

**South Dakota School of Mines and Technology
Statement of Institutional Priorities
for Faculty Performance**

ADOPTED: Spring 2022

Contents

Contents	2
1. Purpose of this document.....	3
2. The Mission and Values of South Dakota Mines.....	3
3. Faculty Roles within the South Dakota Mines Mission.....	4
4. Overview of Faculty Activities	4
4A. Overview of Teaching Activities	5
4B. Overview of Scholarship Activities	5
4C. Overview of Service Activities	6
5. Faculty Roles and Workload.....	6
6. Performance Standards for Faculty.....	8
7. Overview of Performance Standards	10
7A. Performance Standards Applied to the Teaching Role	10
7B. Performance Standards Applied to the Scholarship Role.....	10
7C. Performance Standards Applied to the Service Role	10
8. Performance Expectations and Rank	11
8A. Tenure-Line Faculty.....	11
8B. Non-Tenure Line Faculty	12
9. Performance Expectations and Annual Evaluation.....	13
10. Performance Expectations and Promotion and Tenure.....	13
10A. Common Performance Standards.....	13
10B. Mid-Term Review	14
11. Summary	15
Appendix A: Examples of Performance Standards for Teaching Activity	16
Appendix B: Examples of Performance Standards for Scholarship Activity	20
Appendix C: Examples of Performance Standards for Service Activity	23
Appendix D: Sample Workload Assignments	26
Appendix E: Template for Departmental Expectations Document.....	28

1. Purpose of this document

The purpose of this institutional priorities document is to clarify and summarize the academic and professional roles and performance expectations of faculty members of the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology (South Dakota Mines), consistent with South Dakota Board of Regents (SDBOR) policy and the mission and vision of South Dakota Mines. This document is intended to assist

- **faculty** with their professional development, and to prepare for annual review, promotion, and tenure,
- **program supervisors** in their assignment of workload duties to faculty, and in their annual evaluation of those duties, and
- **Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee members** in fairly evaluating faculty candidates for tenure and promotion, particularly across disciplines and varying effort distributions.

2. The Mission and Values of South Dakota Mines

South Dakota Mines is established by the South Dakota Board of Regents as the technological university within the South Dakota System of Higher Learning. The mission of South Dakota Mines is to educate scientists and engineers to address global challenges, innovate to reach our creative potential, and engage in partnerships to transform society. Its vision is to develop world-class leaders in science and engineering to benefit society, and to be recognized as a premier technical university in the United States.

Consequently, the institutional priorities of South Dakota Mines are

- to provide a well-rounded education that prepares students for leadership roles in engineering and science,
- to advance the state of knowledge and application of this knowledge through research and scholarship, and
- to benefit the state, region, and nation through collaborative efforts in education and economic development, with the immediate goal of being recognized as the university of choice for engineering and science within South Dakota and among its peer group of specialized engineering and science schools.

Resources.

- SDBOR Policy 1.2.4 [SOUTH DAKOTA SCHOOL OF MINES AND TECHNOLOGY MISSION STATEMENT](#)
- South Dakota Mines [Mission, Vision and Values](#)

3. Faculty Roles within the South Dakota Mines Mission

South Dakota Mines prides itself on its tradition of providing excellent education, a high level of scholarly activity, and quality professional service. As described in SDBOR policy 4.4.3, Mines faculty will participate in three broad areas of activity: **teaching, scholarship, and service**. *Teaching* refers to those activities that relate to class instruction, as well as advising. *Scholarship* involves activities related to any scholarly activity that can be critically reviewed by professional peers, which may include research, securing funded grants, publications, patents, creative works, and/or creative performances. *Service* is comprised of activities related to governance or leadership roles within the profession, campus, department, or community.

Faculty roles vary widely across departments and within disciplines, and thus the distribution of activity in each role will vary by discipline, faculty classification, and individual. Regardless of role, however, all Mines faculty are expected to

- employ their knowledge and experience for the enhancement and development of the potential of every student and to provide service to institutional, communal, and professional activities,
- commit to the improvement of the learning environment by actively engaging in scholarly work, keeping current in their specialty fields, and building their professional reputation through the merit of their work, and
- adhere to and practice personal and professional honesty, integrity, and honor and to embrace the *Code of Ethics* of this institution and of their individual discipline.

Resources.

- SDBOR Policy 4.4.3 [STATEMENT CONCERNING FACULTY EXPECTATIONS](#)
- South Dakota Mines Policy IV-11 [Code of Ethics](#)

4. Overview of Faculty Activities

Every Mines faculty member will be assigned a role that reflects their department mission, with a distribution of effort in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service negotiated between the faculty member and their department or program supervisor during the annual evaluation process. This section provides an overview of the activities involved in the teaching, scholarship, and service roles. Lists (though still not comprehensive) of teaching, scholarship, and service activities are included as **Appendices A, B, and C**. **It is essential that faculty members, supervisors, and P&T evaluators review individual Departmental Expectations and Workload documents and the effort percentages and expected activities negotiated between the faculty member and their supervisor** for the appropriate standards of professional activity expected of that faculty member.

4A. Overview of Teaching Activities

According to SDBOR policy 4.4.3, “A fundamental mission of a university is to provide opportunities for learning and academic achievement. Related to this mission is the professional evaluation of student achievement according to standards of the discipline and university.” Teaching refers to the broad area of student/faculty interaction that facilitate these opportunities and evaluations. The teaching role for Mines faculty includes:

- **Competently teaching and evaluating student performance.** This includes not only offering consistently challenging and relevant courses with clear objectives and expectations, but also activities such as integrating scholarship, updating course content, conducting course assessment to maintain quality, and maintaining reasonable out-of-class availability for students.
- **Participating in the development and assessment of university courses and programs.** Assessment activities occur in many areas of the student experience. Faculty roles in curriculum development, pedagogy, and the development of assessment strategies are necessary for the continuous improvement of courses and programs. Faculty must develop courses consistent with the needs of their program constituencies and ensure that all student and program objectives, or other discipline-specific assessment criteria, are met.
- **Advising students.** Providing guidance, formal and informal, intended to help students investigate, identify, and accomplish individual academic and career plans. As academic advisors, faculty serve as concerned, knowledgeable, and skilled ambassadors for the institution and discipline.

