


Approved: 
President Marta Meana

Date: 2/7/19

**Counselor Education, School Psychology, and Human Services
Bylaws**

Revised May 9, 2018

1. CHAPTER 1: Organization of the Department of Counselor Education, School Psychology, and Human Services

1. Section 1. Purpose of the CSH Department Bylaws

1. *Contents of the CSH Department Bylaws.* The bylaws shall contain the current educational organization and faculty organization of the CSH department; procedures for implementing statements of policy found in the Nevada System of Higher Education Code; statements of policy that relate to the authority and responsibility delegated to the faculty by the Board of Regents; and procedures for implementing these statements of policy. (See Section 1.3.4 of the Nevada System of Higher Education Code.)
2. Questions of interpretation of these bylaws shall be directed to the CSH bylaws committee. Additional advice and interpretation should include consultation with the COE Bylaws, UNLV Bylaws and Nevada System of Higher Education Code.
3. Any CSH faculty member, including academic, administrative and executive, may submit a request for interpretation of these bylaws.

2. Amendment of CSH Bylaws.

1. An amendment to the CSH Bylaws may be proposed by any voting member of the CSH faculty. Before going to the faculty for referendum, all proposals will be referred to the CSH Bylaws committee for consideration and recommendation.
2. Faculty Approval. Faculty acceptance of the proposed amendment requires the approval of two-thirds of the total department faculty and two-thirds of the stakeholder group (e.g., rank, program) that is directly affected by the amendment.

3. Organization of CSH.

1. Doctoral Programs
2. Graduate Degree Programs
 1. Clinical Mental Health Counseling (M.S.)
 2. School Counseling (M.Ed.)
 3. School Psychology (Ed.S.)
3. Undergraduate Majors
 1. Human Services (B.S.)
4. Undergraduate Minors
 1. Human Services
 2. Addictions Prevention
 3. Addictions Treatment

4. Problem Gambling

4. Faculty Organization

1. *Definitions.* CSH department faculty shall be composed of the following categories of positions within the University of Nevada, Las Vegas:

1. *Academic Faculty.* Authorized professional positions in the colleges, departments and units listed under Chapter I, Section 3.1 of the UNLV bylaws who are engaged in teaching, research, or the provision of library services, and those persons specifically identified by the president because of their need for the protection of academic freedom.

2. *Tenured Academic Faculty.* "Tenured Academic Faculty" means members of the academic faculty who have been awarded tenure at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

3. *Nontenured Academic Faculty.* "Nontenured Academic Faculty" means members of the academic faculty who are in tenure-track positions but who have not completed their probationary period.

4. *Nontenure-track Academic Faculty.* "Nontenure-track Academic Faculty" means unranked members of the academic faculty who are not eligible to receive appointment with tenure and they will be designated Rank 0. (B/R 12/04)

5. *Nonacademic Faculty.* Authorized professional positions in the units listed under Chapter I, Section 3.2 of the UNLV Bylaws who are engaged primarily in activities supportive of the university's mission and who may also be affiliated with established academic colleges and/or departments. Nonacademic faculty may also perform such duties as teaching, research, consulting and community service.

2. *Assignment of Academic Faculty.* Each faculty member in this category will be assigned to a department after consultation with the department. Each academic faculty member may be assigned to the graduate faculty in accordance with the Graduate College Bylaws.

3. *Academic Faculty Policy Recommendations.* All CSH department academic faculty members may make recommendations and may vote on all matters of educational policy that affect undergraduate programs of instruction within the department, unless by the terms of the contract the faculty member is exclusively a member of the graduate faculty.

4. *Graduate Faculty Policy Recommendations.* CSH graduate academic faculty members may make recommendations and may vote on all matters of educational policy that affect department graduate programs of instruction.

5. Tenure.

1. *Eligibility.* Only those faculty with appointments as academic faculty as defined in Chapter I, Section 4.1.1 of the UNLV Bylaws who are in Rank II or above are eligible for tenure. Faculty placed in Rank 0 positions shall not be eligible for appointment with, nor shall have, tenure under any circumstances (Board of

Regents Handbook, Title 2, Section 3.2.3). Administrators are eligible for tenure only in the capacity of academic faculty. (C 06/16)

2. Faculty members with well-established careers or with tenure at another institution may be tenured at the time of initial appointment provided they: (1) meet the basic UNLV standards for tenure; (2) are recommended by a vote of those eligible to vote on tenure decisions according to the bylaws of the appropriate department; (3) receive written recommendations from the department chair, the dean of the college and the Executive Vice President and Provost; and (4) receive approval of the President of the University. (B/R 10/98) (C 06/16)
3. A Rank 0 faculty member may not be transferred into a tenure-track (Rank II or higher) position but must compete for such positions in accordance with Chapter III, Section 15 (Recruitment of Faculty) of the UNLV Bylaws. (C 06/16)
4. Academic faculty members with well-established careers or with tenure at another institution occupying administrative positions may be tenured at the time of initial appointment but only in the capacity of academic faculty, provided they: (1) meet the basic UNLV standards for tenure; (2) are recommended by a vote of those eligible to vote on tenure decisions according to the bylaws of the appropriate department; (3) receive written recommendations from the department chair, the dean of the college and the Executive Vice President and Provost; and (4) receive approval of the President of the University. (B/R 10/98) (C 06/16)
5. *Interdepartmental Eligibility.* Qualified academic faculty who are employed by more than one department shall be eligible for appointment with tenure in the department for which the terminal degree held by the faculty member is most appropriate. Such determination shall be made at the time of employment. In cases of disagreement, the Executive Vice President and Provost shall decide which department is most appropriate. (B/R 10/98)
6. *Administrative Channels for Tenure Recommendations.* The recommendation for tenure shall move through proper faculty and administrative channels from department or school to college to the Executive Vice President and Provost to the president; the Executive Vice President and Provost shall provide the Tenure and Promotion Committee with the tenure recommendations. The Faculty Senate Tenure and Promotion Committee shall consult with the Executive Vice President and Provost to ensure comparable rigor of criteria and procedures for recommendations across units. Faculty members not recommended for tenure may request reasons for denial, request reconsideration, and file a grievance with the Faculty Senate Grievance Committee. (See Nevada System of Higher Education Code, Chapter 5, Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4, and UNLV Bylaws, Chapter I, Section 4.6.9.) (B/R 12/04)
7. *Tenure Standards and Procedures.* Each department or school and college shall establish standards and procedures, including a reconsideration procedure, for tenure recommendations. Only persons who hold tenure at UNLV may vote on the application of a candidate for tenure. (B/R 12/04)
8. *Notice of Nongranting of Tenure.* Notice of nonreappointment of nontenured faculty shall be given as defined in the Nevada System of Higher Education Code 5.9.1 (rev. 8/30/84) as follows:

