, the SCFE prepares and conducts an orientation program that includes the following

- (1) a welcome by the Senate President,
- (2) a presentation on the history, structure, and functions of the Faculty Senate,
- (3) a presentation by the Union leadership, and
- (4) a campus tour.

E. Promotion and Tenure Support

(1) ***Nomination of the Candidates for the Promotion & Tenure Committee.*** The SCFE maintains a list of at least eight eligible Faculty willing to serve of the P&T Committee. For each scheduled general election, the SCFE nominates two individuals from its pool for each open seat. In accordance with this responsibility, the SCFE reviews the list of Faculty maintained by the Senate Secretary, and selects the most highly qualified from among tenured Faculty of professor or equivalent rank, as specified in the Board–Union Agreement. It updates its list of candidates within the first six weeks of each semester of the academic year, and provides an informational copy of the list to the Senate, the Promotion & Tenure Committee, and the Union Board. The SCFE prepares a letter to be signed by the Senate President to notify each nominee of their selection.

(2) ***Criteria for selection of Faculty member for the pool of candidates.*** The pool will be composed of tenured members of the Faculty, of professor or equivalent rank (as

specified in the Board–Union Agreement), who in the judgment of the SCFE, meet the following criteria:

- (a) a record of exemplary performance as member of the Faculty,
- (b) a demonstrated commitment to the welfare and reputation of the University, and
- (c) a personal reputation for collegiality, reliability, and professional conduct.

- (3) ***Filling of Unscheduled Vacancies on the Promotion and Tenure Committee.*** Upon notification from the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee that a seat has become vacant, the SCFE nominates a member from the existing pool to fill the open seat for the remainder of the uncompleted term. Within five business days of the notification, the SCFE submits the name to the Faculty Senate to be placed on the agenda for approval at the next scheduled Senate meeting. Upon approval by the Senate, the nominee assumes his or her seat on the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

F. Honorary Degrees and Emeritus Status

Review and recommendation of candidates for honorary degrees is an annual process beginning with requests for nominations from faculty, which may be sent through college-level or Faculty Senate committees to the SCFE for review, with subsequent recommendation from the SCFE to the Faculty Senate. On endorsement by the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Senate President will transmit this endorsement to the UOG President for submission to the appropriate Board of Regents committee. Review and recommendation of Emeritus status follows the same path of invitation and review. The criteria for Emeritus candidate review, adopted by the Senate during Spring semester 2001, and the corresponding checklist for internal use during the review process are appended (Appendix J).

C. Standing Committee on Evaluation (SCE)

1. Mission Statement

The mission of the Standing Committee on Evaluation is to foster an institutional climate committed to ongoing assessment by producing valid evaluative instruments for faculty and administration that are linked to the highest possible standards for academic excellence. Evaluation instruments are intended to enhance self-knowledge and development and provide a basis for decisions regarding career advancement. Evaluation processes must meet the eight-fold criterion of (1) Brevity, (2) Clarity, (3) Necessity, (4) Participation, (5) Reliability, (6) Substance, (7) Utility, and (8) Validity.

2. Vision Statement

The SCE is the faculty's central and leading agent for the development and application of appropriate and effective tools of evaluation and assessment. It takes the initiative and collaborates closely with the administration to incorporate state-of-the-art tools and institutionalize best practices for evaluation of student, faculty, and administrator performance, and assessment of program quality and effectiveness.

3. Roles and Responsibilities

As charged by the Senate Bylaws, the SCE is responsible to:

- A. Develop and recommend procedures and standards evaluation of part-time and full-time Faculty.
- B. Develop and recommend procedures and standards for *Faculty Evaluation of Administrators*.
- C. Review and recommend revisions in the *Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System*.
- D. Perform other necessary functions relative to its areas of responsibility. This is interpreted to include:
 - (1) facilitating a general climate of evidence in academic efforts of faculty,
 - (2) assisting programs requesting consultation at the beginning of evaluation for program review, either annually or ongoing, or when a review is due to begin,
 - (3) facilitating, on request, the evaluation component of program recommendations coming to the Faculty Senate,
 - (4) making requests for modified and improved academic information from the UOG administration in support of program review or other faculty evaluation efforts, and
 - (5) making recommendations to the Faculty Senate for its representative on the Program Review Team under UCRC.