4B. Overview of Scholarship Activities

According to SDBOR policy 4.4.3, “the mission of a university requires of each faculty member a serious commitment to scholarship. Scholarship, broadly defined, is a prerequisite for competent and current teaching, contributes to the expansion of knowledge and the development of the arts, and enhances the services provided to the public. Each faculty member is expected to continue learning in [their] discipline through appropriate journals and books and to participate in the discipline’s professional deliberation.” The scholarship role for Mines faculty includes:

- **Continued learning and professional development.** This includes the acquisition of new skills and knowledge relevant to one’s discipline.
- **Increase knowledge through research.** This includes the submission and acquisition of grants, the supervision of undergraduate or graduate research, and the presentation and publication of one’s ideas and work to professional peers inside and outside the university community.

- **Educational scholarship.** This includes the development of innovations and improvements in curriculum development, presentation, and/or assessment, and the presentation of these innovations to professional peers inside and outside the university community.

4C. Overview of Service Activities

According to SDBOR policy 4.4.3, “the public support for the universities gives rise to significant service responsibilities to the state and society. By tradition, the professoriate has contributed to meeting such expectations of public service and has assisted in the governance and operation of universities and of professional groups.” Service involves using one’s professional knowledge and abilities for the benefit of others. The service role for Mines faculty includes three aspects:

- **Service to the institution.** All faculty members are expected to participate in the academic governance of South Dakota Mines and their home departments through activities such as active service on committees, participation in student recruitment, preparing for accreditation, and advising student organizations.
- **Service to the profession.** This service encompasses the range of activities through which members of learned professions sustain organizations that advance their disciplines or professions, such as serving as an officer of a professional association, reviewing and editing articles for professional journals, or organizing or chairing a professional conference.
- **Service to the community.** The SDBOR directs each university to perform public service in the local, state, regional, national, or international community. This includes outreach, discipline-related service such as consulting; serving as a designated representative of the university; responding to inquiries from the general public; and providing professional knowledge to civic, professional, or economic development projects or activities.

Resources.

- SDBOR Policy 4.4.3 [STATEMENT CONCERNING FACULTY EXPECTATIONS](#)

5. Faculty Roles and Workload

Every South Dakota Mines faculty member will be assigned a role, or title, that reflects their department mission and specifies a distribution of their professional workload in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. SDBOR policy 4.4.6 and the South Dakota Mines Workload Policy define the classifications and duties of academic roles. These roles include Lecturer, Visiting Professor, Adjunct Professor, Research Professor, Professor of Practice, “Librarian Rank,” and “Professorial Rank.”

South Dakota Mines faculty of “Professorial Rank” must participate in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, with a distribution of at least 10% in each area. Any distribution of research greater than 45% or service greater than 20% requires a justification of financial viability.

SDBOR Policy 4.4.3 specifies that faculty workload should be equivalent to thirty (30) workload units per academic year, with each workload unit corresponding to “approximately 3 hours.”¹ Each department will develop workload equivalencies for teaching and advising, scholarship, and service that include expectations for all faculty classifications, and include consideration of national standards, institutional and department priorities, and benefits to the state of South Dakota.

With respect to teaching, the percentage of workload is related to, but not solely a function of, the number of course credits taught, and contact hours met. One (1) course credit is typically equivalent to one (1) workload unit under ideal conditions. This is represented by a *baseline section*: a 3-credit course that the instructor has previously taught, with a typical enrollment of 20 to 30 students, adequate grading resources, and for which most assignments, materials, and exams can be easily updated or repurposed from previous semesters. Additional factors that affect the time commitment for a quality course may impact the workload associated with it and include section size, the number of times the faculty member has taught the course, responsibility for oversight of associated labs, necessity of course updates, availability of grader support, and level of interaction with students required by the course.

Undergraduate mentoring and advising activities will be included in the percentage of effort assigned to teaching. Appointments with an increased workload of advising are permitted if negotiated between the faculty member and department head or program supervisor during the annual evaluation process.

It is more difficult to provide general equivalencies for workload units in scholarship or service, as what constitutes appropriate activities in those areas varies with department and discipline. Moreover, faculty roles vary widely across departments and within disciplines. The distribution of activity in each role will similarly vary by discipline, faculty classification, and individual. To ensure quality work, there must be consideration of the time commitment required for assigned tasks. Several sample faculty role workload assignments are included as **Appendix D. It is essential that faculty members, supervisors, and P&T evaluators consult with individual Departmental Expectations and Workload documents** for the appropriate workload equivalencies expected of that faculty member.

¹ Assuming a standard 40-hour workweek, this equates to each workload unit corresponding to *exactly* 2 hours and forty minutes of work per week.

Resources.

- SDBOR Policy 4.4.3 [STATEMENT CONCERNING FACULTY EXPECTATIONS](#)
- SDBOR Policy 4.4.6 [RANK AND PROMOTION](#)
- [South Dakota Mines Faculty Workload Policy](#)

6. Performance Standards for Faculty

Performance standards are statements, indicators, or descriptors of activities that are expected of an individual faculty member within each area of professional responsibility given their assigned role and professional rank. *Evaluation* is an appraisal through documentation of the degree to which a faculty member has met their performance standards for the purposes of contract continuation, promotion, tenure, or salary augmentation. As per SDBOR policy 4.4.4, performance in each of the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service is evaluated at one of the following four rankings: *Does Not Meet*, *Meets*, *Exceeds*, or *Substantially Exceeds* expectations. South Dakota Mines defines these rankings as follows:

- **Does Not Meet Expectations:** the faculty member's performance of the assignments in this area of activity has significant or ongoing performance deficiencies or includes unacceptable conduct.
- **Meets Expectations:** the faculty member's documented performance reflects the baseline level of performance for the assignments in this area of activity, based on their faculty role, rank, and Professional Development Plan (if applicable). The performance standards needed to earn this evaluation for a given role and rank are referred to as *basic performance* for that role, rank, and contract.
- **Exceeds Expectations:** the faculty member not only *Meets Expectations* in this area of activity (as indicated above) but moves beyond it in a qualitative or quantitative sense. This level of evaluation is expected for promotion, tenure, and discretionary salary decisions. Performance actions that earn this evaluation are above *basic performance* for the role, rank, and contract and are referred to as *high-level performance indicators*.
- **Substantially Exceeds Expectations:** the faculty member not only *Exceeds Expectations* in this area of activity (as indicated above) but does so in a significant, qualitative, and quantitative way.

