Arnold School of Public Health
Annual Review Procedures
October 2026

Purpose of the Annual Review

The annual review assesses the faculty member's performance in teaching, research/scholarship, and service over the past calendar year and provides specific evaluative feedback. The review is sufficiently detailed to encourage and support the faculty member's continued professional growth and development. Faculty who are in administrative roles will also receive feedback from the Dean or Chair about their administrative performance.

Faculty Members Who Receive an Annual Review

All faculty members, regardless of rank, track, or tenure status, including those in departmental and school-level administrative positions, must receive a written annual review.

Exception to the Annual Review Procedures

For **tenure-eligible faculty members undergoing their tenure-progress review,** the Arnold School of Public Health (ASPH) Tenure and Promotion Committee (TPC) annual review is replaced with the ASPH TPC tenure-progress review (see the *ASPH Tenure-Progress Review Procedures* for more details). However, the Department Chair will still conduct an annual review meeting for those faculty members.

Annual Review Policies, Procedures, and Forms

All Arnold School of Public Health (ASPH) guidance and forms are located on the ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs web page:
https://www.sc.edu/study/colleges_schools/public_health/internal/faculty_staff/administrative_departments/faculty_affairs/index.php

USC Columbia policies are available in the Faculty Manual and other documents on the USC Office of the Provost website:
https://sc.edu/about/offices_and_divisions/provost/index.php

When ASPH procedures and USC policies conflict, USC policies prevail.

Overview of Annual Review Responsibilities

The following table outlines who is responsible for conducting annual reviews and what is expected in the review:

Faculty Member Being Reviewed	Person (or Group) Conducting the Annual Review	Other Comments
Tenure-eligible faculty members who are not undergoing their tenure-progress review and tenured associate professors	Arnold School of Public Health Tenure and Promotion Committee (ASPH TPC)	ASPH TPC provides a written review that assesses progress toward tenure and/or promotion.
Tenure-eligible faculty members and tenured associate professors	Department Chair	Department Chair meets with faculty to discuss ASPH TPC annual review. If desired, Department Chair may also use a departmental evaluation instrument to help guide salary and merit decisions.
Tenured full professors who do not serve as Department Chairs	Department Chair	Department Chair provides a written review of performance in the faculty member's assigned responsibilities during the prior year and meets with faculty to discuss this annual review.
Professional-track faculty members	Administrative head(s) of the department, program, and/or center/institute in which the faculty member's appointment is based (primary supervisor)	Primary supervisor provides a written review that addresses productivity for the prior year and strategies to address individual and departmental goals for the upcoming year in the context of the specified distribution of effort. If preferred by the Department Chair and primary supervisor, a committee can prepare the written review. The primary supervisor meets with faculty to discuss the annual review.
*Department Chairs and administrators reporting directly to the Dean	Dean	Dean provides a written review that considers administrative responsibilities and distribution/quality of effort in teaching, research, and other service activities for the prior year.

*Every three years, Department Chairs and Assistant and Associate Deans undergo a 360 evaluation where peer administrators, faculty, staff, and students are invited to complete an evaluation. In the year they undergo this 360 evaluation, they will debrief with the Dean on the results and their performance over the prior year.

Annual Review Timelines

Dates in these timelines will be adjusted each year, as needed, based on the yearly calendar.

Timeline for Tenure-Eligible and Tenured Faculty

Date	Tenure-Eligible and Tenured Faculty
By February 1	Faculty members submit annual review materials to the ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs and their Department Chair *(note: Department Chairs can establish an earlier deadline).*
February 2-28	Departmental review panels meet to review annual review files of tenure-eligible faculty members and tenured associate professors and draft annual review letters.
By March 1	Department Chairs or review panel chairs send draft annual review letters from the departmental review panels to the ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs.
March 5	ASPH TPC meets to review annual review files for tenure-eligible faculty members and tenured associate professors.
By March 12	Departmental review panels revise annual review letters, based on feedback from the ASPH TPC, for tenure-eligible faculty members and tenured associate professors and send them to the ASPH TPC Chair via the ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs.
By April 9	The Dean shares disagreements, if any, with the ASPH TPC's overall performance rating for tenure-eligible faculty members and tenured associate professors with the ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs, and letters are revised by the ASPH TPC Chair as needed (see details in later sections).
By April 15	• The ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs emails the ASPH TPC annual review letters to the tenure-eligible faculty members and tenured associate professors. The following people are copied on these emails: ASPH TPC Chair (signatory on the letter), Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, Department Chair, and Dean. • The Department Chair completes annual review letters for tenured full professors.
*By May 15	Department Chairs meet with all faculty members regarding their evaluations. Department Chairs send annual review letters for tenured full professors to the ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs.
By June 15	Dean meets with Department Chairs and administrators (who report to the Dean) to share and discuss written evaluations.