4. Procedures

A. Student Feedback on Instruction

The development of procedures and standards for student evaluation of part-time and full-time faculty is an ongoing process involving faculty input as well as suggestions from students, staff, administration, and consultants.

B. Administrative Evaluation

The development of procedures and standards for the faculty evaluation of administrators includes an annual evaluation instrument, the Evaluation of Administrator Performance (EAP), which is given to all eligible faculty in the latter half of the Spring semester each year, often in concert with a faculty election. The EAP was developed with full input from faculty, Faculty Senate, administration, and staff in the Spring Semester of 2001 and revised in Spring 2004 and 2005 to reflect UOG's reorganization and to include new administrative positions. The EAP is administered by the Faculty Election Commission, then summarized and reported by the SCE to the Faculty and Administration. An open-ended question at the end of the EAP allows further modification suggestions from faculty completing this instrument each year. The full, retyped comments are transmitted with a summary to the supervisors of administrators evaluated for confidential review with their supervisees. Confidential data from evaluation of administrator performance will be sealed in an envelope, marked confidential and stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Senate Secretary's office. A copy of the revised EAP instrument is appended (Appendix G).

C. Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System

Review and recommendation of revisions of the Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System (CFES), includes ongoing collection of suggestions from faculty, other university stakeholders, and consultants. The review will take into account other comparable university models plus accreditation feedback. Such review is continuous.

D. Faculty Senate Representative on the Program Review Team

Members of the Program Review Team review the self-study of the academic programs, the recommendations of the AAC and the Dean and make recommendations to the SVP-ASA. One of the four members of the Program Review Team is selected by SCE. According

to the criteria set by SCE, former or current full-time or part-time faculty from the same or a related field who are willing to serve on the Program Review Team are eligible to be nominated.

Selection procedures: Standing Committee on Evaluation (SCE) solicits nominations of potential reviewers for upcoming academic programs. Nominations for program review teams should accompany the candidate's consent to serve on the program review team and a brief description of their qualifications. SCE maintains a list of nominees, selects the most qualified reviewer from among the nominees for each review, and submits the name to the Faculty Senate for approval. Following approval, the reviewer receives a package from review committee explaining the program review process, team members' roles and responsibilities, proposed timelines for the review in addition to the program self-study.

D. Standing Committee on University Budget and Planning (SCUBP)

1. Mission Statement

The mission of the Standing Committee on University Budget and Planning is to participate in the budgeting process on behalf of the Senate and to review, report on, and/or propose Senate action on matters that affect the University's academic, physical, and aesthetic resources.

2. Vision Statement

The Standing Committee on University Budget and Planning strives to be the informed voice of faculty through its active participation in its designated roles and responsibilities.

3. Roles and Responsibilities

A. Review and make recommendations for the budgeting of all university funds including:

- (1) proposed annual budget and revised budgets submitted to the legislature,
- (2) budgets for indirect funds,
- (3) scholarship funds, and
- (4) annual audits.

B. Review and recommend revisions of university-wide planning activities and institutional master plans, including:

- (1) academic master plan,
- (2) physical master plan,
- (3) fiscal master plan,
- (4) IT master plan, and
- (5) enrollment management master plan.

C. Review and make recommendations on the University's planning databases, including those relating to or used by the:

- (1) Institutional Researcher,
- (2) Registrar,
- (3) Computer center,
- (4) Campus Safety office,
- (5) OSHA and ADA compliance offices, and
- (6) Building and grounds maintenance.

D. Act as Faculty Senate liaison to committees dealing with budget and planning, including the:

- (1) University Planning and Budgeting Advisory Committee (UPBAC),
- (2) University Technology Advisory Committee (UTAC),
- (3) BOR Committee on Budget and Fiscal Planning, and
- (4) BOR Committee on Facilities

E. Perform other necessary functions relative to its area of responsibilities, including:

- (1) Make recommendations to the Faculty Senate on budget and planning indicators.
- (2) Monitor annual program expenditures and financial trends.