Implied by these definitions is that the evaluation of faculty is not simply checking some specified number of boxes from a checklist of performance indicators. Instead, it is an assessment of both the quality and quantity of the faculty member's activities relative to their assigned faculty role and current rank. The same *high-level performance indicators* that earn a tenure-track Assistant Professor an evaluation of *Exceeds Expectations* might reasonably be considered only *basic*

performance activities for a tenured full Professor (and might therefore earn the latter an evaluation of *Meets Expectations*). **It is essential that faculty members, supervisors, and P&T evaluators consult with individual Departmental Expectations and Workload documents** to determine the quality of performance expected for each rank, and that expected to achieve promotion and tenure.

Faculty roles vary widely across departments and within disciplines. As a result, the standards of performance in each area of professional activity for each role vary considerably across departments and within disciplines. SDBOR Policy 4.4.3 notes that “faculty members have a legitimate interest in knowing which professional activities are to be recognized and their university’s determinations of the relative importance of the recognized activities.”

Consequently, each academic department or program will maintain a **Departmental Expectations** and Workload document that clarifies for its faculty members the relative importance of each area of professional performance and identifies performance standards that will be used in evaluating faculty in annual evaluation, tenure, and promotion processes. This document should:

- state the department’s (or program’s) mission and goals,
- articulate each faculty role’s primary responsibilities,
- specify the relative importance, expected time commitment, and example range of faculty workload distributions by role, rank, and contract, while acknowledging that workload distribution may vary,
- include workload guidance for use in determining baseline effort percentages and time allocations based on the faculty’s contract as per SDBOR policy,
- provide a description of basic performance; that is, of the performance standards that describe, upon entry to the rank, the levels of performance in each area of activity needed to earn an evaluation of *Meets Expectations* by role, rank, and contract,
- provide examples and illustrations of appropriate high-level performance indicators and activities beyond basic performance (i.e., that which *Exceeds* or *Substantially Exceeds Expectations*) by role, rank, and contract,
- indicate acceptable forms of documentation (such as examples, products, activities, or accomplishments) a faculty member may provide as evidence of performance, and
- provide clear expectations for performance standards denoting timely progress towards promotion or tenure.

Departmental Expectations and Workload documents must be reviewed and revised by each department’s faculty members and supervisors every three years and submitted to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost) for approval. The Provost, in consultation with supervisors, will ensure department-specific equivalencies are reasonably equitable across departments, while considering differences in program structure and factors unique to the discipline being taught and the scholarship being done. Lists (though still not comprehensive) of

performance standards for teaching, scholarship, and service, together with ways to document them for the purposes of review and evaluation, are included as **Appendices A, B, and C** to assist with the development of departmental performance standards.

Resources.

- SDBOR Policy 4.4.3 [STATEMENT CONCERNING FACULTY EXPECTATIONS](#)
- SDBOR Policy 4.4.4 [FACULTY EVALUATION](#)
- [South Dakota Mines Faculty Workload Policy](#)

7. Overview of Performance Standards

Performance standards are used to assist faculty and their supervisors with annual evaluation, promotion, and tenure. Each is intended to illustrate factors that should be considered, as well as the types of documentation that serve as evidence of performance. This section provides a more detailed overview of potential performance standards as applied to the teaching, scholarship, and service roles. **It is essential that faculty members, supervisors, and P&T evaluators consult with individual Departmental Expectations and Workload documents** for the standards of professional activity expected of that faculty member.

7A. Performance Standards Applied to the Teaching Role

Among the universal performance expectations of teaching (*Meets Expectations*) for all South Dakota Mines faculty regardless of rank, are a commitment to teaching and learning, integration of relevant and current information and research, use of student-appropriate teaching methods and evaluation strategies, and performance of self-assessment relative to one's teaching and advising responsibilities. Faculty members should adhere to academic standards in the assessment of performance and ensure that students are informed about course objectives and standards through established course outlines and goals. Other essential activities include the appropriate integration of technology in the classroom, the assessment and evaluation of courses, or participation in faculty development opportunities relevant to teaching and advising.

7B. Performance Standards Applied to the Scholarship Role

Among the universal performance expectations of scholarship (*Meets Expectations*) for all South Dakota Mines faculty is the presentation or dissemination of one's ideas, research, or creative works to professional peers or the learned public. Other essential activities may include the submission of proposals for competitive research or development grants, contributing as a co-author or co-presenter of joint research, or the application for copyrights and patents.

7C. Performance Standards Applied to the Service Role

Among the universal performance expectations of service (*Meets Expectations*) for all South Dakota Mines faculty is the performance of all contract responsibilities. Faculty members must participate in university committees, support projects that contribute to the mission of the

university and their department, and contribute on a basic level to the benefit of one's discipline and society. Other essential activities may include participating in university recruitment events, assisting with studies required by accrediting organizations, and serving in an active capacity in a professional organization.

Resources.

- SDBOR Policy 4.4.3 [STATEMENT CONCERNING FACULTY EXPECTATIONS](#)

8. Performance Expectations and Rank

The evaluation of performance standards is based on a faculty member's rank. The classifications and duties of faculty ranks are classified in SDBOR policy 4.4.6 and the South Dakota Mines Workload Policy. In defining expectations commensurate with various faculty ranks, it is necessary to view expectations on a continuum that is affected by role, rank, and contract.

8A. Tenure-Line Faculty

SDBOR Policy 4.4.4 states that “faculty unit members serving on tenure-track appointments will be responsible for proposing their own professional development plans in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service.” Thus, each tenure-track Assistant or Associate Professor must, with the assistance of their department or program supervisor, devise a Professional Development Plan (PDP) that addresses departmental and institutional standards for faculty performance, and outlines performance activities to ensure success in advancing to a higher rank. Consequently, a PDP should provide a plan for the faculty member to develop appropriate high-performance indicators over time. A PDP is not required for tenured Associate or Full Professors.

