



# Cleveland State University

Office of the Provost and Senior Vice President

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** College Deans and Department Chairs/School Directors

**FROM:** Chin Y. Kuo, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

**CC:** Michael Schwartz, President

**DATE:** December 9, 2004

**SUBJECT:** **Promotion/Tenure Standards**

---

You will recall that in my October 15, 2004 "Message from the Provost," I called for a general, University-wide review of our current standards for promotion and tenure. I pointed out that CSU has operated under fundamentally the same promotion/tenure standards for 40 years. The only systematic review occurred in the mid-1990s, but that exercise was simply to assure that departmental and college promotion/tenure requirements were consistent with the general guidelines identified in the Faculty Personnel Policies and the Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement.

The purpose of this memorandum, therefore, is to operationalize the general observations in my message of October 15, 2004. Please undertake a general review of promotion/tenure standards at the department/school and college levels and develop for implementation, where necessary, a set of more precise and rigorous criteria to be applied to all future faculty appointments. As I indicated earlier, any revised standards will be applied only to new faculty -- not to those already on board who may have been hired under a different set of expectations. In other words, how do each department and each college intend to implement the very general standards for promotion/tenure articulated in the "Greenbook" and the faculty union contract? In each department and college, what exactly constitutes such things as "evidence that a candidate is a fully competent teacher," "evidence of sustained excellence in teaching," "significant scholarship in addition to his or her dissertation," "an outstanding record as a scholar," etc? Most importantly, how do our standards compare to peer institutions?

**I am asking that each academic unit undertake such a review and revision and submit a report to their college dean by March 18, 2005. Each dean should coordinate the reports from departments/schools in his/her college and submit a combined report to me by the April 1, 2005 deadline.**

Each report should contain at least the following:

1. Who performed the review?
2. What process was used to review and update the promotion/tenure standards in each unit?
3. What are the findings and results of the review?
4. When will the revised promotion/tenure standards be implemented?

Thanks for your attention to this matter. I look forward to seeing the results of this process.