4. Procedures

A. Monitor progress, inform the Senate, and ensure that the Senate maintains file copies of the following documents.

- (1) Master Plans:
 - (a) Academic master plan,
 - (b) Physical master plan,
 - (c) Fiscal master plan, and
 - (d) Information technology master plans.
- (2) Status reports:
 - (a) Campus crime report,
 - (b) Campus safety report,
 - (c) Parking facilities,
 - (d) EEO/ADA Compliance, and

Others to include: enrollment, faculty recruitment, facilities management, major new initiatives such as distance education, capital campaigns.

B. The committee will present the Faculty Senate with a State-of-University Budgeting and Planning report during the Fall semester of each academic year.

C. This State-of-University Budgeting and Planning report will be posted on the Senate website after its approval by the Faculty Senate. Hard copies of the approved report will be forwarded to academic administrators' offices, the RFK Library, UOG-GFT Office.

D. The committee will conduct faculty hearings on proposals for the annual institutional budget (prior to Board of Regents review and action):

- (1) Selected budgeting and planning issues (as described in the State-of-University Budgeting and Planning report).
- (2) Comments and suggestions compiled from the faculty hearings will be used to prepare proposals for Senate action.

XIII. MISSIONS, ROLES AND PROCEDURES OF THE SENATE’S ACADEMIC REVIEW COMMITTEES

A. The Mission of the Academic Review Committees

Under Article IX of the Senate Bylaws, the Senate charters and maintains three academic review committees: The Undergraduate Curricula Review Committee, the Graduate Curricula Review Committee, and the General Education Review Committee. The functions established for the review committees in the bylaws are encapsulated in the Mission Statement:

The mission of the Senate’s Academic Review Committees is to provide *objective, independent peer review* of faculty proposals and reports regarding the curricula for undergraduate, graduate, and general education curricula, in accordance with the provisions of Article IX of the Senate Bylaws. The intended effect of such review is to strengthen proposals and ensure informed decisions regarding them.

1. Specific Areas of Responsibility of the Academic Review Committees

A. Undergraduate and Graduate Curricula Review Committees

Under Article IX of the Senate Bylaws, the Undergraduate and Graduate Curricula Review Committees are specifically responsible for review of recommendations and reports concerning programs, including (1) policies and standards for admission and degree requirements, (2) new courses and programs, (3) substantive changes (see Appendix P for definition of substantive changes) in existing courses and programs, (4) ongoing assessment practices, (4) periodic program reviews, and (5) other recommendations and reports relevant to the curricula. They also conduct a general review of the Undergraduate Catalogue and Graduate Bulletin, respectively, near the end of each cycle of publication, just before it goes to the administration for approval. They may also perform other necessary functions relative to their areas of responsibility.

B. General Education Review Committee

Under Article IX of the Senate Bylaws, the General Education Review Committee (1) provides faculty review and oversight of the University General Education curriculum, (2) reviews and recommends faculty proposals to include courses in the General Education curriculum, (3) reviews the portions of the Undergraduate Catalogue, (4) reviews and responds to student learning outcome measures relevant to general education, (5) reviews the FY101 course, (6) provides recommendations to the Administration for developing and enhancing General Education at the University, and (7) recommends procedures for and coordinates ongoing assessment and periodic reviews of the General Education curriculum. It may also perform other necessary functions relative to its areas of responsibility.