Performance standards for the tenure-line rank are as follows:

- **Assistant (tenure-track).** The faculty member should demonstrate basic performance expectations in teaching, scholarship, and service, consistent with their discipline, role assignment, and Professional Development Plan. They should demonstrate the potential for professional development to support promotion to a more senior rank and the award of tenure.
- **Associate (tenured or tenure-track).** The faculty member should demonstrate a greater number of higher-level performance standards in teaching, scholarship, and service than what is required for an Assistant Professor, and consistent with their discipline and role assignment (and their Professional Development Plan, if tenure-track). They should demonstrate the potential for increased levels of performance in faculty roles leading to promotion to Professor.

- **Professor (tenured).** The faculty member should demonstrate a greater number of higher-level performance standards in teaching, scholarship, and service than what is required for an Associate Professor, consistent with their discipline and role assignment. They should demonstrate leadership qualities in at least one of the areas of teaching, service, or scholarship.

8B. Non-Tenure Line Faculty

The assigned workload areas based on role are as follows:

- **Lecturer** performance should be primarily in teaching and service.
- **Professor of Practice** performance should be in teaching, research, and service.
- **Research Professor** performance should be primarily in research and service.
- **Librarian Rank** faculty focus on library programs and on functions supporting instruction or research.

There is no PDP requirement for faculty in the non-tenure line rank. The performance standards are as follows:

- **Instructor/Assistant.** The faculty member should demonstrate the essential expectations of performance in the professional activity (teaching, scholarship, and/or service) assigned to them, consistent with their discipline and role assignment. They should demonstrate the potential for professional development to support advancement to a more senior rank.
- **Lecturer/Associate.** The faculty member should demonstrate a greater number of higher-level performance standards in the professional activity (teaching, scholarship, and/or service) assigned to them than what is required for an Instructor/Assistant, and consistent with their discipline and role assignment. They should demonstrate the potential for increased levels of performance in faculty roles leading to distinction and advancement to a more senior rank.
- **Senior Lecturer/Professor.** The faculty member should demonstrate a greater number of higher-level performance standards in the professional activity (teaching, scholarship, and/or service) assigned to them than what is required for a more junior rank, consistent with their discipline and role assignment. They should demonstrate leadership qualities in the professional activity (teaching, scholarship, and/or service) assigned to them as appropriate to their role.

Resources.

- SDBOR Policy 4.4.4 [FACULTY EVALUATION](#)
- SDBOR Policy 4.4.6 [RANK AND PROMOTION](#)
- South Dakota Mines [Professional Development Plan Form](#)

9. Performance Expectations and Annual Evaluation

The evaluation of faculty on an annual basis is described in SDBOR policy 4.4.4. The purpose of faculty evaluations is to establish annual goals and expectations, document progress in achieving goals, provide feedback on performance, and support salary decisions. This is intended to be a joint process between the faculty member and the department or program supervisor.

The evaluation process involves establishing faculty responsibilities relative to teaching, research, and service, and the preparation and submission of the Faculty Evaluation Form by the faculty member. The supervisor then assesses performance of the faculty member by designating whether the faculty member *Does Not Meet*, *Meets*, *Exceeds*, or *Substantially Exceeds* the level of performance expected in each assigned area of professional activity. This assessment by the supervisor uses the standards described herein, together with SDBOR policy and the faculty member's Departmental Expectations and Workload document, as the basis for salary, promotion, and tenure recommendations. The Faculty Evaluation Form is then submitted to the Provost.

A minimum evaluation of *Meets Expectations* in all assigned areas of professional activity in the Faculty Evaluation Form is needed for continued acceptable performance in the annual review.

Resources.

- SDBOR Policy 4.4.4 [FACULTY EVALUATION](#)
- SDBOR Policy 4.4.5 [FACULTY COMPENSATION](#)
- South Dakota Mines [Faculty Evaluation Form Part A](#)

10. Performance Expectations and Promotion and Tenure

The processes for tenure and promotion are described in SDBOR policies 4.4.6 and 4.4.7. In determining performance levels commensurate with various faculty ranks, it is necessary to view performance activities on a continuum that is affected by rank and tenure. Performance standards for faculty increase with rank. As an example, the basic performance expectations for an Associate Professor (those earning *Meets Expectations*) will be at a higher level than those for an Assistant Professor. Moreover, the specific performance expectations for faculty members vary not just by rank, role, and contract but widely across departments and within disciplines. **It is essential that P&T evaluators consult with individual Departmental Expectations and Workload documents, as well as the effort percentages and assigned activities negotiated between the faculty member and their supervisor** for the appropriate standards of professional activity expected of any faculty member under review.

10A. Common Performance Standards

Certain general statements about performance standards and promotion apply to all South Dakota Mines faculty.

- **Basic performance.** All faculty members are expected to achieve a minimum of basic performance (*Meets Expectations*) in all the areas of professional activity (teaching, scholarship, and service) assigned to them as appropriate to their role. For example, an Instructor must earn *Meets Expectations* in teaching and service, while an Assistant Professor must earn *Meets Expectations* in all three areas of activity.
- **Professional growth.** South Dakota Mines expects that faculty will continue to grow professionally and be promoted to higher ranks in their faculty track. Consequently, faculty will be expected to demonstrate more high-level performance indicators in teaching, scholarship, and service as they advance in rank and role, and this performance is then documented in the annual Faculty Evaluation Form.
- **Promotion or Advancement in Rank.** To be promoted or advanced to a higher rank, a faculty member must demonstrate sufficient high-level performance indicators in teaching, scholarship, and service (as appropriate to their rank and role) as to be commensurate with the basic performance standards of the higher rank.
- **Tenure.** To be awarded tenure, tenure-track faculty must demonstrate sufficient high-level performance indicators in teaching, scholarship, and service, as described in their departmental expectations document as to be commensurate with the basic performance standards of the rank of Associate Professor. Moreover, the faculty member must also show the potential for promotion to full Professor, so the performance standards at this level must incorporate this expectation.

