

**Arnold School of Public Health Annual
Review Policies and Procedures
October 2010**

All faculty members, regardless of rank, track or tenure status and including those in departmental administrative positions, must receive an annual written review. The review should provide specific evaluative information and an assessment of the faculty member's performance in the categories of teaching, research/creative activities and service. The review should be sufficiently detailed to encourage and provide support to the faculty member in promoting continued professional growth and development. The review is intended to encourage and provide support to faculty in promoting continued professional growth and development.

The procedures for this annual review vary based on the faculty member's specific rank and track:

- All faculty members in each department are reviewed by their department chairs using an appropriate departmental evaluation instrument; this latter review is related to salary and merit issues.
- All tenure-eligible faculty and tenured associate professors are reviewed by the Arnold School Tenure and Promotion Committee (TPC) regarding their progress toward tenure and/or promotion.
- All clinical and research faculty are reviewed by the administrative head(s) of the department, program and/or center in which the faculty member's appointment is based with respect to the faculty protocol for their respective track and to their individual distribution of effort as specified in the annual appointment letter.
- All tenured professors not serving as department chair are reviewed by their department chairs with respect to their current productivity and responsibilities.
- Department chairs and administrators reporting directly to the dean are reviewed by the dean, with respect to administrative responsibilities and distribution/quality of effort in teaching, research and other service activities.

These annual review processes are the most frequent of several review processes. During the third year of the faculty appointment, each tenure-eligible faculty completes a third-year review document instead of the annual review; see Arnold School Third Year Review policy. No later than the sixth year of the faculty appointment, each tenure-eligible faculty must apply for tenure (and promotion if assistant professor); this process involves external reviewers and approvals through the University Board of Trustees (see Arnold School Tenure and Promotion Criteria). Every tenured faculty member must complete a post-tenure review every six years unless the faculty member has been reviewed and advanced to or retained in a higher position during the past six years (see Arnold School Post-Tenure Review Standards and Procedures). Department chairs complete a more comprehensive review every three years at which time

peer administrators, faculty, staff and students are invited to complete an evaluative questionnaire and provide any additional comments. All Arnold School policies are located on the Office of Faculty Affairs and Curriculum web page:

http://www.sc.edu/study/colleges_schools/public_health/internal/faculty_staff/administrative_departments/faculty_affairs_and_curriculum/faculty_affairs/index.php

Procedures for All Faculty

1. Faculty members are notified that their annual review file will be due to their department chair on or about February 1st. The review file should report activities for the preceding calendar year. Annual review forms are located on the Office of Faculty Affairs and Curriculum webpage:
http://www.sc.edu/study/colleges_schools/public_health/internal/faculty_staff/administrative_departments/faculty_affairs_and_curriculum/faculty_affairs/index.php The faculty member's current curriculum vitae should be attached to the report along with copies of student course evaluations and peer reviews of teaching if applicable. Copies of manuscripts and grant proposals are not required.
2. Copies of the files are transferred to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Curriculum by the department chairs.
3. This annual review file is reviewed by the department chair, possibly using an appropriate departmental evaluation rubric; this review is related to salary and merit issues. The departmental annual review should be completed by May 15.
4. The department chair prepares a written evaluation for each faculty member that addresses productivity for the prior year and strategies to address personal and departmental goals for the upcoming year in the context of the specified distribution of effort.
5. For faculty not reviewed by the Arnold School TPC, copies of the written evaluation prepared by the department chair (or dean for administrators) must be sent to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Curriculum.

Procedures for Tenure-eligible Faculty and Tenured Associate Professors

The Arnold School TPC reviews the annual review documents to provide feedback for all tenure-eligible faculty at all ranks regarding their progress toward tenure and/or promotion and tenured associate professors regarding their progress toward promotion. This review is managed through the School's Office of Faculty Affairs and Curriculum. The forms are based on the Arnold School of Public Health's tenure and promotion guidelines and must be used for submitting information for the annual review. In the review process, the TPC will evaluate the faculty member as making satisfactory progress, satisfactory progress with commentary, or unsatisfactory progress toward the appropriate criteria for tenure and/or promotion in the three areas of research/scholarship, teaching and service; the committee will also determine a summary evaluation of satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance.

1. Review panels are established for each department jointly by the chair of the SPH TPC and the associate dean for faculty affairs and curriculum; review panels consist of a minimum of three (3) members of the SPH TPC. Membership on the panels consists of tenured faculty with at least one faculty member from the department. Chairs of the review panels are jointly selected by the chair of the SPH TPC and the associate dean for faculty affairs and curriculum. Whenever possible, a full professor is appointed as panel chair.

