

2024 Faculty Annual Evaluation Frequently Asked Questions

Q: Are performance evaluations required for every faculty member every year?

A: Yes, annual evaluations are required for all faculty members, including full professors who are effective/exceptional performers, though, these can be succinct. Performance evaluations should also be completed for all continuing, contract, and adjunct (CCAF), except one-time adjunct faculty who work less than one academic year and who are not expected to return.

Q: Are performance evaluations required for faculty on sabbatical or on leave?

A: Yes, if they work any part of the year. No, if they are on leave the entire year.

Q: What is performance period of the goal setting/new performance evaluation process?

A: Faculty evaluations run on a calendar year. Department chairs and heads should talk to faculty about the new evaluation form and ratings in Fall 2024, as the new form will be used in Spring 2025. Because these changes are rolling out mid-way through the year, this first performance period will look different. Unless goals were set in Spring 2024, faculty may only have 1-2 SMART goals in Fall 2024. Department chairs/heads will evaluate faculty progress towards those goals in Spring 2025 and will work with the faculty to set 3-5 SMART goals for the 2025 calendar year.

Q: How do you effectively document performance?

A: Department chairs/heads are asked to ensure feedback is accurate, objective, confidential, comprehensive, and timely (via ongoing communication/collaboration throughout the year). Specific examples should be used to justify ratings, while recognizing it is unnecessary to reiterate all the information that should be in the faculty's evaluation materials, including their CV. Contact human resources (HR) and/or the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs (VPFA) if you have questions or need support.

Q: How can performance management be used effectively to motivate and recognize faculty who are not up for promotion?

A: Department chairs/heads should understand and communicate the purpose and goal of the updated performance management evaluation, ensuring faculty understand how their contributions align with departmental, college, and university objectives. Clear communication regarding performance will be assessed is essential for engagement and motivation.

In addition to promotion, the annual faculty salary exercise process provides an opportunity to recognize exceptional faculty contributions through merit-based adjustments. Merit increases should reflect performance evaluation outcomes, but supervisors may also take other relevant factors into consideration when determining increases. For example, faculty who have taken significant, approved leave should not be penalized for lower productivity and their evaluation should focus on contributions when actively working.

Q: How do department chairs/heads differentiate good and excellent performers with the new rating categories?

A: Clearly define what "good" and "excellent" performance within the context of your department is crucial. Leaders are encouraged to provide examples that illustrate the differences in various performance areas. Effective performance is the appropriate rating for individuals who are doing a good job and the rating we expect most faculty will receive. Exceptional performance should be reserved for those who consistently demonstrate long-term exemplary performance. Performance management is not only about the rating; it is important to celebrate accomplishments throughout the year and address concerns promptly.

Q: Do these ratings apply to T&P? We use the former 5-point rating system in our T&P processes.

A: No, the annual performance ratings do not apply directly to tenure and promotion (T&P) processes, just as the former 5-point system did not. Annual reviews should align with the feedback from T&P committees to candidates. If there is misalignment, more frequent conversation between the department chair/head, the T&P committee, and faculty is recommended to increase clarity. The criteria used to evaluate faculty for T&P should be clearly communicated in writing to all faculty. If you are unsure of the criteria, ask your department chair/head or T&P committee chair.

Q: Do we need to change our department code if it details what faculty need to do to achieve ratings (on the former 5-point scale) for annual review?

A: Yes. Faculty Council convened a task force in Fall 2024 to consider whether there should be a FC standing committee on codes. This committee might be responsible for code review, preparing code templates, and suggestions on making it easier to keep department codes in compliance with the Manual etc.

Q: Will the Faculty Manual need changes?

A: Potentially, in places where old ratings are used like "exceeds expectations" are referenced (e.g., Section E.12.1). Department codes shall make it clear what is needed for a faculty member to meet teaching expectations and what is needed to exceed expectations. See above on potential code committee of FC.

Q: Is the effort distribution required on the evaluation form each year?

A: Yes, per Section E.9.2 of the Faculty Manual:

E.9.2 Individual Faculty Workload *(last revised August 9, 2019)*

Department codes shall make it clear how workload percentages are determined and set expectations accordingly.

See the Faculty Success website and the Workload Equity Task Force resources on transparency, effort calculators, and other shared resources (to be published in Fall 2024).

Q: Can a department chair/head change the faculty's effort distribution?

A: Any changes to effort distribution should involve a conversation with the faculty, explaining how the change aligns with the needs of the department, college, and/or university. If there is no mutual agreement, it is important the faculty understands the expectations and how their performance will be measured in the upcoming year with their existing effort distribution.

Q: How many goals are recommended?

A: During the Fall 2024 transition, if goals were not previously set in Spring 2024, 1-2 goals are recommended. Going forward, 3-5 goals/year are recommended. See [presentation slides/template](#) for example of goals for each of the three duty categories.

Q: How do you connect effort distribution with SMART goals?

A: Effort distribution should inform goal-setting, ensuring goals are achievable within the faculty's workload expectations.

Q: How should behavior concerns be effectively documented and communicated?

A: It is important to communicate any concerns as they arise with the faculty and ensure they are appropriately documented, including on the annual evaluation form. Check the "concerns" box on the evaluation form and consider consulting with HR and/or the VPFA for more information on how to document the concerns on the evaluation.

Q: What are examples of relevant faculty SMART Goals?

A: Please see [presentation slides/template](#) for examples of relevant faculty SMART goals.

Q: How do goals align with T&P?