10B. Mid-Term Review

In addition to the annual review of faculty, all academic units will conduct mid-term reviews for faculty on annual tenure-track appointments. The primary intent is to review progress toward tenure so that timely guidance can be extended to the faculty member. The evaluation of tenure-track faculty through their *mid-term review* is described in the South Dakota Mines Mid-Term Review Policy. The purpose 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.

The mid-term review process is typically initiated during the faculty member's third year and involves the submission of a mid-term dossier and written evaluations of the faculty member's progress towards promotion and tenure by the program supervisor and departmental faculty review committee (when applicable). In no case will the review carry the promise of future promotion, tenure, or change in salary, or be considered an appointment/non-reappointment review. The mid-

term review cannot supersede SDBOR or South Dakota Mines policies on appointments or other personnel matters.

Resources.

- SDBOR Policy 4.4.3 [STATEMENT CONCERNING FACULTY EXPECTATIONS](#)
- SDBOR Policy 4.4.6 [RANK AND PROMOTION](#)
- SDBOR Policy 4.4.7 [TENURE AND CONTINUING APPOINTMENTS](#)
- South Dakota Mines Policy IV-19 [Mid-term Reviews for Tenure-Track Faculty](#)
- South Dakota Mines [Guidelines for Mid-term Reviews for Tenure-Track Faculty](#)
- South Dakota Mines [Guidelines to Candidate Dossier Preparation for Promotion/Tenure](#)
- South Dakota Mines [Guidelines to Dossier Preparation for Advancement in Rank Within the Lecturer Series](#)

11. Summary

The broad definitions and standards given in this document are representative of the breadth of activities that may be appropriate for various faculty members depending on discipline, rank, and role assignment. This document may be used in developing more discipline-specific departmental or program standards, but any such documents must be consistent with SDBOR policy and this Statement of Institutional Priorities for Faculty Performance.

This document restates the mission of South Dakota Mines as approved by the South Dakota Board of Regents. It clarifies the primary roles of teaching, scholarship, and service for all faculty members and describes, in broad terms, the standards of performance for these three roles. The intent is that the document will serve as a guide for faculty, administrators, and evaluators in developing and evaluating discipline-specific departmental performance standards, for setting goals, identifying opportunities for growth, and accomplishing activities which are within the parameters of the South Dakota Mines mission.

Appendix A: Examples of Performance Standards for Teaching Activity

A1. Examples of teaching activity

At South Dakota Mines, the **teaching and advising** role includes:

- A. demonstrating competence in teaching and in evaluation of student performance,
- B. out of class contact time, such as office hours,
- C. participating in course and program assessment, and
- D. advising students.

The following list indicates examples of how these goals may be achieved. These lists are representative, not comprehensive.

A. Demonstrating competence in teaching and in evaluation of student performance:

- offering consistently challenging and current courses that afford students opportunities to learn the information, methods of inquiry, and professional skills identified in the course descriptions and relevant departmental or program mission statements,
- incorporating scholarly activities or findings into their teaching on a regular basis,
- providing students with information about course objectives, content, activities, and performance expectations,
- being regularly available for out-of-class consultation with students,
- reviewing and periodically revising course content, classroom activities, out-of-class assignments, and evaluation procedures to be consistent with expectations of the respective profession concerning content and quality,
- requiring all students engaged in course activities to make active use of technological resources employed by professional practitioners in the discipline, and
- engaging in collaborative endeavors among faculty and departments.

B. Participating in course and program assessment:

- developing and evaluating program objectives,
- developing and assessing expectations and student outcomes for graduates of major programs, and
- developing and assessing expectations and outcomes for courses delivered by the faculty member.

C. Advising students:

- maintaining advisee records in accordance with confidentiality requirements,
- assisting advisees in locating accurate academic information and directing them to current information about university and departmental graduation requirements,
- guiding and monitoring major program planning and encouraging timely progress toward degree,
- informing advisees about possible consequences of academic decisions, including information on academic standards, appeals, and charges of academic dishonesty,
- assisting advisees with career guidance, and
- advocating student commitment to civic engagement, and institutional and professional responsibilities post-graduation.

A2. Performance Standards in Teaching and Advising

Indicators of high-level teaching performance include demonstration of positive student attitudes; efforts to enrich the learning experience and the quality of education beyond the basic level; the development of innovative instructional methods; comprehensive evaluation of teaching; being sought out as a student or faculty mentor; or receiving regional, national, or international teaching awards.

Indicators of high-level advising performance might include initiating meetings with advisees or being sought out by students as their undergraduate or graduate research advisor.

In measuring teaching performance, several indicators might be considered:

- What evidence is there of student learning?
- Does the faculty member employ acceptable and valid research, theory, teaching, or advising methods?
- Does the work reflect increasing pedagogical competence?

The following are examples of performance standards for teaching and advising. This list is merely a guide. It is neither comprehensive nor ordered by importance.

A. Basic performance for teaching:

- demonstrates a commitment to teaching and learning,
- offers challenging and current courses that afford students opportunities to learn the information, methods of inquiry, and professional skills identified by departmental mission statements and program objectives,
- presents relevant and current information and research,
- uses effective pedagogy and assessment strategies suitable to the instructional modality (face-to-face, online, or hybrid),
- engages in self-assessment relative to their teaching and advising responsibilities,
- provides an appropriate syllabus for each course, which includes a statement of course objectives and standards of performance,
- develops measurable course objectives and provides learning materials, course activities, and assessments that are aligned with the objectives and assist students to achieve them,
- instructs and evaluates at levels meeting department standards for the discipline,
- views and revises program and/or course material including textbooks, syllabi, evaluation instruments,
- facilitates assessment and evaluation of courses taught, and
- uses technology appropriate to the discipline and needs of the students.