*To assist with workflow demands, Department Chairs may wish to meet with tenured full professors earlier, as evaluations are based only on the Department Chair's review of their performance.

Timeline for Professional-Track Faculty

Date	Professional-Track Faculty
By February 1	Faculty members submit annual review materials to the ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs and their primary supervisor and/or Department Chair *(note: Primary supervisors/Department Chairs can establish an earlier deadline).*
By April 15	Primary supervisors complete annual review letters. If preferred by the primary supervisor and the Department Chair, a committee can write the annual review letters.
*By May 15	Primary supervisors meet with professional-track faculty members to share and discuss their annual review letters. Primary supervisors send annual review letters to the ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs.

*To assist with workflow demands, primary supervisors may wish to hold annual review meetings earlier, as evaluations are typically based only on the primary supervisor's review of their performance.

Required Materials for the Annual Review File

The annual review covers performance over the previous calendar year. All faculty members required to undergo an annual review will submit the following documents for their annual review file:

- Annual review form (including only activities from the previous calendar year except in tables that report cumulative counts)
    - This form is not required for tenured full professors. However, Department Chairs may elect to require tenured full professors to submit a summary of activities in a different format.
- Current curriculum vitae
- Student course evaluations from the previous calendar year (if applicable)
- Peer teaching evaluations from the previous calendar year (if applicable)
- Any additional materials requested by the Dean, Department Chair, Program Director, Center/Institute Director, and/or ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs (e.g., progress on development plan for faculty receiving an overall performance rating of 'unsatisfactory progress' on the previous year's review, appointment or reappointment letter for professional-track faculty)

Annual Review Procedures Specific to Tenure-Eligible Faculty and Tenured Associate Professors

The ASPH TPC provides written feedback to tenure-eligible faculty members who are required to undergo an annual review of their progress toward tenure and/or promotion. The ASPH TPC also provides written feedback to tenured associate professors regarding their progress toward promotion. The ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs manages this review. The required annual review documents are based on ASPH's tenure and promotion guidelines.

The possible ASPH TPC annual review ratings for research/scholarship, teaching, and service are:

- satisfactory progress
- satisfactory progress with commentary
- unsatisfactory progress

The ASPH TPC also determines an overall performance rating of 'satisfactory progress' or 'unsatisfactory progress.'

When concerns are identified, written feedback should include specific recommendations for improvement. The Department Chair and/or faculty mentors will monitor these recommendations, and they will be considered during the next annual review.

For tenured associate professors, the ASPH TPC may determine that while the faculty member is not making the progress needed for promotion to full professor in one or more areas, their performance at the current rank is nonetheless satisfactory progress. The use of such wording is permissible.

Annual reviews are conducted in three stages:

- ***Stage 1 – Departmental Panel Review***
  - The initial review of files is done at the department level by faculty in that department at a higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed. Each department will establish two departmental review panels.
    - One panel comprises all tenured associate and full professors in the department. This panel reviews the annual review files of their department's assistant professors.
    - The second departmental review panel comprises all full professors in the department. This panel reviews the annual review files of their department's associate professors.
  - Departmental review panels generally have a minimum of two weeks to review files and prepare draft annual review letters. Departments are responsible for setting panel review meetings.
  - All faculty on the panel are expected to review all annual review files for their respective panel(s) and participate in the panel review meeting. For each faculty member being reviewed, the Department Chair or review panel chair assigns a primary and secondary reviewer to draft the feedback letter, which is reviewed by the other panel members. The ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs will provide a template.
  - The Department Chair or review panel chair will invite the ASPH TPC Chair and the ASPH Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs to attend the departmental review panel meetings to answer questions and ensure consistency across panels.
  - Each departmental review panel is responsible for creating a draft annual review letter for each faculty member reviewed that reflects the panel's consensus. The Department Chair or review panel chair sends the draft letter to the ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs.

