South Dakota School of Mines & Technology

Guidelines to Candidate Dossier Preparation for Promotion/Tenure

**Updated Spring 2023**

This document provides guidance to candidates for tenure and/or promotion as they prepare their dossiers for consideration. In addition, this document describes the approach to be used by department heads to obtain additional information about the applicant's contributions to his/her field of study (see Division 4). The promotion/tenure dossier will be submitted electronically as follows:

* A single PDF document containing a summary and narrative information for Divisions 1-3
* A single PDF document for suggested referees titled "Division 4 Reviewer Letters"
* A single PDF for all annual evaluations titled "Division 5 Section A Annual Evaluations"
* A single PDF for all student surveys titled "Division 5 Section B Student Surveys"
* A single PDF for Division 5 supplemental information, if desired, titled "Division 5 Sections C-D"

It is recommended to use the guidelines document as a template in preparing Divisions 1-4. If using an alternate template, please ensure that heading styles are used for Divisions and Sections to facilitate navigation. Links to published materials, if available, may be submitted in lieu of the full publications.

Candidates must refer to their departmental expectations documents, university expectations documents, and BOR Policy [4.4.3](https://public.powerdms.com/SDRegents/documents/1726896) in preparing their dossiers. The dossier will be submitted to the candidate's immediate supervisor no later than October 5th. If the candidate is a department head/chair, the provost shall fulfill the functions specified in Division 4 for the department head/chair. Refer to BOR Policies [4.4.6](https://public.powerdms.com/SDRegents/documents/1726900) and [4.4.7](https://public.powerdms.com/SDRegents/documents/1726901) for additional information about the tenure and promotion process.

**Important Dates:**

**September 1st**  **Candidate may submit draft dossier content to immediate supervisor for feedback**

**October 5th**  **Candidate submits final dossier to immediate supervisor**

**October 15th Department Heads solicit letters**

**November 15th Department Head submits dossier and all review documents to the Provost's Office**

**January 20th Promotion & Tenure Committee provides its recommendations to President**

**April 1st Faculty notified of President's recommendation**

**April 15th President's recommendation due to the BOR**

*April 15th If recommendation is to deny promotion and/or tenure, the candidate may submit a written request to the President for reasons for the recommendation. The President shall respond in writing within fifteen (15) working days.*

*May 15th If recommendation is to deny promotion and/or tenure, the candidate may file a written request for reconsideration to the President after the receipt of the President's reasons for denial of promotion and/or tenure.*

*June 1st If recommendation is to deny promotion and/or tenure, the President shall review the candidate’s request for reconsideration and will notify candidate of the final institutional recommendation that will be forwarded to the BOR.*

**June 1st Process complete**

# Division 1: Letter of Transmittal

The candidate's Letter of Transmittal indicates the purpose of the dossier (for consideration for promotion to [rank] and/or tenure) and clearly describes how the candidate has fulfilled their employment expectations (performance of teaching and advising; research, scholarship, or creative activities; service; time in rank; etc., see BOR Policies [4.4.3](https://public.powerdms.com/SDRegents/documents/1726896), [4.4.6](https://public.powerdms.com/SDRegents/documents/1726900), and [4.4.7](https://public.powerdms.com/SDRegents/documents/1726901)) and warrants consideration for promotion and/or tenure.
This narrative should summarize all areas in the expectations document and should clearly articulate the most significant work in teaching, advising, research and scholarly activity, and service and provide critical information not listed in the tables. It should speak to the impact and importance of the candidate's work to the discipline(s) and/or society and should provide a statement of vision of future activities and potential impact.

The candidate must also include a signed statement that they agree with materials in Divisions 1-3 and examples of teaching, research, scholarly, or creative capabilities. Other supporting documents the candidate provides will be made available to internal and external reviewers as part of the evaluation process. The relevant departmental expectations documents must also be included in Division 1.

# Division 2: Current Curriculum Vitae

Include a current curriculum vitae in this section.