B. High-level performance indicators for teaching:

- earns consistently high results in student evaluations assessing the quality of teaching,
- receives favorable ratings from independent administrators or peer reviews,
- conceives, explores, develops, implements, evaluates and refines creative, innovative instructional methods, techniques, and materials,
- is sought by and serves as a mentor for students and other faculty,

- evaluates teaching techniques with a variety of methods, such as peer evaluation,
- is sought by students to serve as member of undergraduate or graduate committees because of the quality contribution and demonstrated expertise,
- is sought by undergraduate students as capstone advisor and directs capstone projects of exceptional quality,
- receives teaching awards at the campus, regional, or national level,
- seeks collaborative opportunities to enhance the learning process as appropriate,
- sponsors field trips, outside speakers, and research projects, if appropriate and consistent with discipline and available resources,
- attends conferences and faculty development opportunities relevant to teaching, and
- receives fellowships for teaching activities.

C. Basic performance for advising:

- is regularly available to students,
- helps students transition into South Dakota Mines and into an academic major,
- informs students of university policies and procedures,
- directs students to available resources,
- guides students in the selection of classes to meet academic requirements,
- helps students identify and seek out support services,
- communicates basic career guidance to students, and
- writes advisee recommendations for scholarships and job placement.

D. High-level performance indicators for advising:

- initiates interactions with students,
- serves as a mentor for other advisors across campus,
- develops and distributes information to assist advisees and other faculty advisors,
- assists students in developing study skills and other techniques to improve their academic performance,
- is recognized as an outstanding advisor and provides training to other advisors,
- develops advising strategies to improve student retention,
- assists students in obtaining experience that enhances their global understanding, and
- seeks out opportunities to enhance advising skills.

E. Suggested documentation for teaching and advising:

- student evaluations of instruction, including questions devised by the department to evaluate department-specific goals,
- results of administrative or faculty peer course evaluations,
- records of seminars and presentations relating to teaching and advising on- and off-campus,
- written reports submitted from workshops and meetings attended,
- written reports detailing course modifications undertaken and an evaluation of the effort,
- records of grant applications submitted, and grants received related to instructional methods or student development,

- review of textbooks or papers (on pedagogy) for publication in appropriate media,
- letters of commendation by students, alumni, and/or peers on advising,
- advising-related awards,
- evidence of high-quality advising, e.g., keeping students on target in programs of study,
- advising records,
- records of grant applications submitted or received related to advising, and
- serving on advising enhancement task forces or projects.

Appendix B: Examples of Performance Standards for Scholarship Activity

B1. Examples of Scholarship Activity

At South Dakota Mines, the **scholarship** role includes

- A. continued learning and professional development, and
- B. curriculum development.

The following list indicates examples of how these goals may be achieved. These lists are representative, not comprehensive.

A. Continued learning and professional development:

- acquisition and use of new skills and knowledge relevant to one's professional expertise,

B. Increasing knowledge through research:

- submission of research proposals,
- acquisition of research or development grants and contracts,
- presentation or publication of one's ideas and work to professional peers both inside and outside the university community, including proprietary reports substantiated by the sponsoring organization, and
- development of software.

C. Educational scholarship:

- innovations in curriculum development,
- innovations in curriculum presentation, and
- improvements in pedagogy.

Note: these innovations in curriculum or pedagogy must also be presented to professional peers inside or outside the university community for discussion and critique.

B2. Performance standards in scholarship

Indicators of high-level scholarly performance might include delivering invited lectures or addresses; securing competitive grants or patents; or receiving regional, national, or international professional recognition.

If a faculty member or supervisor is unsure how to assess the quality of an activity as a measure of scholarly performance, several indicators might be considered:

- Does the profession, through its periodicals and other information outlets, recognize the merit of the work?
- Is the work valued by other reputable professionals, as evidenced by favorable citation or the adoption of the work or its derivatives?
- Does the work reflect increasing professional competence?

The following are examples of performance standards for scholarship. This list is merely a guide. It is neither comprehensive nor ordered by importance.

A. Basic performance for scholarship:

- presents ideas, research or creative work to professional peers or the public; for example, publishes or disseminates the results of research, scholarship, or creative endeavor; produces, exhibits, and/or performs creative works; delivers lectures, papers, speeches, or presentations,
- writes and submits quality proposals for competitive research or development grants,
- evaluates grant proposals on the local and state levels,
- contributes to the development of ideas used in competitive grant applications,
- presents or performs original works to colleagues, the campus, or regional communities,
- contributes as co-author or co-presenter to joint research projects,
- supervises undergraduate and graduate research activities,
- demonstrates scholarship that enhances the program and supports program goals,
- publishes, performs, conducts, or shares literary work, musical compositions, and/or works of art in peer review publication or venue,
- applies for fellowships for research or artistic activity,
- applies for assignments at special programs for advanced study,
- applies for copyrights or patents related to the profession or field, and
- engages in documented library, archival, and/or laboratory research on a regular basis.

B. High-level performance indicators for scholarship:

- publishes results of research, literary work, musical compositions, and/or works of art in peer reviewed publications/contexts,
- delivers presentations, performances, exhibits, lectures, speeches, or papers at other universities, professional meetings, conventions, and conferences on regional, national, or international levels because of expertise or professional recognition,
- receives research and development grants in a competitive environment,
- is recognized and sought by graduate students as a major professor who provides quality advising and research mentoring
- supervises theses or dissertations that result in peer-reviewed publications,
- advises and supports multiple graduate student research using funded research,
- receives fellowships for research or artistic activity,
- is selected for assignment at special programs for advanced study,
- obtains copyrights or patents related to the profession or field,
- contributes to the arts or performing arts at a regionally or nationally recognized level,
- provides leadership in the development of teams that address research in a multidisciplinary approach, and
- receives regional, national, or international recognition as an expert in their field.

C. Suggested documentation for scholarship:

- lists of submitted or published manuscripts,

- lists of submitted and/or funded grant applications,
- lists of research accomplishments,
- lists of literary or creative work exhibited, presented, or performed,
- lists of awards for research or creative work,
- lists of undergraduate or graduate student theses and dissertations supervised to completion, lists of graduate students supported by external funds, and
- lists of research, literary, and creative works cited in manuscripts, grant applications, and during instructional activities can be used to indicate recognition in one's field.

Appendix C: Examples of Performance Standards for Service Activity

C1. Examples of Service Activity

At South Dakota Mines, the **service** role includes

- A. university service,
- B. professional service, and
- C. community service.