C. Functions residing with the College Academic Affairs Committees

Under Article IX of the Senate Bylaws, functions not assigned to the Senate’s review committees are left to the college academic affairs committees and other appropriate organs of academic governance within the university and the colleges. Functions recognized for such entities include, but are not limited to:

- (1) making recommendations to the Administration concerning academic programs, including policies and standards for admission and degree requirements, new programs and courses, and substantive changes in existing programs and courses;

- (2) making recommendations to the Administration for development and implementation of assessment plans;
- (3) accomplishing periodic reviews of degree programs in accordance with University Program Review Guidelines;
- (4) conducting a detailed review of the portions of the Undergraduate Catalogue and Graduate Bulletin within the purview of the college, near the beginning of the annual review cycle;
- (5) recommending technology and facilities needed to support the curricula; and
- (6) recommending and reviewing policies for development and use of the library collection to support the curricula.

B. Roles of the Academic Review Committees, Senate, and SVP in the Academic Review Process

The role of the Academic Review Committees is analogous to the role of peer reviewers selected by an editor of an academic journal to review, comment, and advise the authors and editors on the content of a manuscript submitted for publication by an author. In this context, the role of the Senior Vice President is analogous to that of the journal's senior editor, who makes the final decision regarding publication. The SVP is thus the approving authority for academic proposals. The Senate's role is analogous to the editorial board's role of ensuring the integrity of the process. Endorsement by the Senate is the Senate's certification that it is satisfied that the established rules and procedures for academic review have been followed.

C. General Procedures of the Academic Review Committees

1. Routine Scheduling and Reporting

In accordance with Article IX of the Senate Bylaws, at the first Senate session of the fall semester, each review committee submits to the Senate its schedule for the remainder of the academic year. At each scheduled session of the Senate, each review committee reports on the actions taken since the previous Senate session, and submits approved minutes of any meetings, which the Senate Secretary files.

2. Review, Recommendation, And Endorsement of Academic Proposals And Reports

A. College AAC Recommendation

Proposals and reports on academic matters are recommended by the colleges, through their respective Academic Affairs Committees (see Bylaws of the College AACs in Appendix M), to the Senior Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs, who approves them based on the information and advice provided by independent academic reviewers. Proposals and reports submitted for SVP approval are transmitted using the standard university forms which can be obtained from the SVP's office or downloaded from

<http://www.uog.edu/administration/academic-and-student-affairs/faculty-forms>.

B. Committee Review

The review committees review academic proposals or reports recommended to the administration by the college academic affairs committees, and provide comments and suggestions regarding the proposal or report. Each review includes opportunities for the authors

and other contributors to respond. When the review process is complete, the college academic affairs committee and the review committee forward their respective reports to the Senate. Reviews are conducted in accordance with the University of Guam Undergraduate Program Review and Administrative Procedures, August 2012 (Appendix K) and University of Guam Graduate Program Review Handbook and Administrative Procedures, August 2012 (Appendix L). Specific steps and timing of the review process are contained in the Senate’s “Academic Decision Making” at Appendix B.5.

C. Senate Endorsement of Proposals and Reviews

The Senate monitors the process and, based on its confidence that processes and procedures have been duly followed, endorses the academic proposal or report and forwards it and the reviewers’ report to the approving authority, i.e., the Administration. Thus both the original proposal/report and the review are transmitted to and from the Senate as a package. Senate endorsement of the package certifies Faculty satisfaction and confidence in the quality and integrity of the development and review process.

The Senate does not co-opt the functions of the review committees nor presume to conduct a redundant or separate review of proposals or reports, nor to resolve disagreements between the authors/originators, recommending body, and the reviewers. The Senate may, however, share its own observations or concerns, or attach appropriate conditions or qualifications to its endorsement. *This is a collaborative rather than adversarial process* in which the authors of academic proposals or reports and the reviewers work toward the common goal of producing a product that serves the best interest of the institution, while the Senate monitors and guarantees the integrity of the process.

D. Document Management

Documents coming from the colleges for review by the Senate’s Academic Review Committees must be delivered in person to the Senate Secretary (SBPA Bldg. 2nd Floor, Rm. 243, Ext. 2998). The documents coming to the Senate must be attached to a letter of transmittal addressed as follows:

To: SVP-ASA—for Approval

Via: Faculty Senate—for Endorsement

Via: [Appropriate review committee]—for Review

From: [Originator (most often a college AAC)]

The letter of transmittal should contain a brief explanation, including a background statement of 200 words or fewer (See Appendix P), that will go onto the Senate agenda (See Appendix F.6). The background statement is an abstract, such as one would prepare for a professional paper, which briefly summarizes the purpose and content of the proposal, and provides other pertinent information regarding the history or context of the proposal, if necessary or helpful. The appropriate university form (see paragraph A, above), bearing the original signatures, must also be attached to the letter of transmittal.