9. *Minimum Notice of Nonreappointment.* Except as provided in Subsections 5.4.2 and 5.9.2 of the Nevada System of Higher Education Code, and unless provided otherwise in an employment contract, notice of nonreappointment to employment of nontenured faculty at the University of Nevada, Reno, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada State College, Henderson, College of Southern Nevada, Great Basin College, the Western Nevada College, the Truckee Meadows Community College and the special units shall be given: (B/R 12/04)
1. "(a)Not later than March 1 of the first academic or fiscal year of service, if the employment contract terminates at the end of that year, or if an employment contract for a one-year appointment terminates during an academic or fiscal year, at least 90 calendar days in advance of its termination;
 2. "(b)Not later than December 15 of the second academic or fiscal year of service, if the employment contract terminates at the end of that year, or if the second employment contract for a one-year appointment terminates during an academic or fiscal year, at least 180 calendar days in advance of its termination;
 3. "(c)At least 365 calendar days in advance of the termination of each succeeding employment contract of one academic or fiscal year's duration after the second year of service;
 4. "(d) For employment contracts of less than one academic or fiscal year's duration, for a period of time which may be mutually agreed upon by the parties to such employment contracts, but, in all events, no less than 14 calendar days in advance of the termination of such contracts."

6. Termination of Appointment.

1. *For Tenured Faculty.* Termination of appointment with tenure for reasons other than financial or curricular exigency (Nevada System of Higher Education Code, Sections 6.2.1, 6.2.2) will be decided *in accordance with Nevada System of Higher Education Code Sections 6.9 and 6.12.*
2. *Mid Tenure Review - For Nontenured Faculty Before the End of the Probationary Period.* In addition to the annual reviews conducted by chairs/directors and deans, every candidate will have a mid-tenure (pre-tenure) review at the mid-point of the probationary period. For the purposes of this review, the faculty committees who will participate in the tenure decisions at the unit level will review the materials submitted by the candidate (including but not limited to annual reports, annual evaluations, and other appropriate materials) and advise the chair/director/dean of their opinion of the candidate's progress toward tenure in terms of the criteria set forth in the Code, the university, college and unit bylaws, and any officially sanctioned standards provided. The chair/director will report the determination of the committee to the faculty member and to the dean. If the committee or the chair/director/dean deems the progress toward tenure is not satisfactory, the committee and/or the chair/director/dean may recommend remediation or recommend non-reappointment. At the college/unit level, the committee that will participate in the tenure decision will review the materials submitted, along with the chair/director's assessment, and provide the dean with their determination about the progress of the faculty member toward tenure. The committee may suggest remediation or recommend non-reappointment. The dean may, after conferring with the chair/director and/or the faculty committees, recommend remediation or non-reappointment in a summary report to the Executive Vice

President and Provost. When the likelihood of meeting tenure standards as defined in Nevada System of Higher Education Code Section 3.4.2 is negative, the member shall be notified in accordance with the Nevada System of Higher Education Code Sections 5.2.3, 5.2.4 and 5.9.1. (B/R 12/04)

7. Faculty Bylaws.

1. *Department or Unit Bylaws Authorized.* The faculty assigned to each department or unit must create bylaws to govern its internal operation. (B/R 12/04)
2. *Approval of College, Department or Unit Bylaws.* Any provision of college, department, or unit bylaws not consistent with the UNLV bylaws, and/or the NSHE Code, is invalid. All college, department, and unit bylaws are subject to approval by the president. (B/R 9/05)
3. *Suspension of College, Department, or Unit Bylaws.* Upon the recommendation of the College Dean and the Provost, the president may, in extraordinary circumstances, suspend a college, department, or unit bylaws, and place the affected unit in receivership. Justification can be found in the UNLV bylaws.

8. Committees.

1. The department will maintain representation on the following college committees.
 1. Academic Standards
 2. Bylaws
 3. Curriculum
 4. Dean's Advisory Council
 5. Graduate Studies
 6. Merit Review
 7. Multicultural & Diversity
 8. Peer Review
 9. Promotion & Tenure
 10. Scholarship & Honors
 11. Teacher Education, Licensed Personnel, and Experience (TELPHE)

9. Definition of Regular Administrative Channels

1. Regular administrative channels are from the department or unit in accordance with department or unit bylaws and/or procedure manuals, to the appropriate dean or director, to a vice president when appropriate, to the Executive Vice President and Provost, and to the president. (B/R 10/98)

10. Department Chair

1. Duties and Responsibilities.

The Chair of the CSH Department should:

1. Be available and accessible as stated in COE Bylaws, Chapter 3, Section 4.2.1
2. Meet regularly with program coordinators to facilitate program and department goals.

3. Be responsible for personnel recruitment and for personnel evaluation, to include recommendation on retention, tenure, promotion, and merit and annual performance evaluation. See COE Bylaws, Chapter 3, Section 4.2.2
4. Coordinate class scheduling and other program functions in consultation with program coordinators. Consistent with COE Bylaws, Chapter 3, Section 4.2.3
5. Schedule departmental functions in consultation with program coordinators. See COE Bylaws, Chapter 3, Section 4.2.3
6. Manage the departmental budget and provide department faculty a budget report illustrating expenditures and encumbered funds minimum of twice per year (or as needed for discussing program needs and department priorities). See COE Bylaws, Chapter 3, Section 4.2.4
7. Provide leadership in establishing and implementing departmental goals, program priorities, and policies with consultation of faculty. See COE Bylaws, Chapter 3, Section 4.2.5
8. Coordinate program efforts and department support in attaining/maintaining accreditation.
9. Provide leadership in curricular review and/or alteration. See COE Bylaws, Chapter 3, Section 4.2.6
10. Appoint, as appropriate, departmental committee(s) and serve as ex officio member when needed. See COE Bylaws, Chapter 3, Section 4.2.7
11. Represent the department both on and off campus. See COE Bylaws, Chapter 3, Section 4.2.8
12. Advise students, respond to student requests for information, and evaluate student petitions. See COE Bylaws, Chapter 3, Section 4.2.9
13. Perform any other appropriate assignments that the Department or College circumstances may require. See COE Bylaws, Chapter 3, Section 4.2.10

2. Nomination/Recommendation for CSH Department Chair

1. The department chair shall serve for a minimum period of three (3) years with the possibility of reappointment, and shall conform to procedures for nominating and recommending department chairs as determined by department, according to the UNLV Bylaws, Chapter II, Section 10.8, (05/12; p. 19).
2. Departmental Academic faculty and full time Faculty in Residence [FIR] shall nominate a tenured member of the faculty, of rank III or IV.
3. A CSH Department Chair from outside the department can be selected after a national/international search is conducted. This search would follow department procedures/bylaws for faculty searches.
4. If a term cannot be completed, an Interim Chair of the Department may be appointed using the procedures in Section 2.b and 2.e-n.
5. The nomination of the CSH Department Chair shall take place during the first (Fall) semester of the third year of office of the incumbent chair or as expediently as possible to allow for appropriate transition time.
6. Two CSH Department Nomination/Recommendation Monitor(s) will collect/compile nominations and subsequently the department vote.