2. Members of the SPH TPC generally have a minimum of two weeks to review all files. Panel meetings are set by the SPH TPC chair with assistance from the associate dean for faculty affairs and curriculum. The faculty annual reports assigned to each panel are reviewed at that time. Tenured associate professors on the panel review only faculty of equal or lower rank. Tenured full professors review faculty at all ranks.
3. At a date early in the semester (typically the last Friday in February or the first Friday in March and the Friday immediately following the date of the panel meetings) the full SPH TPC meets to review each tenure-track faculty (with the exception of tenured full professors). All assistant professors are reviewed first, followed by associate professors and then tenure-eligible full professors.
4. Panel chairs report their panel's findings verbally and provide a written summary of the committee's deliberations to the full SPH TPC. A draft letter for each faculty member being reviewed is prepared by the panel chair; the content of the letter is read to the full SPH TPC and is submitted to the chair of the SPH TPC. The letter must contain a rating of progress toward tenure and/or promotion in each area of evaluation and a summary rating of satisfactory or unsatisfactory. If the rating in any area is satisfactory with commentary or unsatisfactory, the letter must include constructive suggestions for improvement. These suggestions should be monitored by the department chair and/or faculty mentor and will be considered during the next annual review.
5. The SPH TPC reviews the panel's recommendations and a consensus is reached; the content of the letters is agreed to by the full TPC; the letter includes recommendations for an appropriate developmental plan if needed. Final editing of the letters is the responsibility of the chair of the SPH TPC.
6. Drafts of the annual review letter are forwarded to the department chair and the dean. The dean will assess the faculty member's overall performance as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The annual review letter will be updated to reflect the overall performance. A satisfactory evaluation will be noted when either the school TPC or the dean assesses the faculty member's performance as at least satisfactory. An unsatisfactory evaluation will be noted only when both the school TPC and the dean assess the faculty member's overall performance as unsatisfactory.
7. A faculty member requesting feedback about or consultation regarding the outcome of the annual review and the developmental plan should notify the chair of the SPH TPC; the chair contacts the chair of the appropriate departmental annual review panel to arrange for a meeting. After meeting with the faculty member, the chair of the annual review panel indicates in writing the nature of the discussion and the action recommended, if any. A copy is forwarded to the chair of the SPH TPC, to the dean, and to the department chair. The dean, in consultation with the department chair, makes the final determination about the review and developmental plan if applicable.
8. If the summary rating is unsatisfactory, the suggestions in the annual review letter must be the basis for a formal development plan. The department chair will appoint a development committee to assist the faculty member in improving performance. The development plan will form the basis for evaluations of the faculty member until satisfactory performance is achieved. At the next annual review, the chair of the SPH TPC and the appropriate annual review panel make an assessment of the progress of the faculty member. This evaluation is

forwarded to the SPH TPC; the committee reviews the assessment and states its concurrence or dissent in writing. The assessment and the SPH TPC's response are forwarded to the dean and to the department chair. A copy is also forwarded to the faculty member. The dean makes the final determination on progress under the development plan and whether further measures are necessary to restore the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level.

Procedures for Clinical and Research Faculty

Each clinical and research faculty member is required to submit an annual report summarizing his/her accomplishments in instructional activities, scholarship, and service as identified in the letter of appointment along with any other activities completed during the previous calendar year.

The annual report is reviewed by the administrative head(s) of the department, program and/or center in which the faculty member's appointment is based. Primary responsibility for administrative evaluation of a clinical or research faculty member's annual report lies with the administrator (department chair, center director or program director) who heads the unit providing the majority of the funding that supports the faculty member's salary. If the faculty member's salary support is shared by more than one unit, all responsible administrators review the report and provide comments to the administrator with primary responsibility for supervision of the faculty member. Further, while final authority for evaluation of the annual review resides with a single administrator, it is expected that the evaluation will reflect the consensus of those who have provided comment. Evaluation of a faculty member's report will be based on the criteria and standards associated with his/her current rank in context of the distribution of effort defined in the appointment letter and his/her individual goals and objectives. Each faculty member's overall performance should be rated as satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

The primary supervisor of a clinical or research faculty member will meet with the faculty member to communicate the administrative evaluation. During this meeting strong and weak points in a faculty member's performance will be noted. 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. This evaluation will be provided to the faculty member in the form of a written summary.