

**Post Tenure Review Policies**  
Department of Biology  
College of Science

**Purpose of Post-Tenure Review:** In accordance with University Rule 12.06.99.MI and University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01, Post-Tenure Review of the tenured faculty in the Biology Department is required. The purpose is to promote continued academic professional development, and to insure tenured faculty in the department maintain a satisfactory or better level of performance and productivity. Post-tenure review also enables a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of performance and productivity.

**Period of Evaluation:** Every 3 years after the granting of tenure, or following an academic promotion, as a component of the Annual Review.

**Peer Evaluation Committee:** The Annual Review Committee (ARC) is composed of the Associate Head of Operations (ex officio and voting member) and 6 tenured faculty elected by the department, with no fewer than 3 Full Professors. Members will serve a three-year term.

**Performance to be Evaluated:** The individual criteria ratings in teaching, research, and service from the Annual Review, along the Department Head evaluation report of each tenured faculty member over a 3-year period will be used to make a determination of the merit of the faculty member's performance and accomplishments in Post-Tenure Review.

**Report:** A separate statement on Post-Tenure Review will be provided every 3 years in the Annual Report for each faculty member. The Post-Tenure Review will evaluate the 3 years prior to the review year (e.g. an Annual Review for the year of 2020 would include a Post-Tenure Review statement for years 2017-2019).

Faculty will be rated as *Satisfactory*, *Needs Improvement*, or *Unsatisfactory* in each category of research/scholarship, teaching, and service.

**Satisfactory:** The faculty member has maintained a *Satisfactory* rating or better in each individual category of teaching, research/scholarship, and service from the Annual Report evaluation over the 3-year period, or has provided evidence of meeting milestones from a *Needs Improvement* rating in any category.

**Needs Improvement:** The faculty member has one rating of *Needs Improvement* in the individual categories of teaching, research/scholarship, or service from the Annual Report evaluation over the 3-year period.

**Unsatisfactory:** The faculty member has received one or more *Unsatisfactory* ratings, or two or more *Needs Improvement* ratings, in the individual categories of

teaching, research/scholarship, or service from the Annual Report evaluation over the 3-year period, and has not provided evidence of meeting milestones from an improvement plan.

Overall performance in Post-Tenure Review will be reported as being either *Satisfactory*, *Needs Improvement*, or *Unsatisfactory*.

1. Specific deficiencies will be defined in writing for a ranking of *Needs Improvement* in any single category in the Post-Tenure Review. This will inform the development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration with the faculty member and department head as defined in the Biology Department Annual Review Policy.
2. A finding of two or more *Needs Improvement*, or one *Unsatisfactory* in the individual categories of teaching, research/scholarship, or service in the Post-Tenure Review (above) shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the Biology Department Annual Review Guidelines. Either outcome will result in an overall *Unsatisfactory* Post-Tenure Review rating and initiate a Professional Development Review.

**Outcome:** A Professional Development Review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives an overall *Unsatisfactory* post-tenure review. The Department Head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member may be exempted from review upon recommendation of the Department Head and approval of the Dean when substantive mitigating circumstances exist.