7. The CSH Department Nomination/Recommendation Monitor(s) will be either (a) the two newest noneligible faculty members in the department or if either/both said individual(s) decline(s) respective role, (b) elected department representative(s) (department meeting nominations/volunteer, simple majority vote).
8. CSH Department Nomination/Recommendation Monitor will email department faculty to solicit nominations. Faculty have 5 business days to submit nominations, including self-nominations.
9. CSH Department Nomination/Recommendation Monitor(s) will contact nominees (after 5 business days) to verify acceptance of nomination.
10. CSH Chair candidates have the option of including a personal statement to be shared with the department faculty when accepting nominations (or alternatively to make a brief statement during a faculty meeting preceding the department vote).
11. If five or more candidates are nominated, voting members of the department shall indicate their top three candidates via secret ballot (collected by monitor in a department meeting). The three candidates with the highest number of respective votes advance to a subsequent ballot for department vote (see j below).
12. If three or more candidates are nominated, voting members of the department shall indicate their top two candidates via secret ballot (collected by monitor in a department meeting). The two candidates with the highest number of respective votes advance to the final department vote.
13. For the final department vote, voting members of the department shall indicate their choice for CSH Department Chair via secret ballot - printed ballot with designated program affiliation or electronic with program affiliation (but otherwise anonymous ballot). Absentee ballots are permitted.
14. The CSH Department Chair Nomination/Recommendation must be confirmed by a two-thirds (or greater) total votes from the CSH Department Faculty and two-thirds (or greater) votes by each program in order to be forwarded to the COE Dean.
15. The CSH Department Nomination/Recommendation Monitors will transmit the minutes of any/all election meetings and the voting results to the Dean.
16. Reappointment of the CSH Department Chair for a subsequent 3-year term may be made following guidelines, and approval from the Dean. A CSH Department Chair can serve unlimited terms, but no more than two terms consecutively.

3. Evaluation

1. Annually, the department Academic faculty and full time Faculty in Residence shall evaluate the performance of the CSH Department Chair for the calendar year. The P & T committee (with input from the untenured faculty, FIRs, and department staff) will design a survey collecting qualitative and quantitative feedback on the chair's annual performance in the areas of administration, personnel, and leadership. Ratings in each of the areas and all written faculty comments shall comprise the report that is provided to the CSH Department

Chair and the COE Dean. The Dean then incorporates the reported information into the CSH Department Chair's annual evaluation. If the CSH Department Chair disagrees with the COE Dean's evaluation, the CSH Chair shall follow the procedure for disagreement with annual review (See COE Bylaws, Chapter 4, Section 2.4.1).

4. **Procedures for Recommending Termination**

1. Any full time departmental academic faculty or full time Faculty in Residence [FIR] may initiate the procedure to recommend the termination of appointment of the Department Chair by writing a letter signed by at least 20% of voting members of CSH.
2. A special meeting is called by the faculty who signed the letter in support of the termination recommendation.
3. At the special meeting, the process is coordinated by a tenured faculty member elected by majority vote of the department faculty including proxy. If no one receives a majority vote, then the meeting is chaired by a tenured faculty member chosen at random from those willing to serve in that capacity.
4. The vote on recommendation of termination is taken by secret ballot one week after the issue has been thoroughly aired in one or more special meetings as needed. A 2/3 vote of department faculty and 2/3 vote of each program is required for a conclusive recommendation to be made to the COE Dean.
5. The chair of the special meeting is responsible for transmitting to the COE Dean the minutes of the special meeting(s), and the results of the secret ballot.

Chapter 2: Policies and Procedures Related to Educational Policy

1. **Purpose.** The purpose of this chapter is to contain the agreed-upon policy, statements and procedures for departmental policies that are not included in UNLV or COE Bylaws.
2. **Instruction - Course Offerings**
 1. **Academic Faculty Course Recommendations.** The department faculty shall recommend the departmental courses to be taught each semester for University credit in accordance with departmental and COE Bylaws.
 2. **Nonacademic Faculty Course Recommendations.** Those members of the nonacademic faculty who teach academic courses offered by the department must abide by the policies and procedures of the UNLV, COE, and CSH Bylaws and any applicable college/school and departmental policies and procedures.
3. **Instruction - Staffing Courses**
 1. *Faculty Course Assignments.* The Department Chair, after consultation with the departmental faculty and the dean in accordance with Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 3, the UNLV Workload Assignment Policy and Guidelines, college/unit bylaws, and the UNLV Faculty Course Assignment Policy will assign each faculty member specific courses. (B/R 6/07).
 2. *Interdepartmental and Interdisciplinary Course Assignments.* Since departmental faculty members will be the instructional staff for non-departmental courses and

interdisciplinary courses, the chair of the department concerned will assign faculty to these courses after consultation with the appropriate dean. (B/R 10/98)

4. Instruction - Initiation and Development of Specific Courses

1. Each faculty member may initiate and develop specific courses and recommend their approval in accordance with the UNLV Bylaws, Chapter II, Section 5.

5. Instruction - Review and Approval of Specific Courses

1. *Procedures for Course Approval, Deletion or Changes.* Approval, deletion or change of specific courses by the department faculty is to be obtained by the following procedures:
 1. *Program Faculty Approval.* The program faculty will approve all deletions, changes or proposed courses within defined program areas. Forwarding of Course Change Recommendations to CSH Curriculum Committee.
 2. Course changes, deletions, and new courses approved by the program faculty will be forwarded to the CSH Curriculum Committee in accordance with CSH Bylaws.
 3. *CSH Curriculum Committee Recommendations.* The CSH Curriculum Committee will deal with recommendations in accordance with CSH Bylaws. Approved deletions, changes, and proposed courses will be forwarded to Department Chair and added to the next scheduled CSH meeting agenda as an information item.
 4. *Forwarding of Course Change Recommendations to COE Curriculum Committee.* Course changes, deletions, and new courses approved by CSH Curriculum Committee will be forwarded to the COE Curriculum Committee upon review by the department faculty during CSH department meeting.

6. Instruction - Review and Approval of all Curricular Programs of Study

1. *Curricular Approval by Department.* All curricular programs of study to be offered by the department must be approved by the department as specified in the departmental bylaws.
2. *Procedures for Curriculum Changes.* New curricular programs of study or changes within a program of study must be approved as follows:
 1. *Program Faculty Approval.* The program faculty will approve any new program.
 2. *Forwarding of new program to CSH Curriculum Committee.* New program proposals approved by the program faculty will be forwarded to the CSH Curriculum Committee in accordance with CSH Bylaws.
 3. *CSH Curriculum Committee Recommendations.* The CSH Curriculum Committee will deal with recommendations in accordance with CSH Bylaws. Approved new program proposals will be forwarded to Department Chair and added to the next scheduled CSH meeting agenda.
 4. *Department Approval.* The department faculty will approve any new program.