- ***Stage 2 – ASPH TPC Review***
  - At a date set by the ASPH TPC Chair (typically in early March), the full ASPH TPC meets to review all tenure-eligible faculty and tenured associate professors. The committee reviews all assistant professors first, followed by associate professors, and then tenure-eligible full professors. Only faculty members at a higher rank than those being reviewed are present for discussions.
  - Attendance by all ASPH TPC members is expected. If an ASPH TPC member must miss a meeting, the member will send an email explaining the absence to the ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs at least two weeks before the meeting date (except in the case of

emergencies).
    - The departmental review panel chair (or a designee) shares the names of faculty members evaluated as making 'satisfactory progress' in all areas. The full ASPH TPC does not discuss these files unless an ASPH TPC member requests discussion.
    - For any faculty member who was evaluated as 'satisfactory progress with commentary' or 'unsatisfactory progress' in any area of review (teaching, research, and/or service), the departmental review panel chair (or a designee) presents their ratings and rationale to the full ASPH TPC, along with the written recommendations for improvement.
    - For faculty members evaluated as 'satisfactory progress with commentary' or 'unsatisfactory progress' in any area of review, the ASPH TPC reviews the draft letters, provides input, and reaches consensus on the written recommendations. The departmental review panel chair (or a designee) revises the feedback letters to reflect the full ASPH TPC's agreed-upon wording and sends them to the ASPH TPC Chair via the Office of Faculty Affairs. The ASPH TPC Chair is responsible for final editing of all letters.

- ***Stage 3 – Dean Review***
    - The ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs sends ASPH TPC annual review letters to the Dean for review. The Dean assesses each faculty member's overall performance as 'satisfactory progress' or 'unsatisfactory progress.'
    - The final annual review overall performance rating is 'unsatisfactory progress' only if both the ASPH TPC and the Dean rate it as unsatisfactory progress; otherwise, it is satisfactory progress.
    - The annual review letter will be revised by the ASPH TPC Chair, as needed, to reflect the overall performance rating based on the ASPH TPC and the Dean's ratings. For example, if the ASPH TPC's overall performance rating is 'unsatisfactory progress' but the Dean's rating is 'satisfactory progress,' the annual review letter will be revised to reflect a 'satisfactory progress' rating.

The ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs emails each faculty member their final annual review letter by April 15. The ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs will copy the ASPH TPC Chair (signatory on the letter), the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, the respective Department Chair, and the Dean.

A faculty member requesting feedback regarding the outcome of the annual review should notify the ASPH TPC Chair.

- If the faculty member requests that a factual error be corrected (e.g., the publication count), the ASPH TPC Chair will, after checking the annual review file, correct the factual error as appropriate and send an updated annual review letter to the faculty member (with copies to the people named above).
- If a faculty member requests feedback regarding their overall performance rating, the ASPH TPC Chair will meet with them. The ASPH TPC Chair will consult with the departmental review panel and the Department Chair, as deemed necessary or helpful, and record in writing the nature of the discussions and the recommended action. A copy of this summary and recommendation is forwarded to the Dean and the Department Chair. The Dean, in consultation with the ASPH TPC Chair and the Department Chair, makes the final determination of the review outcome.

Procedures Following an Unsatisfactory Overall Performance Rating for Tenure-Eligible Faculty and Tenured Associate Professors

When a faculty member's annual review overall performance rating is 'unsatisfactory progress,' the recommendations in the annual review letter should be the basis for a formal development plan. These procedures also apply to faculty members making 'unsatisfactory progress' toward tenure and promotion in their tenure-progress review.

After consulting with the faculty member, the Department Chair will take the lead in establishing a development plan that is designed to restore the faculty member's overall performance to a satisfactory level. The written plan will include appointing a development committee to help the faculty member set goals to improve their performance. The members of the development committee must hold a rank equal to or higher than that of the faculty member. The development plan will form the basis for evaluations of the faculty member until satisfactory performance is restored. If the faculty member concurs with the plan, they will sign to indicate their understanding and agreement, and the signed copy will be sent to the ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs.