Upon receipt of the letter of transmittal with the attached forms and proposal, the Senate Secretary prepares a receipt with a date/time stamp, gives the receipt to the person delivering the

document, and places the original document in a secure file. The Senate Secretary makes the necessary copies to support committee review and Senate endorsement.

Upon Senate endorsement, the Senate Secretary prepares a Senate Letter of Transmittal (See Appendix F.4) and attaches the original set of documents (i.e., the originator's letter of transmittal, university forms with original signatures, and the original copy of the proposal) to it. The Senate Letter of Transmittal is signed by the Senate President to certify the Senate's endorsement. The Senate Secretary hand-carries the Senate Letter of Transmittal and its attachments to the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs, and obtains a receipt from the staff member taking delivery.

XIV. CEREMONIES

The Faculty and its leadership should play visible roles at university ceremonies, particularly the commencement ceremony. The participation of the Faculty should dignify the ceremony and enhance the public esteem of the institution and its degrees. To this end, the Faculty Senate establishes and supports the following ceremonial practices.

A. Faculty Marshal

One of the criteria of effective Faculty senates listed by the American Association of Higher Education and National Network of Faculty Senates (see Section IV) is that its "leadership plays a visible role in the ceremonial and symbolic affairs of the campus." In keeping with this principle it is appropriate that the Faculty Senate President, as the academic leader of the Faculty, represent the Faculty as Faculty Marshal at each commencement ceremony and other ceremonies when faculty are present. Should the Senate President not be available, the role will fall successively to the Vice President, recorder, and chair of each standing committee in the order the committees are listed in the bylaws.

B. Annual Faculty Recognition Day

The university hosts a day each year, normally near the end of March, when Faculty are recognized for a variety of awards. These include the Faculty Excellence Awards in Teaching, Research, and Service (XII, Section B.4.B, above). These awards are presented by the Faculty Senate President.

C. Conferring of Graduate Diplomas at Commencement Ceremonies

When possible, Faculty advisors should accompany their students and walk with them in the processional, on the student's right-hand side. Immediately following the presentation of the diploma by the dean of the respective college, the advisor places ceremonial hood on the recipient of the degree.

D. Palulap Award Ceremonies

Procedures for the Palulap Award are contained in Section XII.A.3.E.2. For the award ceremony, the entire Senate, including the Review Committee Chairs, participates in the ceremony, dressed in academic attire.

E. Senate Inaugurations

The University President is invited each year to administer the oath of office to the newly elected members of the Senate and the newly elected Senate officers, at the Senate's inaugural meeting. At this time, one of the previous Senate officers also presents each new member with a lei. When new

members of the Senate are seated at other times, the Senate President administers the oath. After the oath of presented to new members, the Senate Recorder, presents the new member with a lei.

XV. REFERENCES

- Burke, E. 1774. Speech to the Electors of Bristol. *The Works of the Right Honourable Edmund Burke*. London, H.G. Bohn. 1: 446-48.
- Robert, H.M., III and W.J. Evans. 2000. *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised, 10th Edition*, Reading, MA, Perseus Books.
- Zimmerman, D.P. 1997. *Robert's Rules in Plain English*: NY, Harper Perennial.