5. *Department Chairs Submit Curriculum Changes.* The Department Chair will submit any departmentally approved description of the program of study, the requirements, electives, name of person responsible for coordination, and justification of the program to the College Curriculum Committee in accordance COE Bylaws.

7. Budget Reporting

1. *Department Budgets.* The Department Chair shall provide regular budget reports to the faculty.

8. Department Standing Committees

1. CSH Curriculum Committee.

1. The CSH Committee shall consist of one faculty representatives selected from each of the program areas identified within the CSH Bylaws. Each representative is a voting member of the committee and the Chairperson shall be elected by the committee.
2. The committee shall receive and review all undergraduate and graduate curriculum and program recommendations, or proposals developed and forwarded by CSH program faculty. This shall include all new course proposals, suggested dual listings, course deletions, changes to course descriptions, prerequisite changes, substantive editorial rewording of program descriptions, credit modifications, changes affecting course integrity, new degree programs including minors and program changes other than editorial rewording.
3. After deliberation, the CSH Curriculum Committee shall recommend appropriate action regarding all proposals. Feedback will be provided to all faculty via distribution of its committee minutes, which will be provided within 24 hours of a recommendation. It may (1) return the proposal to the originator for amendments or corrections, (2) reject it with stated reasons, or (3) accept and forward it with recommendation for its approval to the Department Chair, who will place the proposal on the next scheduled CSH department meeting.
4. If a recommendation or proposal is rejected by the CSH Curriculum Committee, an appeal for a general department faculty discussion and vote may be made in writing and presented to the Department Chair. Such an appeal must be filed within ten working days from the date of faculty notification. The Department Chair shall then place this matter on the agenda of the next CSH department meeting for full faculty review and action.

2. CSH Bylaws Committee.

1. The Committee shall consist of one faculty representatives selected from each of the program areas identified within the CSH Bylaws. Each representative is a voting member of the committee and the Chairperson shall be elected by the committee.
2. The purpose of the CSH Bylaws Committee is to: 1) maintain an up-to-date file of the NSHE Code, UNLV Bylaws, and COE Bylaws, and CSH Bylaws., 2) revise the CSH Bylaws whenever so authorized by the department Faculty, 3) edit the CSH Bylaws in accordance with the NSHE

Code, UNLV Bylaws, and COE Bylaws, and 4) To serve in an advisory capacity to the Department Chair to prevent violations of the CSH Bylaws.

3. The CSH Bylaws committee shall review the NSHE Code, UNLV Bylaws, and COE, and CSH Bylaws and recommend revisions to the CSH Bylaws as needed. It shall also serve to interpret the CSH Bylaws and recommend such interpretations to the department faculty. The committee should obtain copies of the CSH department meeting minutes regarding actions that affect the CSH Bylaws, and take responsibility for confirming that the current edition of the CSH Bylaws is posted on the COE website.
4. Amendment of Bylaws. Amendment of the CSH Bylaws may be accomplished in the following manner:
 5. A prepared amendment must first be submitted to the Bylaws committee. The CSH Bylaws committee will review the proposed amendment to check conformity with UNLV Bylaws, COE Bylaws, and NSHE Code.
 6. The proposed amendment shall be forwarded to department faculty one (1) week prior to a properly called meeting of the CSH Faculty.
 7. The proposed amendment shall be discussed in a CSH department meeting. If the proposed amendment is approved by a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the voting membership of the CSH faculty, the amendment shall not take effect for 10 days.
3. *Department Search Committees*
 1. Search committees shall be formed upon administrative approval.
 2. CSH search committees shall consist of no fewer than three voting members elected from the department faculty. Tenured, tenure track, and faculty in residence are eligible to serve as voting members of the committee. Visiting faculty may serve as nonvoting members.
 3. The search committee will elect its chair and facilitate the recruitment and screening process according to CSH Bylaws.
4. *Promotion & Tenure Committee*
 1. Membership
 1. Membership on the CSH Tenure and Promotion Committee consists of all Tenured faculty (unless no tenured faculty are in the department). If the candidate believes that there is a potential conflict of interest with any of the tenured faculty members, the candidate will provide a written list and rationale of faculty to be excluded from serving on this committee. There must be a minimum of three members. The Chair approves P&T Committee for each candidate.
 2. Faculty members who serve on the Committee are restricted to voting once – at either the department, college, or university level.
 3. The CSH Representative to the COE Tenure and Promotion Committee is a Full Professor unless no Full Professors are in the department.
 4. The committee shall elect a Chair and Chair-elect from among its members using secret ballot. In April, at the conclusion of the

Committee's business for the academic year, the Committee elects a new Chair-elect who serves with the incoming Chair as leaders of the Committee. The Chair-elect assists the Chair in all business with the intent of assuming the role of Chair the following academic year.

2. Roles and Responsibilities

1. The committee chair will call a meeting of the P & T Committee at which members will discuss the candidate's dossier. The CSH Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews the dossier of each candidate for tenure and/or promotion. The committee is advisory to the Department Chair. After reviewing the candidate's materials, the committee forwards a written report (votes and reasons for votes) to both the candidate and the Chair. The written report of the CSH Promotion and Tenure Committee becomes part of the candidate's promotion and/or tenure file (dossier of materials). The report will include the committee's vote and a summary of comments made by members of the committee regarding the candidate's performance and progress towards promotion. The candidate may write a response to the committee's report be included in the candidate's file.
2. The CSH Promotion and Tenure Committee, as a faculty committee, will forward a report of the actions of the committee (votes and reasons for the votes) to the COE Promotion and Tenure Committee.
3. The CSH Promotion and Tenure Committee shall work with the department faculty to establish minimal standards and criteria for promotion and tenure that are congruent with the NSHE CODE, UNLV Bylaws, and COE Bylaws for all CSH candidates. These standards serve to guide the committee's votes and reasons for the votes. Procedures, criteria, and standards established by the CSH Promotion and Tenure Committee should undergo periodic reevaluation. The basic document and all changes resulting from reexamination are shared in writing with all CSH faculty.

3. Procedures to be followed in the promotion and/or tenure process

1. At the time of hire, each candidate shall be furnished a letter of appointment which includes written guidelines and standards for review. Copies of annual reviews from the Department Chair(s) and the mid-tenure evaluation from the department will be provided to the candidate in written form. If specific concerns are identified by the Department Chair and department promotion and tenure committees, written suggestions for addressing those concerns should be provided to the candidate. It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that copies of these evaluations (annual reviews and mid-tenure evaluation) be a part of the promotion/tenure dossier.
2. Each September the Department Chair will provide the CSH Promotion and Tenure Committee with a complete list of all faculty in the department who must be considered for promotion and/or tenure during the academic year. A list of additional faculty who have requested to be considered will also be provided. Department

promotion and tenure deadlines must be set in accordance with COE deadlines.