If the faculty member consults with the development committee but does not concur with the committee's proposed development plan, both the faculty member and the development committee shall submit proposed development plans to the Dean for final determination of the plan. If the faculty member refuses to consult with the development committee in designing a development plan, the development committee will write the plan and forward it to the Dean. The plan will be sent to the faculty member, who will be asked to sign to indicate they have reviewed it. If the faculty member refuses to sign, this refusal will be documented on the plan. The Dean and the ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs will retain a copy of the final version of the plan, with the faculty member's signature or refusal to sign.

After the implementation of the development plan and until the Dean determines that the faculty member's overall performance has been restored to a satisfactory level, the faculty member's annual review will include an assessment by their Department Chair and the development committee of the progress that the faculty member has made under the development plan. This assessment will be forwarded to the ASPH TPC. The ASPH TPC will review the assessment and state, in writing, whether it concurs with the assessment as a whole or in part. The assessment and the ASPH TPC's response will be forwarded to the Dean and the faculty member. The Dean will make the final determination on the faculty member's progress under the development plan and whether further measures are necessary to restore the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level.

Annual Review Procedures Specific to Tenured Full Professors

Full professors must submit their current curriculum vitae, student course evaluations from the previous calendar year (if applicable), peer teaching evaluations from the previous calendar year (if applicable), and additional materials requested by the Department Chair. While full professors are not required to complete the annual review form used for tenure-track assistant and associate professors, Department Chairs may elect to require tenured full professors to submit a summary of activities using a different format.

Based on these materials, the Department Chair provides a written review of the faculty member's performance in their assigned responsibilities during the prior year and meets with the faculty member to discuss this annual review. The Department Chair shares the written review with the faculty member and submits it to the ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs.

Annual Review Procedures Specific to Department Chairs and Administrators Who Report to the Dean

The Dean requests that Department Chairs and administrators who report to the Dean complete an annual review document and submit their current curriculum vitae. The annual review document is developed by the Dean. The Dean uses these materials to provide a written review that considers administrative responsibilities and distribution/quality of effort in teaching, research, and other service activities for the prior year.

Every three years, Department Chairs and other Administrators who report to the Dean undergo a 360 evaluation where peer administrators, faculty, staff, and students are invited to complete an evaluation. In the year they undergo this 360 evaluation, they will debrief with the Dean on the results and their performance over the prior year.

Annual Review Procedures Specific to Professional-Track Faculty

The annual review file is reviewed by the administrative head(s) of the department, program, and/or center/institute in which the faculty member's appointment is based. If preferred by the primary supervisor and Department Chair, a committee may conduct the annual review. See the *ASPH Document on Professional-Track Procedures* for more details about the annual review process.

The administrator (Department Chair, Center/Institute Director, and/or Program Director) who heads the unit that provides the majority of the funding supporting the faculty member's salary has the primary responsibility for reviewing and evaluating a professional-track faculty member's annual review file. If the faculty member's salary support is shared by more than one unit, all responsible administrators review the annual review file and provide comments to the administrator with primary responsibility for supervision of the faculty member. Further, while a single administrator has final authority for evaluating the annual review file (or a committee if preferred), the evaluation will reflect the consensus of those who provided comments.

Evaluation of a faculty member's annual review file will be based on the criteria and standards associated with their current rank, in the context of the distribution of effort defined in the appointment/reappointment letter, and on their individual goals and objectives. A faculty member should not be evaluated negatively for the absence of activities in an area that is not included in their assigned responsibilities or distribution of effort.

Each faculty member's overall performance will be rated as:

- **Outstanding**: The faculty member's performance significantly exceeds the minimally effective level of performance.
- **Excellent**: The faculty member exceeds the minimally effective level of performance.
- **Good**: The faculty member fully meets the minimally effective level of performance.
- **Fair**: The faculty member has accomplished less than the minimally effective level of

performance.

- **Unacceptable**: The faculty member has not met the minimally effective level of performance.

The primary supervisor of a professional-track faculty member will meet with the faculty member to communicate the administrative evaluation. During this meeting, the primary supervisor will note strengths and weaknesses in the faculty member's performance. In addition, goals and objectives for the next year will be developed. The subsequent annual review will focus on performance relative to these goals and objectives.

The primary supervisor will provide the written review to the faculty member and submit it to the ASPH Office of Faculty Affairs.