# Division 3: Summary Information

The dossier must contain clearly labeled bookmarks 1-7 corresponding to the sections indicated below.

## Section 1. Background information:

Name:

Department:

Date:

Academic rank and date granted:

## Section 2. Purpose:

*\*Check all that apply*

Promotion

 From Assistant Professor to Associate Professor \_\_\_\_

 From Associate Professor to Full Professor \_\_\_\_

Tenure \_\_\_\_

Other (Please explain)

**For Sections 3 through 7, information should be arranged in reverse chronological order.**

## Section 3. Effort Percentages and Evaluation:

List annual effort percentages of teaching and advising; research, scholarship, and creative activity; and service from the time of initial appointment, or from the time of the last promotion, pursuant to BOR Policies [4.4.3](https://public.powerdms.com/SDRegents/documents/1726896) and [4.4.4](https://public.powerdms.com/SDRegents/documents/1726897). Percentages from relevant annual evaluation forms must be listed in a table indicating calendar year (for annual reviews covering 2015 and prior) and academic year (for reviews covering AY2015-16 and beyond).

#### Table D3-3.1 Effort Percentages and Evaluation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Review Year | Teaching/Advising | Research, scholarship, or creative activity | Service |
|  | % Effort    | Evaluation | % Effort    | Evaluation | % Effort     | Evaluation |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Section 4. Teaching and Advising:

See BOR Policy [4.4.3](https://public.powerdms.com/SDRegents/documents/1726896), the [South Dakota Mines Statement of Institutional Priorities for Faculty Performance](https://www.sdsmt.edu/Academics/Faculty/Docs/South-Dakota-Mines-Institutional-Priorities-for-Faculty-Performance/) (adopted Spring 2022), and the Departmental Expectations document for examples of relevant contributions to teaching and advising.

#### Teaching Narrative

Provide a teaching narrative that provides a detailed description of contributions to teaching. Include information about delivery methods (e.g., synchronous or asynchronous distance delivery, hybrid, team-teaching, lab courses, courses with built-in labs, courses with projects, service-learning projects, etc.) as well as course design, pedagogical methods, and continuous improvement efforts. Example materials can be included in Appendix 5D. Include a summary table of courses (i.e., Table D3-4.1) and relevant evaluations pertaining to teaching (from students, peers, chair, Small Group Instructional Diagnosis, etc.).

#### Table D3-4.1 Courses Taught

List all courses taught during the review period. Do not include senior research, thesis, or dissertation sections; these are covered in Section 5.
Note: only list cross-listed once and indicate effort (%) associated with team-taught courses. Specify "N/A" for IDEA scores if the course was not surveyed.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year & SemesterYYYY FA, SP, or SU | CoursePrefix-Course#-Section# | Course Title, Credit Hours  | # Students(# student survey responses) | Raw (Adjusted) IDEA scores for "Excellent Teacher"(5 pt. scale) | Raw (Adjusted) IDEA scores for "Excellent Course"(5 pt. scale) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

*\*Submit IDEA survey results in the Appendix (Division 5-part B). Please note this material is required for the dossier.*

#### Table D3-4.2 Additional Teaching Activities

Provide a table describing other teaching activities, teaching improvement, or related activities during the review period.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Dates | Course/Activity (teaching workshops, other teaching-related activities, guest lectures, design project advising, etc.) | Contributions |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### Table D3-4.3 Undergraduate and Graduate Advisees

Provide a semester-by-semester listing of numbers of undergraduate and graduate advisees in the review period.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| SemesterYYYY FA, SP, SU | Undergraduate Advisees | Graduate Advisees |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### Academic Advising

Describe in paragraph form significant contributions to undergraduate academic advisement, coordinating and/or advising students in minors or certificates, and other activities related to academic advising.