3. Candidates are responsible for preparing a dossier of materials. The dossier must contain the following: The University of Nevada System Recommendation for Tenure or Promotion form (“The Regents’ Form”); Vita; Mid-tenure Evaluation; Annual Evaluations by Department Chair(s); summary of teaching evaluation; examples of course syllabi; and samples of scholarly work. Candidates are responsible for providing additional materials to support their activity if requested to do so by the CSH Promotion and Tenure committee.
 4. Candidates are first considered at the department level by CSH Promotion and Tenure committee. The report from the committee, including the votes and the reasons for the votes, will be transmitted in writing to the Department Chair.
 5. The Department Chair reviews the entire record and makes an independent recommendation that is transmitted in writing along with the material from the CSH committee to the candidate and the Dean. The Dean refers each dossier, which includes reports from the department promotion and tenure committee and the Department Chair, the COE Promotion and Tenure Committee for review.
 6. The COE Promotion and Tenure Committee will review each dossier and file a written report to the Dean of the COE, the Promotion and Tenure Committee and to the candidate. The College Promotion and Tenure Committee may request and/or gather additional evidence before completing the report. If additional material is added to the dossier, the department will be notified.
 7. Following completion of deliberations by the COE Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Dean reviews the entire dossier and makes an independent recommendation that is transmitted in writing to the candidate and becomes part of the dossier of materials.
 8. Promotion guidelines and criteria may be found in Appendixes A and B.
5. *Merit Review Committee*
1. The Merit Review Committee will consist of three elected CSH faculty members (UNLV Bylaws Chapter III, Section 6.1.A) and must include representation from each program area within the department. Following the election of the department committee members, one of the elected department committee members will be selected by the department to serve as department representative to the college committee. Clinical, tenure-track, and tenured faculty are eligible for election to the department committee. The department committee will undertake three roles in the merit review process.
 2. The department committee will determine if each merit applicant has met the minimum standard for merit.
 3. The department committee will rank order (in each of the three areas of teaching, service, and scholarship) those applicants who are found to meet

the minimum standards. Such standards shall take into account the variations in assigned workload present in the college (UNLV Bylaws chapter III, Section 10.2.2). No faculty member may be present during the presentation or ranking of his or her application for an award of merit. (UNLV Bylaws chapter III, Section 10.2.3).

4. The department committee will forward the three ranked lists to the college committee and chairs.
5. Feedback to faculty regarding merit ranking in the department will be included as part of the Department Chair's annual evaluation process with each faculty member.

APPENDIX A

CSH WORKLOAD, MERIT, PROMOTION AND TENURE, ANNUAL REVIEW, MIDTENURE REVIEW GUIDELINES

Approved 5.9.18

PREAMBLE

Decisions about the promotion and merit of faculty within the Department of Counselor Education, School Psychology, and Human Services (CSH) are guided by three basic principles.

First, a candidate's performance may be evaluated in the areas of research, teaching, and service. In general, FIRs are not expected to conduct research, therefore, evaluations for promotion and merit are based on the significance of the teaching and service activities. However, if a faculty-in-residence engages in scholarship and research, and chooses to have this work submitted for promotion and/or merit decisions, then it shall be evaluated and count towards promotion and/or merit.

Second, it is the candidate's responsibility to demonstrate the significance of his/her work by using the departmental benchmarks or other direct evidence that clearly reveals its impact. Significant work is defined by its quality and impact that is in line with the mission of the program and department. The impact of one's work is its influence on research, teaching, and practice in one's discipline, profession, and broader society. Benchmarks of significant work and how to measure impact are suggested in Appendix B.

Third, the Department's P & T Committee serves as an independent department-level review of the candidate's work.

ANNUAL WORKLOAD

In order to define benchmarks to evaluate faculty candidates for promotion and tenure, a standard to guide these decisions is needed. This standard is founded upon the workload expectations of faculty.

The Board of Regents guidelines (Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 3) and UNLV policy operationalize teaching workload only. Six courses per year totaling 18 credits is the standard expectation for tenure-track and tenured faculty and eight courses (24 credits) for FIRs. The resulting workloads are these:

- The FIR teaching load is 80% teaching because of service expectations at 20%; or, one course equals 1/6th of 80% teaching time (or 10%).
- The equivalent workload for tenure-track and tenured faculty is 60-20-20 (teaching at 60%, research at 20%, and service at 20% of total workload).

To allow for differentiated workloads, faculty can adjust their workloads to achieve goals consistent with the department's mission: (a) research more, (b) teach less, and/or (c) more service through the process of workload reassignment conducted each semester.

- For tenure track and tenured faculty, the typical reassignment is one three-credit course release for research activities resulting in a two-course teaching load per semester (four courses a year).
- The resulting workload changes to 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service, which is consistent with the Top Tier trajectory (see COE Bylaws).
- Tenure-track faculty should submit their workload reassignment requests to the Chair to teach less and research more according to the Top Tier standard of 40-40-20 workload.

- Tenured faculty are also encouraged to do so to fulfill the COE and UNLV Tier One mission; however, it is optional.
- The benchmarks in the following Tenure and Promotion Guidelines are based on this expectation of workload.

Faculty in Residence: FIRs are non-tenure-track faculty referred to as Rank 0 faculty according to UNLV Bylaws (3.18). They are valuable assets to the programs, departments, and colleges they serve due to their expertise in practice and teaching. FIRs are primarily responsible for teaching activities, along with substantial service and administrative activities, and/or specialized assignments. They are eligible for promotion and merit. FIRs have earned terminal degrees and bring both experiential and academic credentials to their positions in the College. Based on graduate faculty status, FIRs contribute to both undergraduate and/or graduate programs within the college and serve on student committees.

FIR Workloads:

- FIRs teach eight courses a year or four courses a semester with a workload of 80-20, teaching and service.
- Service may sometimes be expanded to include special administrative assignments and teaching is therefore reduced based upon their initial job description upon hire, which is a reflection of program/departmental needs. The resulting workload becomes 70-30 (teaching to service), or seven courses a year.

All workloads are contingent upon approval by the Chair and Dean. Additional variations of workload may be developed according to NSHE guidelines and the parameters in this document or as dictated by job description at time of hire.

For illustrative purposes only, the workloads discussed above are summarized in Table 1 below:

<u>Teaching Effort</u>	<u>Teaching</u>	<u>Research</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Course Load</u>
<i>Basic Load (tenured faculty)</i>	60	20	20	3/3
<i>High Research Load (tenure track, tenured faculty)</i>	40	40	20	2/2
<i>Teaching Load (FIRs)</i>	80	0	20	4/4
<i>Special Administrative Load (FIRs)</i>	70	0	30	3/4

CRITERIA AND DOCUMENTATION FOR MERIT DECISIONS

Contrary to the multi-year period covered in promotion decisions, merit decisions are typically based on one's yearly performance. Both types of evaluations, however, are guided by assessments of the quality and impact of administrative/specialized assignment, teaching, and service activities (see Appendix B for specific indicators of quality/impact). Positive merit evaluations will be given to candidates who demonstrate significant work in these activities. Exceptional performance in any or all areas will be recognized in merit decisions, as will published scholarship (e.g., journal articles, scholarly books, etc.), since these fall outside of expectations for faculty-in-residence.