A: Annual evaluations and progress toward tenure (T&P) should align. If they are not, department chairs/heads should have a conversation with the review committee. Departments should also consider updating their T&P criteria if it hasn't been reviewed in several years. Tailor SMART goals to the expectations of each faculty rank and appointment type.

Q: What happens if department chair/head, T&P committee/criteria, and/or dept code changes?

A: Misalignment can occur when factors change, but it is important not to move the goalpost for probationary faculty. Take into consideration what goals faculty have been working towards. If T&P criteria change while a faculty member is part way through the probationary period or time in rank to go up for promotion, the extant criteria when they started the probationary period or time in rank should still apply. Communication and mentoring play a role (ideally have a mentor who is a member of the T&P committee and well-aligned with what the committee is looking for).

Q: What if a department chair/head disagrees with the T&P committee's review or decision to reappoint?

A: Alignment between the department chair/head and the T&P committee is critical. Frequent communication can prevent discrepancies. If consensus cannot be reached (e.g., effort distribution, assigned teaching, etc.), the VPFA is a good resource.

Q: Does everyone have to report on diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice (DEIJ) in each category?

A: No, this section is optional. However, it can be an effective tool to document how faculty are contributing to institutional DEIJ goals. See the [presentation slides/template](#) for additional guidance.

Q: What if someone refuses to engage in DEIJ, despite it being in department code/mission?

A: Encourage participation by providing educational opportunities (e.g., Office of Inclusive Excellence FIIIE) and communicate the importance of DEIJ contributions to supporting students, faculty, and staff. Ask faculty to consider setting a goal appropriate to their level of DEIJ competency to work towards during the next year.

Q: Is it appropriate to document on the evaluation allegations of misconduct (e.g., research, discrimination, harassment, or bullying) against a faculty member?

A: Only document if there is an official finding by an official CSU investigative body. Refer to the appropriate office (OVPR, OEO, HR, etc.) for support.

Q: Is using the TILT Teaching Effectiveness Framework (TEF) required?

A: No, using the TILT TEF is not required, but demonstrating teaching effectiveness using evidence-based practices is strongly encouraged. Faculty should avoid relying solely on course evaluations and peer observations. Be sure to refer to department code, mentoring, and T&P committee recommendations for guidance on best practices in teaching evaluation.

Q: Can I split or make numerical ratings? (e.g., effective/exceptional performance or 3.5)

A: No, split and numerical ratings should not be used in the new evaluation process. The performance evaluation system is designed to provide clear performance ratings.

Q: What if a department chair/head disagrees with one of the SMART Goals?

A: Goals should align with the department's mission, vision, strategy, and/or priorities. If there is disagreement, department chairs/heads and faculty are encouraged to have a conversation to ensure mutual understanding of how faculty strengths and interests can contribute to advancing those initiatives. Chairs/heads are expected to respond to each goal set in the annual evaluation.

Q: Should merit raises be based solely on the faculty annual review?

A: While performance ratings should align with merit increases, a holistic and flexible approach that considers multiple factors is recommended. This ensures that all contributions are recognized in determining merit raises.

Q: Does mentoring count in annual evaluation?

A: Yes, mentoring of students, colleagues, and/or others should be considered for all faculty. [Section E.12.1](#) of the Faculty Manual and [Graduate Center for Inclusive Mentoring \(GCIM\)](#) provide further guidance on mentoring.

Q: What if there are concerns the faculty member is not a good graduate student advisor?

A: Concerns about graduate student advising should be documented under teaching. To support improvement, consider what training opportunities and/or resources may help the faculty improve in the upcoming year. Opportunities like the GCIM may offer valuable support. Beginning Fall 2024 all new CSU faculty are being strongly encouraged to participate in GCIM.

Q: Can we align reappointment with annual evaluations/T&P?

A: CSU is working towards making first-year reappointments automatic and is considering other opportunities to make the process more efficient. The new annual evaluation system includes an opportunity to address reappointment.

Q: Can we do the comprehensive review at the same time as the annual review?

A: Comprehensive reviews and annual evaluations do not have to be conducted at the same time, but it is good practice to discuss T&P documentation during the annual evaluation. Long-term, it is beneficial to align these processes and expectations.

Q: How can we ensure faculty feel valued for their contributions to the university beyond their teaching and research/scholarship responsibilities?

A: It is important to ensure service contributions are recognized in the faculty's performance rating and in T&P criteria. Faculty should feel their service is valued and not just volunteering their time. Encourage senior faculty to mentor junior faculty and contribute to the department culture. Shared governance works when we incentivize and reward service to CSU.

Q: Is the behavior checkmark grievable?

A: No, only the overall rating is grievable and the behavior checkmark does not affect the overall rating directly. However, if the concerning behavior affects performance and productivity in one of the Faculty Manual E.12 categories, that category's rating may be affected, which can influence the overall rating. Documenting behavior concerns is intended to address conduct constructively and not necessarily lead to discipline.

Q: Will the grievance process be adjusted to account for this updated document?

A: This is up to Faculty Council. Since the evaluation ratings are not specifically mentioned in Section K of the Faculty Manual, no changes are anticipated at this time.

Q: Does the Faculty Council need to approve this change?

A: No, the annual review rating system is not defined in the Faculty Manual, so the Faculty Council approval is not required for this change.

Q: What is the difference between annual review and annual progress towards tenure?

A: Annual reviews are conducted by supervisors (typically the department chair/head) and assess a faculty's performance during the year. Annual progress towards tenure statements are done by the T&P committee, are cumulative, and assess the faculty's overall progress towards tenure. These two processes should align and if they do not, the department chair/head and T&P committee should work together to resolve any discrepancies.