## Section 5. Research, Scholarship, or Creative Activity:

See BOR Policy [4.4.3](https://public.powerdms.com/SDRegents/documents/1726896) the [South Dakota Mines Statement of Institutional Priorities for Faculty Performance](https://www.sdsmt.edu/Academics/Faculty/Docs/South-Dakota-Mines-Institutional-Priorities-for-Faculty-Performance/) (adopted Spring 2022), and the Departmental Expectations document for examples of relevant contributions in this area.

Describe significant contributions to research, scholarship, or creative activity.

#### Research Narrative

Provide a research narrative that describes contributions to research/scholarship/creative activity. Include information about major research directions, collaborations, and funding sources. Include potential changes or extensions to current directions, if applicable. If grants and/or publications involve large (>5) groups of collaborators, as common in some fields, describe your roles and level of contribution to the research efforts culminating in those grants and/or publications.

#### Student Research

Provide information on supervision of student research in the following tables.

#### Table D3-5.1 Undergraduate Research Project Supervision

List undergraduate student projects supervised or co-supervised (note if advisor or co-advisor) and other scholarly activity with undergraduates in the review period. Indicate if they are grant funded and the amount.
Note: senior/capstone design advising should be included in Table D3-4.2.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student Name | Research Project Title  | Grant Funded (Y/N), amount | Dates |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

#### Table D3-5.2 MS Thesis Research Supervision

List MS thesis research supervision or co-supervision in the review period (note if advisor or co-advisor).
Note: List committee memberships separately in Table D3-5.4 and non-thesis MS advising in Table D3-5.5. Indicate if they are grant funded and the amount. Please indicate (in the Thesis Title column) the students that officially completed their degree along with the degree program and year of graduation.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student Name | Thesis Title | Grant Funded (Y/N), amount | Dates |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

#### Table D3-5.3 Ph.D. Dissertation Research Supervision

List Ph.D. dissertation research supervision or co-supervision in the review period (note if advisor or co-advisor). Note: List committee memberships separately in Table D3-5.4. Please indicate (in the Dissertation Title column) the students that officially completed their degree along with the degree program and year of graduation. Indicate if they are grant funded and the amount.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student Name | Dissertation Title | Grant Funded (Y/N), amount | Dates |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

#### Table D3-5.4 MS Thesis and Ph.D. Dissertation Committee Memberships

List thesis and dissertation committee memberships during the review period only.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Student Name | Thesis or Dissertation Title | Dates |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### Table D3-5.5 Non-thesis MS Student Research or Project Supervision

List non-thesis MS student research or project supervised or co-supervised (note if advisor or co-advisor) and other scholarly activity with graduate students in the review period.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Student Name | Project Title | Dates |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### Funded Proposals and Student Support

Provide information on funded proposals. List the faculty member’s portion of the budget in parentheses in the amount column.

#### Table D3-5.6 List of Funded Proposals in Review Period

Provide information on funded proposals.

| Agency | Title | Amount | Duration | PI, co-PI(s), Senior Personnel\*\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total of candidate’s portion | $xxx,xxx |  |  |

*\*List faculty member's portion of the budget in parentheses*

*\*\*Note if the candidate is PI, co-PI, or senior personnel*

#### Other Proposal Activity

Provide information on other proposal activity in the following tables.

#### Table D3-5.7 Enumerated List of Currently Pending Proposals

List pending proposals (granting agency, title, dates, amount, PI, co-PI(s), date submitted) in the review period. Indicate the role of the candidate (PI, co-PI, or Senior Personnel)

| Agency | Title | Amount\* | Duration | PI, co-PI(s), senior personnel\*\* | Date Submitted; Status |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### Table D3-5.8 Enumerated List of Pre-proposals or White PapersList granting agency, title, dates, amount, PI and co-PIs, and date submitted in the review period. Indicate the candidate's role (PI, co-PI, or Senior Personnel) and note submission status.

| Agency | Title | Amount\* | Duration | PI, co-PI(s), senior personnel\*\* | Date Submitted; Status |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### Table D3-5.9 Enumerated List of Declined Proposals

List granting agency, title, dates, amount, PI and co-PIs, and date submitted in the review period.
Indicate the candidate's role (PI, co-PI, or Senior Personnel) and note the reason the proposal was declined.

| Agency | Title | Amount\* | Duration | PI, co-PI(s), senior personnel\*\* | Date Submitted; Reason Declined |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### Scholarly Activity

Provide information on scholarly activities in separate lists below and provide complete bibliographic information for each entry. Note student authors with \* and underline the corresponding author.