PROMOTION GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY-IN-RESIDENCE

Eligibility for Promotion

1. In compliance with NSHE and COE procedures, non-tenure-track academic faculty and non-academic faculty members (Rank 0 and 1) are eligible to seek promotion (see UNLV Bylaws 3.18). Lecturers can seek promotion to senior lecturer. FIRs can seek promotion from assistant professor in residence to associate professor in residence and from associate professor in residence to full professor in residence.
2. FIRs follow the same timeline for promotion as academic faculty (see UNLV Bylaws 3.18).

Promotion Review

The review process is intended to assist, support, and guide the evaluation of FIRs as they progress toward promotion in the CSH Department. While seeking promotion is optional, the three-year Progress Assessment is required and follows the same guidelines outlined here (see NSHE policy (see 5.12.2 Procedures for three-year Progress Assessment)). The process provides feedback to candidates in regards to their performance in teaching and service activities. Candidates may elect to submit materials in the area of scholarship and creative activities, although this area is not required. The mid-promotion review usually occurs during the sixth semester (three years) of a candidate's employment.

Composition of Promotion Committee: All tenured faculty are eligible to serve and must include a minimum of three members. One member must be a faculty from the candidate's program of service (e.g., Program Coordinator). If the candidate believes that there is a potential conflict of interest with any committee member, the candidate will provide a written list and rationale of faculty to be excluded from serving on this committee. The Chair is responsible for selecting the Promotion Committee for each candidate.

All members of the Promotion Committee will review the candidate's dossier. The committee chair is elected by the committee by secret ballot. The committee chair will call a meeting of the P & T Committee at which members will discuss the candidate's dossier. The committee chair will complete a written report that will be given to the department chair and the candidate. The report will include the committee's vote and a summary of comments made by members of the committee regarding the candidate's performance and progress towards promotion (mid-promotion review or a recommendation for Promotion). The candidate may write a response to the committee's report, which may be included in the candidate's file.

Criteria For Promotion To Associate Professor-In-Residence

Distinctions between excellent and satisfactory performance within the CSH Department are based on the quality and significance of the work. For decisions regarding merit and promotion to Associate Professor-in-Residence, the specific benchmarks for "excellent" and "satisfactory" performance in the areas of teaching and service as well as the specific benchmarks for "satisfactory" performance in the area of service, are summarized in the following section.

FIRs should meet the “excellent” benchmarks in the primary role for which they were contracted; for example, 80% in teaching should be excellent compared to 20% service. A rating of “commendable” represents performance that falls between the benchmarks for satisfactory and excellent.

It is the candidate’s responsibility to make the argument for an “excellent” ranking for which they were contracted and their workloads.

Teaching: Evaluative decisions based on excellence in teaching rest on the significance of this activity. The candidate’s teaching portfolio will demonstrate the significance of his/her particular teaching-related activities according to established benchmarks (see Appendix B) or other direct evidence of its impact.

A candidate can achieve an excellent rating in teaching in many ways, and a detailed case should be made by the candidate. As a general standard, however, the accomplishment of most of the following activities would likely achieve a rating of “excellent” in teaching. The following are examples:

- A consistent record of effective teaching practice, as represented by independent evaluations of one’s teaching portfolio.
- A consistent record of effective teaching practice, as represented by peer reviews of teaching.
- A consistent record of effective teaching practice, as represented by strong student evaluations.
- Recipient of an external award for teaching from an honorary, learned, and/or professional society.
- Recipient of a college-wide award for teaching-related activities.
- Recipient of a university-wide award for teaching-related activities.
- Significant curriculum development, including the design of multiple courses for graduate and/or undergraduate concentrations within a departmental or multi-disciplinary program.
- Scholarship in the area of teaching or other creative accomplishments.
- A substantial record of extensive and successful mentoring (or clinical supervision) of students, as indicated by, but not limited to: (1) active supervision of numerous graduate or undergraduate students in independent studies, practica, and internships; or (2) major participation in student committees beyond departmental or college norms; or (3) multiple instances of mentoring student work and projects.

The ranking of satisfactory performance in teaching involves activities that do not achieve the expectations for “Excellent” in teaching. Over the candidate’s evaluation period for promotion, the following benchmarks for satisfactory performance in teaching would likely include all of the following activities:

- Participation in formal or informal efforts to improve teaching on a continuous basis.
- A clear record of satisfactory peer reviews and positive student evaluations of teaching.
- Participation in some mentoring activities, including serving on graduate and undergraduate committees (e.g., thesis, dissertations, independent studies).

Service: Evaluative decisions based on excellence in service rest on the impact of the particular activity. The candidate’s portfolio will demonstrate the impact of his/her particular work

according to benchmarks in this document or other direct evidence of impact. Most, if not all, faculty-in-residences serve their respective units in key administrative posts and spend as much or more time in administrative activity as in teaching. For this reason, FIRs need to demonstrate the breadth and scope of both academic and administrative service performed for their respective units.

A candidate can achieve an excellent rating in service in many ways, and a detailed case should be made by the candidate. As a general standard, however, standard of excellence at the associate level is centered within the unit, the college, and the university. The following would likely achieve a rating of “excellent” in service:

- Significant performance in a key administrative/specialized assignment role within the candidate’s unit beyond the normal expectations of academic faculty (e.g., graduate or undergraduate coordinator, basic course director, field experience coordinator, debate/forensic coach).
- External awards or recognition of distinguished administration/specialized assignment activities from honorary, learned, and/or professional societies.
- Internal awards for excellence --university awards are given the most weight, followed by college awards and then departmental awards.
- Significant contributions to a service role in the college beyond the normal expectations of the appointment (e.g. sitting on or chairing college committees).
- Significant advisory roles within the university (e.g. sitting on or chairing university committees, serving as the graduate college representative on graduate student committees).
- Professional service beyond the university is not required; however, doing so at the state, regional, national, or international level is an indicator of excellence.

A satisfactory rating in service is required for promotion to Associate Professor-in-Residence. The benchmarks for achieving this ranking involve measure of the quality, quantity, and the significance of the service activities (see Appendix B for specific indicators).

Criteria for Promotion to Professor-in-Residence

The rank of Professor-in-Residence is awarded to those who have maintained a strong record of quality teaching-related activities, or service and who have provided significant service duties within the unit, the university, the profession, and the community.

A successful candidate for promotion to Professor-in-Residence has a clear record of significant contributions across the range of FIR’s responsibilities. It is incumbent upon the candidate to make an argument about the quality of such achievements. Generally speaking, the following would demonstrate acceptable indicators of quality (see Appendix B for specific indicators of quality/impact):

- Evidence of steady and active participation in teaching-related activities, including course and curriculum development, professional development, and student mentoring at the undergraduate and/or graduate levels.
- A record of leadership in university and/or professional service, including major administrative positions within the university that may be open to FIRs (e.g., chairing university- level committees, serving as assistant chair/director or as associate dean), and/or service through appointments or elected positions within professional

associations, learned societies, or community organizations.

