

Guidelines for Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation

April 2026 | Office of the Provost, Cleveland State University

Purpose

These guidelines support implementation of ORC Section [3344-16-17](#) | Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation, adopted by the Cleveland State University Board of Trustees (BOT) on December 20, 2025, in compliance with Ohio Revised Code (ORC) [Section 3345.452](#). They are intended to guide faculty, unit administration, deans, and the Provost's Office in carrying out fair, consistent, and efficient annual evaluations.

Each college and unit retains the autonomy to apply these guidelines in ways that reflect the norms, expectations, and bylaws of their respective disciplines, provided that all evaluations meet the requirements of the BOT-approved policy and applicable state law.

Scope

These guidelines apply to all full-time faculty members directly compensated by Cleveland State University, as defined in ORC Section [3344-16-17](#). Evaluations are based on the workload assignment for the preceding academic year, as determined under ORC Section [3344-16-16](#) | Faculty Workload Assignment.

Responsibility Structure

The annual performance evaluation is a shared responsibility carried out across four roles:

Role	Primary Responsibilities
Faculty Member	Submits the annual activities report by the last Friday of the spring semester; participates in workload planning meeting with unit administrator; reviews and may appeal the final evaluation.
Unit Administration	Conducts workload planning meeting; prepares the evaluation based on the annual activities report and assigned workload; submits completed evaluation to the dean for review.
Dean / Associate Dean	Reviews and approves or disapproves the unit administrator's evaluation; resolves disagreements; informs the Provost's Office of approved evaluations and any deviations.
Provost's Office	Receives final evaluations; provides oversight of process compliance; maintains records; reviews evaluations in cases of disagreement between chair and dean; reviews faculty appeals of final evaluations

The Annual Performance Evaluation

Basis for Evaluation

Each faculty member's annual performance evaluation is based on their assigned workload and expectations as agreed upon in the faculty's annual plan. Evaluations are comprehensive, standardized, objective, and measurable. The annual activities report and additional supporting documentation serve as the data for completing the annual performance evaluation.

Evaluated Components

Units shall develop or maintain discipline-appropriate expectations for evaluating performance in each component, consistent with their retention, promotion, and tenure guidelines and college bylaws. These expectations should be shared with faculty in writing at the beginning of each academic year.

Components include:

- Teaching (including clinical instruction and student supervision, where applicable)
- Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA)
- Service (internal and professional)
- Administration (when exceeding 5% of total workload assignment)

Teaching

The evaluation of teaching will be holistic, considering, but not limited to, these four components:

Individualized Expectations

During individual discussions with the department chair for workload, faculty may also have other individual expectations (examples: flip a class, address concerns raised in previous reviews, implement a new prep, attending Center for Faculty Excellence (CFE) workshops to improve teaching....[this list is not exhaustive]). As such expectations affect workload, they may also be included in the annual evaluation. These expectations should be explicitly stated in the faculty member's annual plan.

Student Evaluations

Student evaluations must include the standard questions established by the Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE) and considered in the annual evaluation as required under ORC [Section 3345.451](#).

Peer Evaluations

Peer evaluations must be conducted, as required under the ORC [Section 3345.451](#), with emphasis placed on the faculty member's professional development regarding the faculty member's teaching responsibilities. The written system of peer evaluation (under development with UFAC) is detailed on the Faculty Affairs webpage.

Standard Expectations

Institutional guidelines frame the standard, required expectations related to teaching.

- Classroom and related responsibilities policy (ORC Section [3344-16-02](#))
- Refer to unit level and college bylaws and to the Provost's Teaching report for [Promotion and Tenure](#)

RSCA

Refer to unit bylaws and tenure and promotion guidelines for standard expectations of annual performance in this area.

Service

Refer to unit bylaws and guiding university documents. A service workload assignment of 6 hours is approximately 1 day of work per week.

Administration

In individual discussions with the department chair for workload, one may also have other individual administrative responsibilities. Such responsibilities affect workload; they will also be included in the annual evaluation.

Summary Rating

Each evaluated component shall receive one of the following summary ratings:

Rating	Description
Exceeds Performance Expectations	Performance is consistently above the expectations defined for the assigned workload component.
Meets Performance Expectations	Performance fulfills the expectations defined for the assigned workload component.
Does Not Meet Performance Expectations	Performance falls below the expectations defined for the assigned workload component.

Connection to Workload Assignment

The annual performance evaluation informs the workload assignment for the subsequent academic year. At the annual review/workload planning meeting, the unit administrator and faculty member discuss the prior year's annual activities report and evaluation results together with the faculty member's development plan for the upcoming year. The resulting workload assignment must be approved by the dean and is compliant with ORC Section [3344-16-16](#).

Appeals

A faculty member who wishes to appeal a final evaluation may do so by submitting a written appeal to the Provost's Office. The appeal should be submitted within 30 workdays of receiving the final evaluation and should identify the specific basis for the challenge, along with any relevant supporting documentation.

The Provost's Office will acknowledge receipt of the appeal, provide the faculty member with an opportunity to be heard, and issue a written determination within 30 workdays. The process is designed to be fair, transparent, and consistent with due process principles from existing CSU faculty procedures.

Policy Review Cycle

The Provost's Office is responsible for these guidelines. They will be reviewed at a minimum every five years, or earlier as required by changes in law, BOT policy, or institutional practice. The Provost may invite the participation of faculty governance bodies in such reviews.