1. **Enumerated list of peer-reviewed journal papers in reverse chronological order in the review period (note if accepted, published, or in press)**

*Example:*

1. Smith, J.R.\* and A. Smith (2015). Introduction to civil engineering, *J. of Civil Engineering*, 3(10):340-347.
2. **Enumerated list of peer-reviewed conference papers or abstracts in reverse chronological order in the review period (note if accepted, published, or in press)**

*Example:*

1. Smith, J.R.\* and A. Smith (2015). Introduction to engineering, *Proceedings of the Engineering Meeting*, Any city, SD, April 1-2, 2015, pages x-x.
2. **Enumerated list of books and book chapters in review period; note if peer-reviewed**
3. **Enumerated list of non-peer reviewed publications (i.e., journal papers, conference papers, abstracts, books, book chapters, etc.) in the review period (note if accepted, published, or in press**)

*Example:*

1. Smith, J.R.\* and A. Smith (2015). Introduction to civil engineering, Geostrata, (accepted Jan. 2015).
2. **Enumerated list of other published works in the review period (note if accepted, published, or in press)**
3. **Enumerated list of submitted manuscripts (note submission date)**
4. **Enumerated list of presentations in reverse chronological order in the review period. Note presenter with a #; note student(s) with a \*.**

 *Example:*

1. "Pervious concrete," Smith, K.\* and A. Smith\*, American Association for Concrete Research Conference, Portland, Oregon.
2. **List other research, scholarship, or creative activities in the review period. This could include a Google Scholar profile or other citation metrics.**

## Section 6. Service:

See BOR Policy [4.4.3](https://public.powerdms.com/SDRegents/documents/1726896), the [South Dakota Mines Statement of Institutional Priorities for Faculty Performance](https://www.sdsmt.edu/Academics/Faculty/Docs/South-Dakota-Mines-Institutional-Priorities-for-Faculty-Performance/) (adopted Spring 2022), and Department Expectations for examples of relevant contributions in these areas.

Provide a service narrative that describes contributions in the area of service. Explain how your service role has benefited your professional development, the department, the university, the discipline, and/or the community at large. Note leadership roles.

## Section 7. Honors and Awards:

List honors and awards received within the review period.

# Division 4: External and Internal Reviewer Letters

The candidate may provide the department head/chair with lists that contain the names, addresses, telephone numbers, and e-mail addresses of proposed external faculty reviewers and internal (South Dakota Mines) faculty reviewers. The candidate may also provide lists of names of potential reviewers who they would not want to be invited to provide a review. The dossier will include these lists as part of the candidate's application in Division 4.

Note that the external and internal reviewers will be provided Divisions 1-3 of the dossier and Division 5, Sections C and D containing additional examples and supporting documents provided by the candidate. They will be asked to critically assess the accomplishments of the candidate and the prospect for continued, high-level performance. External and internal reviewers must be tenured and at or above the rank that the candidate is seeking. "Review letters" are not, therefore, to be confused with "letters of recommendation" nor with "letters of reference."

The selection of external reviewers shall be to obtain independent and impartial judgments of the candidate's accomplishments and the prospect for continued, high-level performance.

No more than one of the external reviewers selected should have a formal connection (direct collaborator, former advisor or graduate student, employer/former employer, etc.) with the candidate. Here "direct collaborator" means someone who works directly on the same project. For members of large collaborations, it is acceptable and even desirable to include reviewers who are members of the collaboration so long as not more than one is working closely with the candidate to cause a potential conflict of interest. Internal reviewers may be collaborators. If the faculty of rank in the department provide a joint letter, those individuals should not also provide a separate internal letter.