Although considered heavily, the Promotion to Professor-in-Residence does not occur automatically after an individual has spent a given number of years as an Associate Professor-in-Residence. Instead, if one has a strong record of accomplishments, a promotion to Professor-in-Residence may occur at any time after this earlier promotion to the Associate rank.

Documentation for Promotion

Candidates for promotion are required to submit teaching and administrative/service portfolios that document their significant contributions in each of these areas. These portfolios include a short narrative statement and specific information that is necessary for reviewers to make an informed evaluation of the quality and impact of the candidate's work. The necessary elements of these portfolios include the following at the time of promotion and mid-promotion review:

1. Statement outlining contracted workload, service assignments, and a narrative addressing progress toward promotion (or professional growth since last three-year Progress Assessment (see NSHE 5.12.2))
2. Current vita
3. All existing annual evaluations
4. Teaching portfolio
5. Administrative/service portfolio

Teaching Portfolio:

- A narrative summary (1 page) of a teaching philosophy, including one's goals and expectations surrounding teaching.
- A listing of major teaching activities over the evaluation period (e.g., lists of courses taught and numerical summaries of student evaluations of them, curricular development, student mentoring activities, and other pedagogical activities).
- Evidence of the quality/significance of teaching-related activities using multiple indicators of teaching effectiveness (e.g., internal and external peer- reviews, awards, or other assessments of learning gains). See Appendix B.
- Copies of course materials (e.g., syllabi, handouts, and assignments/exams) for one graduate and one undergraduate class. Provide materials for two different undergraduate courses if not involved in graduate teaching.

Service Portfolio:

- A narrative summary (1 page) of the general nature of one's service and administrative/specialized assignment duties
- External evidence of the quality and quantity of the work associated with these specialized assignment activities, as applicable
- A listing of major service activities and one's role (e.g., member, chair, associate) within each of the following areas: (1) institutional academic and administrative service (e.g., department, college, and/or university), (2) professional service (e.g., serving on editorial boards, reviewing textbooks for publishers, holding elected/appointed positions in professional associations or honorary societies), and (3) community service (e.g., workshops, public outreach/education activities related to the candidate's field)
- Evidence of the quality and quantity of the work associated with these service activities as evidenced (see Appendix B).

Other required documents for promotion decisions include copies of:

- Chair and Coordinator evaluations within each area of administrative/specialized assignment, teaching and service.
- Department Promotion Committee review of portfolios from mid-promotion review, if applicable

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

UNLV Bylaws (Chapter 6, Section 16.6 B) specify that an Assistant Professor may be considered for promotion at any time and must be considered for promotion after a period of not more than 6 years in this rank. Candidates typically apply for promotion to Associate Professor at the beginning of their sixth year unless otherwise specified at the time of hire.

Research and Scholarship

Research is broadly defined as those activities associated with the systematic collection, analysis, and dissemination of information or data for the generation or verification of new knowledge; the formulation of theories, models, or philosophies that stimulate the thinking and research of others; or the development of processes and procedures for practitioners based upon current empirical data or theory. Included under research are studies that involve laboratory, field, clinic, library, and other creative endeavors. Competence and accomplishment must be documented. UNLV Bylaws (Section 16.1) recognize “essential requirements” for tenure and promotion but also acknowledge differences among fields; the CSH also recognizes essential requirements (i.e., a continuous record of peer reviewed publication along a related line of inquiry) and through its own bylaws provides parameters for both essential requirements and specific contributions unique to the applicant’s field of study.

Performance Indicators: UNLV and COE Bylaws do not specify particular requirements for research that merit promotion and/or tenure at the department level. The CSH requires a portfolio or dossier identifying appropriate supporting evidence, to be submitted for review. The items listed below are appropriate for inclusion in the dossier, as indicators of research performance. This does not imply that the candidate must provide evidence in all of the areas identified, nor is the list exhaustive.

- Articles published in national peer-refereed journals ^[SEP]
- Evidence of articles in press
- Published books that are single or co-authored (non-edited)
- Edited books, book chapters, monographs
- Evidence of books, book chapters or monographs in press
- Book reviews, bulletins, technical reports, research reports, creative products, and

editorials which contribute to the field of study

- Evidence of research grants received
- Evidence of research grants under review
- Research or works in progress
- Honors and awards for research
- Presentations at professional meetings based on research or scholarly projects ^[1]_[SEP]

It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide evidence for the items in the Appendix B for which consideration is requested, including any instances where the candidate is requesting that increased weight be given to an indicator. ^[1]_[SEP]

The COE Bylaws indicate that for tenure and promotion from assistant to associate professor, the candidate must demonstrate evidence of *continuous* quality in research or scholarly *productivity within the individual's discipline*.

In addition to research and publication, faculty members are encouraged to seek external funding to support their programs of research. Faculty members are given credit in their annual performance evaluations, as well as in their progress toward tenure and promotion, for applying for, obtaining, and administering external and internal funding that supports their research agendas.

CSH further refines this rubric as follows with the understanding that *these indicators are intended to serve only as illustrative of the quality of performance and are not a checklist for approval*. For example, when evaluating refereed journal publications, a smaller number of publications may warrant an evaluation as excellent or as commendable, contingent on specific features such as length, impact, quality of the journal, number of citations, and so forth (see Appendix B for discussion of impact).

Explicit justification of the quality or impact of work is provided to account for the various factors involved in determining quality. See Appendix B for impact analysis. It is the responsibility of the candidate to justify the quality of their work and the rankings of excellent. It is the responsibility of the candidate to justify the quality of their work and the rankings of excellent.

The guidelines for excellent include but are not limited to:

- The candidate has made outstanding contribution to the body of knowledge through published works and other sources of evidence of scholarship/research.
- The candidate has a national or international reputation based on research contributions to a particular area or areas of research.
- The candidate has demonstrated continuous and sustained research productivity, as evidenced by an average of one high quality, peer-reviewed national or international journal publication a year (see Appendix B for impact).

- Evidence of focused efforts toward securing external funding for research. For example, grant proposals submitted to major external funding source or internal sources with candidate as primary or secondary investigator.
- An average of two refereed presentations at major international, national, regional/local conferences each year.

Commendable achievement falls below Excellent and above Satisfactory.

The guidelines for satisfactory include but are not limited to:

- Evidence of a record of continuing ongoing scholarship agenda
- The candidate has a substantial record of publication in quality journals.
- Scholarship is considered to be significant
- The candidate is generally recognized as being an authority in a particular area or areas of special emphasis.
- There is evidence of efforts to secure internal and/or external funding for research.
- The candidate has demonstrated continuous and sustained research productivity, as evidenced by less than an average of one high quality, peer-reviewed national or international journal publication a year (see Appendix B for impact).
- At least one grant proposal submitted to major external funding source with candidate as secondary investigator. Internal funding is also encouraged and appropriate for this rank.
- An average of one or more presentations at major national, international, or regional/local conferences each year during the probationary period.