XVI. LIST OF APPENDICES

Senate Documents

- A. History of the Faculty Senate**
 - 1. Development of the University of Guam Faculty Senate: A personal recollection, by Steven Amesbury
 - 2. Inauguration of the First Faculty Senate: Remarks by Judge Steven S. Unpingco
 - 3. Inaugural Remarks for Faculty Senate Inauguration, January 19, 2001, by Dr. John W. Jenson, President
 - 4. Faculty Senate Charter: BOR Resolution 01-01, 18 January 2001
- B. Senate Organization**
 - 1. Faculty Senate Bylaws (as amended 16 April 2015)
 - 2. UOG Faculty Senate Code of Professional Conduct, 23 March 2006
 - 3. Senate Oath of Office
 - 4. Memorandum of Agreement between the University of Guam Administration and the Faculty Senate, 6 May 2004
 - 5. Academic Decision Making: Steps in the process
 - 6. Committee-based Structure of the Senate
- C. Faculty Senate Membership (Senate and Review Committees)**
- D. Senate Internal Rules and Procedures**
 - 1. Special Rules of the University of Guam Faculty Senate, as amended 13 November 2014
 - 2. Faculty Senate Resolution Relative to Establishing the Palulap Medallion and Concept Paper for the University of Guam Faculty Senate Palulap Medallion
 - 3. Disposition of Business in the Faculty Senate
 - 4. Terminating Discussion and Extending Discussion
 - 5. Preparing and Revising Draft Documents, and Amending Finished Documents
 - 6. Resource Materials on Parliamentary Procedure for The University of Guam Faculty Senate, 28 April 2015, by Dr. John Jenson and Dr. Don Rubenstein
- E. Latest Annual Senate Reports**
 - 1. Faculty Senate President's Address, 16 April 2015, by Dr. Nicholas J. Goetzfridt
 - 2. SEC Report on Senate Organizational Effectiveness: Evaluation of Senate Effectiveness, September 2003
 - 3. 2013 State of the Institution Report, 16 May 2013, by Dr. Kyle D. Smith
- F. Sample Senate Administrative Documents**
 - 1. Memorandum (Letter of Transmittal), by the Faculty Senate President for the Senate
 - 2. Senate Executive Committee: to the Senate and Review Committee members
 - 3. Faculty Senate Resolution 14-01, 13 November 2014
 - 4. Memorandum (Letter of Transmittal to the SVP), by the Faculty Senate President for the Senate
 - 5. Letterhead, 14th Faculty Senate
 - 6. Agenda, Session 1, 11th Faculty Senate, 5 May 2011
 - 7. Minutes, Session 7, 12th Faculty Senate, 31 January 2013

Committee Documents

- G. Call for an Evaluation of Administrator Performance (EAP) and Qualtrics Survey**

External Documents

- H.** Code of Faculty Ethics
- I.** Public Law 26-24 and Bylaws of the UOG Regent Nominating Council, as amended 4 April 2003
- J.** Board of Regents Resolution 03-43, Relative to Approving the Recommendation of the Academic, Personnel and Tenure Committee during its meeting of December 12, 2003 on the Emeritus(a) Professor Policy and Amendment to the Rules, Regulations and Procedures Manual as Article V.A. 13
- K.** University of Guam, Academic and Student Affairs, Undergraduate Program Review Handbook, August 2012
- L.** University of Guam, Academic and Student Affairs, Graduate Program Review Handbook, August 2012
- M.** Bylaws of the College, School, Unit AACs
 1. Bylaws of the Academic Affairs Committee of the University of Guam's College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences (CLASS), 15 February 2005
 2. Bylaws for the CNAS-AAC, 17 March 2005
 3. By-Laws of the Learning Resources Academic Affairs Committee, 2 May 2005
 4. Bylaws of the Academic Affairs Committee of the University of Guam's School of Business and Public Administration (SBPA), 25 November 2008
 5. SNHS
 6. Bylaws of the Academic Affairs Committee of the University of Guam's School of Education (SOE), 20 May 2008
 7. Bylaws of the University of Guam School of Engineering Academic Affairs Committee
- N.** Faculty Election Procedures, as corrected 23 January 2015
- O.** Procedures for Program or Course Substantive Changes, endorsed by the Faculty Senate 18 September 1993, approved by the SVP 28 September 1993
- P.** Letter of Transmittal for a Request for a New Course