



TO: Dr. Marianne Poxleitner, President of Faculty Senate
FROM: Sacha Kopp, Provost
RE: Faculty Senate Resolution on the Draft Handbook
CC: Vice Provost Mia Bertagnolli
DATE: February 15, 2024

Dear Dr. Poxleitner,

Per your request, I provide below further elaboration and clarification on several passages in the 2023 draft of the *Faculty Handbook*. On February 14, the Faculty Senate passed the following resolution:

Resolution: The senate requests the FHC, in coordination with Provost Kopp, provide documented interpretations of specific language in the 2023 Faculty Handbook Draft (v.19.4):

- *Section 304.06 clarifying the meaning of “exceptional cases” for early application for tenure and promotion*
- *Section 306.01 clarifying post tenure review criteria*
- *Section 306.04 clarifying the deans authority and post tenure review*
- *Section 306.05 clarifying what constitutes two consecutive negative post tenure reviews*

Here are specific responses to your inquiry. I am happy to provide these administrative interpretations of how the handbook would be put into operation should the handbook be approved by both the faculty and the Trustees.

304.06: Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Q – What does it mean for a candidate to be “exceptional” in terms of applying for promotion and tenure a year early?

Section 304.06 states “Tenure is one of the most important commitments which Gonzaga makes to its faculty. The decision to confer or deny promotion to Associate Professor with tenure is ordinarily made in the last year before the completion of the probationary period. This means that an individual would apply for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in the Fall of the individual’s sixth year. In exceptional cases candidates may present their application one year early; a candidate who applies early for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and is unsuccessful is not precluded from applying again at the normal time in Fall semester in the sixth year.”

Answer - If a candidate has met the requirements for tenure and promotion a year early, they are considered exceptional. Therefore, if the criteria as stated in Section 304 and the unit guidelines have been met, a candidate may choose to apply after conferring with their chair.

306.01 Post tenure review criteria

Q – Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (section 306), identifies section 300.05 as the criteria for the review of tenured faculty members and also indicates that faculty will be evaluated in all four areas (teaching, advising, scholarly/creative work, academic citizenship and professional service). How are the two sets of criteria applied for post-tenure review?

Answer - Review of tenured faculty is necessary over all areas. For those seeking further promotion (to full professor) the totality of one's future application should be reviewed, and the faculty member is entitled to constructive feedback, per Section 306.01(a). Even for faculty promoted to full professor, reviewing all four areas is of importance to assess the balance of duties an individual contributes to arrive at 100% (e.g., more service, less advising, or more service/teaching, less research, etc.). The evaluation in the four areas (teaching, scholarly/creative work, advising, academic citizenship and professional service) are formative, whereas only the review based on a subset of faculty responsibilities, those found in Section 300.05, may potentially lead to a cause for termination (failure to perform duties). Only after the extensive review and (unsuccessful) attempts at formative remediation in Sections 306.05-306.06 (based on the criteria of Section 300.05) could this trigger the definition of "failure to perform duties" in Section 310.02(b).

306.04 Post tenure review and action of the dean

Q - Can a dean take a chairs/departments positive post-tenure review assessment and change it to a lower assessment? If so, what are the consequences?

Answer – A dean cannot change a unit's post-tenure review assessment to a lower assessment, but the dean can provide their own assessment at a lower rating in the dean's memo. Such an assessment by a dean could figure into subsequent evaluations and managed per 306.05, but by itself would not trigger section 310 (dismissal). However, there is a record of the issue on file for subsequent evaluations. Section 306.04 reads: "If the dean agrees with a Does Not Meet Expectations assessment of an aspect of the faculty member's file, or if the dean disagrees with a reviewer(s) positive assessment and wishes to revise to a lower assessment of an aspect of the faculty member's file, the dean shall file the report for future reference and administrative access."

306.05 Addressing Identified Areas of Concern

Q - Can consecutive "Does Not Meet Expectations" evaluations in different areas be used to trigger termination for cause?

Answer - Per 306.05, the faculty member who received a "Does Not Meet Expectations" rating in a given area is to work with their chair or dean to develop an improvement plan to enable the faculty member to achieve a "Meets Expectations" rating (or higher) in that area no later than by the next evaluation. According to 306.05(a), this would address the area of concern. Therefore, a new "Does Not Meet Expectations" in a different area in a subsequent evaluation would be addressed as a new matter