The department head/chair will solicit letters from people in each category (external faculty and internal faculty) no later than October 15th (example of a written solicitation provided below). These letters do not have to come exclusively from the list provided by the candidate. In the interest of confidentiality to the reviewers, the department head/chair will not reveal to the candidate the names of the individuals selected. The department head/chair will collect the letters, which will be kept strictly confidential, to be viewed by the department head/chair, the institutional P&T Committee, Provost, and President. The department head must submit at least three letters from each category (external and internal faculty). The Head may solicit more than three letters to ensure the expected three letters are obtained and must submit *all* letters to the P&T Committee. Letters must be received by the department head by November 15th to guarantee consideration by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. Late submissions may not be considered if they are received after the P&T committee begins its review of the candidates' materials.

External and internal reviewers, and members of the departmental P&T committee (if established), will be sent relevant documentation concerning the candidate. An electronic copy of Divisions 1-3 and Divisions 5C-D (excluding copies of the student surveys, annual evaluations, and the list of potential reviewers) will be forwarded by the candidate to the department head/chair for this purpose no later than October 5th.

#### Input by Department Head/Chair

The department head/chair shall also provide a letter that critically assesses the candidate's teaching and advising; research, scholarship, and creative activity; service accomplishments; and potential for continued, high-level performance in these areas. The letter must include information on start-up funding, other support, and effort release provided to the candidate. The letter must summarize the external review letters by confirming that (i) each reviewer is a tenured faculty member at or above the rank that the candidate is seeking, and (ii) if the reviewer is a current or past collaborator or otherwise has a conflict of interest with the candidate. This letter is due on November 15th, along with the dossier, review letters, and the departmental P&T committee recommendation (if such a committee was established).

#### Example request from department head/chair for review from external or internal person:

From:
Date:
To:
Subject: Promotion and Tenure Review Request

Dear XXX:

Dr. YYY, currently an [assistant/associate] professor in the Department of ZZZ at the South Dakota School of Mines & Technology, is being considered for [tenure and promotion to associate professor] this fall. I am writing to ask if you would consider providing an evaluation of Dr. XXX's scholarly accomplishments and your opinion on [his/her] potential for sustained high-level performance. Dr. XXX's dossier is due to me on October 5th, and we would need to receive your review by November 15th, 20XX, to assure consideration by the university's tenure and promotion committee. If you agree, I will provide Dr. XXX's dossier and other materials.

South Dakota Mines makes every effort to maintain the anonymity of reviewers. The contents of your letter will be shared only with participants in the promotion and tenure recommendation process or as required by law.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

[Head's signature]

# Division 5: Appendices

#### A. Evaluations

(Required) Copies of all signed annual evaluation forms, including the summary/signature page from the Electronic Faculty Evaluation/PDP system, from the time of the initial appointment or from the time of the last promotion at South Dakota Mines. Include the current evaluation cycle parts A and B if available when the dossier is submitted. These annual evaluations must be arranged in reverse chronological order. In addition, include all Professional Development Plans relevant to the timeframe of this tenure and/or promotion request. At the end of this section, include the recommendations and goals from the candidate's mid-term review, if applicable.

#### B. Student Surveys

(Required) Submit copies of IDEA or other institutionally sanctioned student opinion surveys (and others, if the candidate chooses) for all courses taught and surveyed at South Dakota Mines relevant to this promotion and/or tenure timeframe. Include all individual student comments and the summative forms for each course.

#### C. Publications

(Optional) Copies of (or links to) representative journal publications, papers, proceedings, books, chapters in books, etc., with a distinction made between refereed and non-refereed items, to supplement Division 3, Section 5.

#### D. Other

(Optional) Any pertinent ancillary documents related to teaching and advising, research, scholarship, creative activity, and service may be included.