The following list indicates examples of how such service may be achieved. These lists are representative, not comprehensive.

A. University service:

- promoting a collegial and productive atmosphere at the department and university levels,
- participating in academic governance of the university, contributing to college and departmental deliberations and decision-making, and working on campus committees, task forces, and searches,
- supporting assessment and accreditation of the university and its programs,
- assuming responsibilities relating to the academic or support services of the university community,
- participating in university recruitment and retention efforts, and
- coordinating, advising, and supervising student organizations or student activities.

B. Professional service:

- contributing to the profession as an officer of local, regional, national, or international professional associations,
- organizing sessions at meetings, conferences, and conventions of professional associations,
- editing professional journals,
- evaluating manuscripts as a peer reviewer,
- reviewing proposals for textbooks in one's field of specialization for publishers,
- serving as an organizer or session chairperson of a meeting for a local, regional, national, or international professional association,
- serving as a program evaluator at other institutions, and
- supporting special projects, including academic institutes or workshops.

C. Community service:

- discipline-related service, including consultation related to the faculty member's discipline,
- responding to inquiries for information, identification, etc. from the general public,
- service and outreach as a designated representative of the university, and
- general service in which professional knowledge is applied in work related to civic or professional committees or projects, economic development activities, workshops, or courses.

C2. Performance standards in service

Indicators of high-level service performance might include providing leadership for academic services or professional organizations, reviewing or editing manuscripts for peer-reviewed publication, or serving on the review board of an accrediting agency.

If a faculty member or supervisor is unsure how to assess the quality of an activity as a measure of service performance, several indicators might be considered:

- Do the faculty member's colleagues or the public recognize the quality and impact of the faculty member's service?
- Does the activity contribute to the betterment of the university, the profession, or the community-at-large?

The following are examples of performance standards for service. This list is merely a guide. It is neither comprehensive nor ordered by importance.

A. Basic performance for service:

- serves on and contributes to university, college and/or department committees,
- contributes to the development of the library and other learning resources,
- assists with institutional studies or reports such as those required by accrediting organizations,
- completes special studies and projects for the university,
- participates in university recruitment efforts,
- contributes to meetings and workshops of the discipline/profession,
- coordinates, advises, or supervises sponsored activities of various student clubs, societies, organizations,
- serves in an official, active capacity in a professional organization, and
- serves on city, county, state, regional committees because of professional knowledge.

B. High-Level Performance Indicators for Service:

- provides leadership for academic or support services of the university community,
- serves in a leadership role on departmental, school, college, and university committees,
- expends significant efforts to coordinate, advise and supervise student organizations or student activities which enhance the image of the organization and/or university,
- serves in a leadership role for a regional, national, or international professional association,
- organizes or serves as chairperson of a meeting for a regional, national, or international professional association,
- edits professional journals and/or reviews manuscripts or creative works for peer-reviewed publication,
- serves as organizer, or moderator for a discipline related symposium/conference,
- serves as the designated representative of the university to an organization, or activity,
- conducts institutional studies that benefit the university,
- evaluates grant proposals on the national or international level,
- serves on review boards and with accrediting agencies, and

- leads department and university recruitment efforts.

C. Suggested documentation for Service.

Possible methods of documentation include:

- documentation of membership on university, colleges and/or departmental committees and task forces,
- reports produced for institutional or departmental studies or projects participated in,
- lists of recruitment seminars and recruitment efforts,
- documentation of position in professional organizations,
- documentation of membership in city, county, state, or regional committees,
- documentation of service to schools and other universities,
- recognition or commendation received from administrators or colleagues in academic programs or support activities,
- documentation of leadership roles in campus committees, institutional studies, and special projects,
- recognition and appreciation received from student groups for outstanding efforts and achievements,
- documentation of leadership positions or roles in national and international professional organizations,
- organizational service to meetings of professional organizations,
- lists of reviews of manuscripts and proposals, and
- lists of editorial and advisory service to professional journals.

Appendix D: Sample Workload Assignments

Workload is established as 30-credit hours of undergraduate instruction or its equivalent per academic year (15 credits per semester). The BOR has set out the basic parameters for workload based on a 40-hour work week as follows:

- Yearly effort = 30 workload units
- 1 workload unit = 2 hours and 40 minutes in a work week²
- 10% Effort = 1.5 workload units per semester = 4 hours per week

SDBOR and South Dakota Mines further break down the effort in three categories: teaching, scholarship, and service. Workload allocation is thus generally portioned as a percentage of effort devoted to teaching, scholarship, and service, based on a (typical) 40-hour work week.

Although the general notion of these categories is clear, confusion may arise regarding how a specific activity is categorized. It is neither possible nor practical to easily capture all activities into three or four groups. Those special cases are left to the discretion of the faculty member and their supervisor to define. However, any time allocated to one category may not be double-counted in a second category.

At the outset, it is critical to recognize that the job of a university professor is diverse and extensive. The breadth of faculty activity means that it is impossible to distill the full spectrum of professional activities to a sequence of numbers one can copy into a checklist or spreadsheet. Teaching effort, for example, certainly depends on the number course credits taught, but also on factors such as

- previous familiarity with the material,
- the time to prepare lectures and materials,
- the speed of topic changes,
- the size and academic demographics of the class,
- adequate grading support,
- grading time per student (e.g., automated versus essay),
- out of class contact hours, and
- course and lab administration,

among myriad other factors. Similarly, assigned work, research, and creative performance can, and does, vary greatly from semester to semester. Even under the best of conditions, promising lines of research may fail to lead to publishable results. Workload percentages should reflect an average over several years and not a single semester snapshot. The central goal is to maintain an equable workload for all faculty members and meet the SDBOR requirements for expected effort. For faculty, consideration of the requirements for successful progression towards promotion and tenure, if applicable, should be considered in all workload assignments.

The following list presents possible workload and teaching assignments for various common faculty roles. The classifications of faculty into various categories, the associated workload percentages, and the semesterly teaching loads presented are merely examples. They are neither prescriptive nor authoritative.

² This is the source of the SDBOR's "about 3 hours per week" description.

