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**Timeline for Mid-Term Review:**

October 1 Department Head notifies candidate of intent to conduct a mid-term review

February 1 Candidate submits dossier to department head

March 1 Department Head meets with candidate to discuss the contents of the mid-term review report

March 15 Candidate submits responsive comments and/or additions to the dossier to department head, if applicable

April 1 Department Head provides response to candidate’s comments and/or additions to the dossier, if applicable

April 1 Department Head submits mid-term review dossier and final report to the Office of the Provost

May 1 If issues are raised by the Provost or their designee, a meeting of the candidate, their advocate (if requested by candidate), the department head and the Provost or designee will be arranged by May 1

May 15 Office of the Provost will provide a copy of the final mid-term review report to the candidate and their department head

**The following institutional guidelines are to be used in conducting mid-term reviews**

The goal of the mid-term review is to evaluate the trajectory of the faculty member, as well as construct a dossier that can be built on as part of the promotion and tenure application. In general, the mid-term review is to be used as a supplement to, and not as a replacement for, the annual review in the year it is given.

Mid-term reviews will be conducted during the third year of a tenure-track faculty member’s appointment. This should be discussed by the department head and candidate in the first year of the faculty member’s term of service. The mid-term review dossier, recommendations, and goals will become part of the candidate’s file. The mid-term review recommendations and goals (not the full mid-term review dossier) should be included in the P&T dossier. All materials used in the review must be open to review by the faculty member (with the exception of a waiver of access to outside letters – see below).

At the time of initial appointment, new faculty members should be provided information regarding the standards, expectations and metrics for promotion by the department head in order that they understand the goals and content of review processes (annual, mid-term, promotion and tenure).

Notification for intent to complete a mid-term review should be communicated to the candidate by October 1. The dossier for mid-term review is due to the supervisor by February 1

The mid-term dossier should contain all elements of the full P&T application dossier ([Guidelines to Candidate Dossier Preparation for Promotion/Tenure](https://www.sdsmt.edu/Academics/Faculty/Docs/Dossier-Prep-For-Promotion-Tenure/)), with the exception of an external letter and peer review of teaching reports. Those documents are optional and are to be included only at the discretion of the candidate.

External reviews and evaluation letters for this dossier should be requested only at the request of the candidate. Such external letters will be solicited by the department head at the request of the candidate. In the case where the candidate requests external input, they will submit a list of names with bios from which the department head will select one name. The candidate will be able to see the resultant letter unless they have formally waived that right (waiver of access). The waiver status must be communicated to the letter writer at the time the request is made.

The dossier is reviewed by the department head, any other supervisors, and the departmental faculty review committee (in the cases where departments have a process for internal reviews). Their written evaluations are appended to the dossier and are provided to the faculty member. Their letters should include an evaluation of progress towards promotion and/or tenure, as well as recommended actions the faculty member and department should take.

The recommendations will include an evaluation of performance in each of the three areas of the candidate’s duties followed by a judgment as to whether the candidate is or is not on trajectory for promotion and tenure. If the candidate is judged not to be on course for promotion and tenure, specific action items and timeline must be included in the recommendations. Those recommendations must be consistent with the faculty members’ personal development plan, departmental and institutional expectations document.

The department head must discuss the contents of the report with the candidate by March 1. Formal feedback from the review committee and from the department head must be documented as part of the final copy of the report. If an external review was requested by the candidate and the candidate did not waive their access to view the letter, the external review letter must be included with the final report. If the candidate waived their access to view the external review letter, the department head must make note of the waiver in the report.

Following the discussion of the review with the candidate, the faculty member may either state agreement with the findings or submit responsive comments and/or addenda by March 15. The department head will review any materials added by the candidate and will respond by April 1. Any changes will become part of the mid-term review record.

The department head will submit the dossier and final report to the Office of the Provost by April 1. The dossier will be reviewed by the Provost or their designee. If issues are raised by the Provost or their designee, a meeting of the candidate, their advocate (if requested by candidate), the department head and the Provost or designee will be arranged by May 1. The final mid-term report, recommendations, and responses will be provided to the candidate and their department head by May 15. The mid-term dossier, final mid-term report, recommendations, and responses will become part of the faculty member’s personnel file.

These guidelines do not supersede any provision of BOR policies 4.4.6 and 4.4.7 regarding standards and procedures for granting tenure (and/or applicable university policy). Final authority on whether to grant tenure rests with the Board of Regents.

Reference: South Dakota Mines Policy IV-19: [Mid-term Reviews for Tenure-Track Faculty](https://www.sdsmt.edu/About/Office-of-the-President/Docs/Policy-Manual/Personnel/Policy-IV-19-Mid-term-Reviews-for-Tenure-Track-Faculty/)

**Mid-term Review Form**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of faculty member under review: |   |
| Years of service counted: |   |
| Date of Dossier submission: |   |
| Date Review was concluded: |   |

Feedback from the Departmental Review Committee (if applicable):

Signatures of Faculty Review Committee (if applicable):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Date |   |  |   | Date |   |
|   | Date |   |  |   | Date |   |
|   | Date |   |  |   | Date |   |

The department head should provide feedback on the dossier and how it meets expectations or does not meet expectations. Moreover, the department head should also describe if performance is on track to meet the expectations for promotion and/or tenure relative to the expectations in each of the categories of teaching/advising, research, and service.

Evaluation and recommendations from the department head:

Signature of Department Head:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Date |   |

I have received these comments and ratings from my immediate supervisor. I understand that I have the right to respond and contest statements of fact, provided that notice of such intent is given to the department head within two weeks after receipt of this document.

Signature of Faculty Member:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Date |   |

**Employee Response:**

**[ ]  I am in general agreement with this evaluation.**

**[ ]  I am not in general agreement with this evaluation and have attached my comments regarding my disagreement and requested modification of issues of fact.**

I have reviewed these comments and recommendations and agree that the conclusions and recommendations of the department head are consistent with their personal development plan and the institutional goals of South Dakota Mines.

Signature of Provost or their designee:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|   | Date |