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**Purpose of Post-Tenure Review:** In accordance with University Rule 12.06.99.MI and University SAP 12.06.99.M1, post-tenure review is required of all tenured faculty at Texas A&M University. In the Department of Biology, post-tenure review’s purpose is to assess continued academic professional development and to ensure tenured faculty in the department maintain a minimum of satisfactory 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 six 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 is composed of the Associate Department Head for Faculty Affairs (Chair and voting member) and faculty members elected by the departmental faculty. These elected members include at least one tenured faculty member for every 9 tenure track faculty members in the department and not less than 60% Professor rank composition. Also, the elected committee will include at least one academic professional track (APT) faculty member for every 9 APT faculty members in the department. Elected members will serve a three-year term and can be re-elected.

**Performance to be Evaluated:** The three-year period prior to Post-Tenure Review will be used to determine the merit of the faculty member’s performance and accomplishments in Post-Tenure Review. The individual criteria ratings in teaching, research, and service from the Annual Review Process (see the Annual Review Bylaws), along with the Department Head evaluation report with be used to assess.

**Report:** Faculty will receive an additional statement on Post-Tenure Review every six years in the Annual Report. The Post-Tenure Review will evaluate the three-year period prior to the Post-tenure review year (*e.g.*, an Annual Review for the year 2020 would include a Post-Tenure Review statement for years 2017-2019). Refer to the Annual Review bylaws for evaluation criteria.

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 research/scholarship, teaching, and service from the Annual Report evaluation over the three-year period, or has provided evidence of meeting milestones from a previous *Needs Improvement* rating in any category.

**Needs Improvement:** The faculty member has one rating of *Needs Improvement* in the individual categories of research/scholarship, teaching, or service from the Annual Report evaluation over the three-year period and has not yet formulated a plan or has not yet met the milestones for addressing this rating.

**Unsatisfactory:** The faculty member has received one or more *Unsatisfactory* ratings, or two or more *Needs Improvement* ratings, in the individual categories of research/scholarship, teaching, or service from the Annual Report evaluation over the three-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.
   1. If a development plan was implemented in accordance with the Department of Biology annual review process and is currently in process or that the implemented plan yielded a satisfactory, or greater, ranking in the two subsequent years then no new plan is needed.
      1. Per University policy, faculty remain on a six-year cycle for post-tenure review and the cycle is not reset upon successful completion of a development plan.

2. A finding of two or more *Needs Improvement*, or one *Unsatisfactory* in the individual categories of research/scholarship, teaching, or service in the Post-Tenure Review (above) will state the reasoning 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 they are subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member may be exempted from Professional Development Review upon recommendation of the Department Head and approval of the Dean when substantive mitigating circumstances exist but a development plan should still be implemented to resolve the *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory* ratings.

**Professional Development Plan**: In accordance with Section 5 of University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01, the Professional Development Plan will indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member’s performance will be remedied. The plan will list specific deficiencies, define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies, outline activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes, identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan, set timelines for achieving goals of the plan, and indicate the criteria for assessment in annual review of the progress in the plan.

**Professional Development Review:** In accordance with Section 4 of University SAP 12.06.99.M1, the Professional Development Review will be conducted by an ad hoc, 3 member, faculty review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three-member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the Dean or a person delegated by the Dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities. This procedure, and what is required, can be found in Section 4 of SAP 12.06.99.M1.