- **Instructor or Lecturer:** 90% teaching, 0% scholarship, 10% service 4 + 4 load
- **Senior Lecturer** 80% teaching, 0% scholarship, 20% service 4 + 3 load
- **Teaching-active professor:** 70% teaching, 20% scholarship, 10% service 3 + 3 load
- **Research-active professor:** 45% teaching, 45% scholarship, 10% service 2 + 1 load
- **Freshmen advisor professor:** 70% teaching, 10% scholarship, 20% service 2 + 3 load

An “ $m+n$ load” is defined herein as teaching m baseline sections of at most 2 preparations in the Fall, and n baseline sections of at most 2 preps in Spring, where a *baseline section* is a 3-credit course that the instructor has previously taught, with an average enrollment, adequate grading resources, and for which most assignments, materials, and exams can be easily updated or repurposed from previous semesters. Advising, office hours, and other out-of-class contact time are in addition to the credit hours. Thus, while an $m+n$ load represents a maximum *theoretical* teaching load, a reasonable *practical* teaching load must consider relevant other factors and may be lower.

Moreover, workload will vary by discipline, rank, and contract, and so **it is essential that P&T evaluators consult with individual Departmental Expectations and Workload documents** for the appropriate measures of workload activity expected of any faculty member under review.

Appendix E: Template for Departmental Expectations Document

Each academic department or program must maintain a Departmental Expectations document for faculty, supervisors, and P&T evaluators to consult to evaluate a faculty member's performance in annual evaluation, tenure, and promotion processes. This document must, at minimum, include the following:

- the department's (or program's) mission and goals,
- articulate each faculty role primary activities,
- the relative importance and example range of workload distributions of the areas of activity for its faculty by role, rank, and contract,
- provide a description of basic performance; that is, of the performance standards that describe, upon entry to the rank, the levels of performance in each area of activity needed to earn an evaluation of *Meet Expectations* by role, rank, and contract,
- provide examples and illustrations of appropriate high-level performance indicators and activities beyond basic performance (i.e., that which *Exceeds* and *Substantially Exceeds Expectations*) by role, rank, and contract,
- indicate acceptable forms of documentation (such as examples, products, activities, or accomplishments) a faculty member may provide as evidence of performance, and
- provide clear expectations for performance standards denoting timely progress towards promotion or tenure.

The following is meant to provide a sample template and may be adjusted to meet the needs of the department.

E.1 Department Expectations Template

<Department> mission and goals

Mission

<mission statement>

Goal

<current goals>

Roles

<Define the role, and its primary activities>

Example Workload Distribution

<See possible templates in **Appendix D: Sample Workload Assignments.**>

<This is not meant to be an absolute measure of activities but instead to provide guidance that there is sufficient time to achieve quality work. Time estimates for common tasks can clarify effort percentages. Varying workload times are expected across departments based on the individual faculty member, departmental mission and goals, and expectations in teaching, service, and research. Care should be given to ensure similar activities are given the same measure of effort. >

Performance Expectations

<General expectations for all faculty, regardless of role>

<Possible templates are provided below in E.3 Example Templates for Performance Standards>

Examples of Basic and High Performance for all Faculty

<Overview of basic and high-performance indicators. This is not meant to be comprehensive, but as examples.>

Acceptable Forms of Documentation for all Faculty

<Overview of acceptable, suggested, and required forms. This need not be comprehensive.>

<Role> Expectations

<General expectation for all faculty of this role>

Examples of Basic and High Performance for <Role>

<Overview of basic and high-performance indicators. This is not meant to be comprehensive, but as examples.>

Acceptable Forms of Documentation for <Role>

<Overview of acceptable, suggested, and required forms. This need not be comprehensive.>

Expected Timeline

<Overview of the requirements for following rank if applicable, and examples of expected timeline progress to the next rank>

E.2 Optional Sections

The following are additional sections that may be useful when creating a document.

- Guidance for Faculty Time Allocation for Common Cases
- General Expectations for Classes
- General Expectations for Advising
- General Expectations for Research Productivity
- General Expectations for Service
- Communication Standards
- Expected time commitments for common tasks to ensure quality work

E.3 Example Templates for Performance Standards

The following are sample templates for describing performance standards.

Qualitative Rubric

The following is an overview of performance evaluation upon entry to that rank. This list is not comprehensive but is meant to provide guidance into the performance indicators. A more extensive list of activities may be found in the Institutional Priorities document.

Teaching

	<First Rank>	<Second Rank>	<Final rank>
Does Not Meet			
Meets			
Exceed			
Substantially Exceeds			

Service

	<First Rank>	<Second Rank>	<Final rank>
Does Mot Meet			
Meets			
Exceed			
Substantially Exceeds			

Research

	<First Rank>	<Second Rank>	<Final rank>
Does Mot Meet			
Meets			
Exceed			
Substantially Exceeds			

Outline Format

The following is an overview of performance evaluation upon entry to that rank. This list is not comprehensive but is meant to provide guidance into the performance indicators. A more extensive list of activities may be found in the Institutional Priorities document.

- <First Rank>
 - Teaching
 - Does Mot Meet:
 - Meets:
 - Exceeds:
 - Substantially Exceeds:
 - Service
 - Does Mot Meet:
 - Meets:
 - Exceeds:
 - Substantially Exceeds:
 - Research
 - Does Mot Meet:
 - Meets:
 - Exceeds:
 - Substantially Exceeds:
- <Second Rank>
 - Teaching
 - Does Mot Meet:
 - Meets:
 - Exceeds:
 - Substantially Exceeds:
 - Service
 - Does Mot Meet:

- Meets:
 - Exceeds:
 - Substantially Exceeds:
 - Research
 - Does Not Meet:
 - Meets:
 - Exceeds:
 - Substantially Exceeds:
- <Final Rank>
 - Teaching
 - Does Not Meet:
 - Meets:
 - Exceeds:
 - Substantially Exceeds:
 - Service
 - Does Not Meet:
 - Meets:
 - Exceeds:
 - Substantially Exceeds:
 - Research
 - Does Not Meet:
 - Meets:
 - Exceeds:
 - Substantially Exceeds: