

Office of the Provost
Policy on Inserting Additional Materials into
Promotion and/or Tenure Dossiers
(revised August 2012)

The Provost's policy on updating the contents of a dossier distinguishes between (1) the addition of supplemental materials related to a candidate's record of accomplishment and (2) concerns raised by a candidate about judgments expressed by faculty evaluators in the individual's dossier.

On the first matter, with some qualification addressed below, additional information about a candidate's scholarly achievements (e.g., a grant award or publication acceptance) may be added to the individual's review dossier. The qualifications are those that follow:

- Additional material may be added until such time that the Provost has rendered a final decision in the case.
- The distribution of the new material shall be guided by the disposition of the dossier at the time that the new evidentiary material has been received, as follows:
 - If the dossier has not left the Department or School, the Chair or Director shall share the new evidentiary material with the appropriate *unit faculty* and those reviewers shall be given the opportunity to revise their letters of evaluation. The new evidentiary material shall be incorporated into the dossier, along with any updates to unit faculty letters.
 - If the dossier has left the Department or School but has not left the College, the Chair or Director shall prepare a letter explaining the significance of the new material and forward that letter, along with the new evidentiary material, to the Dean of the College. The Dean, in turn, shall share the new evidentiary material and the unit administrator's letter with the college advisory committee and offer an opportunity for the committee to revise its letter of evaluation. The Dean shall incorporate the new evidentiary material, the unit administrator's explanatory

letter and a revised advisory committee letter, if submitted, into the dossier.

- If the dossier has left the College, the Dean shall forward the new evidentiary material to the Provost, along with the unit administrator's explanatory letter and any commentary on the materials the Dean wishes to provide. In those cases where the Provost is required to seek the advice of an academic area advisory committee, the Provost shall share all materials forwarded by the Dean to the appropriate academic area advisory committee and offer an opportunity for the committee to revise its letter of evaluation.

On the second matter, if an *error of fact* is identified before a dossier has been sent forward to the Provost's Office by the Dean of the College, the Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement shall be consulted. The Dean and the Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement shall evaluate whether or not the error of fact has had a negative impact on the judgments rendered about the case. If so, updates to the dossier shall be shared with the unit and college level reviewers (*unit faculty, Chair or Director, and college advisory committee*) who have previously rendered judgments on the merits of the case, and those reviewers shall be given the opportunity to revise their letters of evaluation.

A dossier will not be returned to previous levels of review if, in the opinion of the Dean and the Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement, the error has not adversely influenced the judgments of evaluators. However, the Dean of the College, in his or her letter of recommendation to the Provost, shall note the error and correct it.

Finally, a candidate may disagree with one or more judgments expressed in the individual's dossier. The University's regulations provide no opportunity, *as a review process transpires*, for a candidate to insert the individual's written opinion about judgments contained in his or her review dossier. The opinion held by a candidate about the judgments expressed in the individual's dossier

must await the conclusion of the review process, as rendered by the Provost in his final judgment. If a candidate feels aggrieved by the final outcome of the case, the individual is afforded [avenues of appeal](#) on questions of procedure or merit. All candidates being considered for promotion or the granting of tenure shall have unfettered access to the [appeals processes](#) identified in [Administrative Regulation 2:1](#).