Documentation for Promotion and/or Tenure for Rank II Faculty:

Each candidate for promotion and/or tenure must present a dossier identifying appropriate supporting evidence. COE and UNLV Bylaws state that the candidate's dossier must contain the following:

- The University of Nevada System Recommendation for Tenure or Promotion form (The Regents' Form)
- Vita
- Mid-tenure Evaluation
- A narrative addressing progress toward promotion (or professional growth since last promotion or Progress Assessment (see NSHE 5.12.2)
- Annual Evaluations by Department Chair(s)
- Summaries of teaching evaluations
- Examples of course syllabi
- Copies of scholarly work.

External Letters of Support. UNLV Bylaws state that the application for promotion from assistant to associate and for associate to full professor requires evaluation from external reviewers. The department will solicit at least four letters from external referees outside the University, at least two of which shall be from persons drawn from a list of names suggested by the candidate. The department requires that the external referees must be at the same rank or higher as the rank for which the candidate is applying. To address conflicts of interest by external reviewers, the candidate will provide a written list and rationale of faculty to be excluded from serving in this role to the Chair by April 15. The Chair is responsible for selecting the external reviewers.

Because the specific documents required for the application are not static, all candidates are encouraged to begin the preparation process in the fall semester of the academic year immediately preceding the academic year in which the application is to be considered.

Committee review begins early in the fall semester. It will be to the advantage of the candidate for all documentation to be *completed during the summer preceding the fall review*, allowing time, if needed, in the early fall to adapt materials for changes in required forms.

Appeal Process

UNLV Bylaws (Chapter 6, Section 16.7) states that the review for academic promotion will move through proper faculty and administrative levels, starting at the department level and progressing to the school or college and then to the Executive Vice Provost to the president, with recommendations provided to the Faculty Senate. UNLV Bylaws (Chapter 6, Section 16.8 and Section 16.9) provide guidelines for candidates who were denied promotion and/or wish to submit a request for reconsideration.

PROMOTION GUIDELINES FOR TENURED FACULTY

ASSOCIATE TO FULL PROFESSOR

UNLV Bylaws (Chapter 6, Section 16.6 C) specify that an Associate Professor may be considered for promotion to Full Professor at any time and must be considered for promotion after a period of not more than 8 years in this rank. At the option of the faculty member, consideration for promotion may be waived. Any accomplishments relevant to the criteria for promotion occurring any time during the period since the last promotion may be considered. UNLV Bylaws (Chapter 6, Section 16.6C) recommend that the candidate for Full Professor have a minimum of 5 years of university level service but that shorter timeframes may be considered in exceptional cases.

Research and Scholarship

The candidate for Full Professor shall provide evidence of national/international recognition in research through scholarship and/or external funding. In addition to demonstrating a programmatic line of research through refereed article publication since tenure and promotion to the Associate rank, applicants are encouraged to publish significant contributions to the field (e.g., authored or co-authored books, monographs) and encouraged to seek significant external research funding that contributes to the candidate's and institution's national reputation.

The guidelines for excellent include but are not limited to:

- The candidate has made outstanding contribution to the body of knowledge through published works and other sources of evidence of scholarship/research.
- The candidate has a national or international reputation based on research contributions to a particular area or areas of research.
- The candidate has demonstrated continuous and sustained research productivity, as evidenced by an average of one high quality, peer-reviewed national or international journal publication a year (see Appendix B for impact).

- Evidence of focused efforts toward securing external funding for research. For example, grant proposals submitted to major external funding source or internal sources with candidate as primary or secondary investigator.
- An average of two or more refereed presentations at major international, national, regional/local conferences each year.

Teaching and Service descriptions same as the FIR guidelines (please refer to them and Appendix B).

Documentation for Promotion for Rank III Faculty

Each candidate for promotion and/or tenure must present a dossier identifying appropriate supporting evidence. COE and UNLV Bylaws state that the candidate's dossier must contain the following:

- The University of Nevada System Recommendation for Tenure or Promotion form (The Regents' Form)
- Vita
- Mid-tenure Evaluation
- A narrative addressing progress toward promotion (or professional growth since last promotion or Progress Assessment (see NSHE 5.12.2))
- Annual Evaluations by Department Chair(s)
- Summaries of teaching evaluations
- Examples of course syllabi
- Copies of scholarly work.

External Letters of Support. UNLV Bylaws state that the application for promotion from assistant to associate and for associate to full professor requires evaluation from external reviewers. The department will solicit at least four letters from external referees outside the University, at least two of which shall be from persons drawn from a list of names suggested by the candidate. The department requires that the external referees must be at the same rank or higher as the rank for which the candidate is applying. To address conflicts of interest by external reviewers, the candidate will provide a written list and rationale of faculty to be excluded from serving in this role to the Chair by April 15. The Chair is responsible for selecting the external reviewers.

Because the specific documents required for the application are not static, all candidates are encouraged to begin the preparation process in the fall semester of the academic year immediately preceding the academic year in which the application is to be considered.

Committee review begins early in the fall semester. It will be to the advantage of the candidate for all documentation to be *completed during the summer preceding the fall review*, allowing time, if needed, in the early fall to adapt materials for changes in required forms.

Appeal Process

UNLV Bylaws (Chapter 6, Section 16.7) states that the review for academic promotion will move through proper faculty and administrative levels, starting at the department level and progressing to the school or college and then to the Executive Vice Provost to the president, with recommendations provided to the Faculty Senate. UNLV Bylaws (Chapter 6, Section

16.8 and Section 16.9) provide guidelines for candidates who were denied promotion and/or wish to submit a request for reconsideration.

ANNUAL REVIEW

The annual review is conducted by the Department Chair. All CSH full-time faculty (tenured, tenure track, non-tenure track, visiting) are required to be evaluated annually. All faculty are evaluated based on their workloads, e.g., visiting faculty should be evaluated only on teaching.

For tenure-track faculty, all tenured departmental faculty review the annual faculty achievement report and CV. The review culminates in a written letter to the Chair by the tenured faculty, summarizing the evaluation and providing feedback relevant to progress and needed growth towards tenure. Tenured faculty are evaluated by the Department Chair without input from faculty.

The guidelines for excellent include a determination of adequate progress towards tenure and/or promotion in their respective areas by rank:

- For non-tenure track faculty (FIRs), the Excellent benchmarks for teaching or service are used.
- For tenure-track faculty (Assistant Professors), the Excellent benchmarks for research are used and Satisfactory benchmarks are used for teaching and service.
- For tenured faculty (Associate and Full Professors), the Satisfactory benchmarks are used as minimum standards for teaching, research, and service.

MID-TENURE REVIEW

The mid-tenure review is conducted at the approximate mid-point of the probationary period with the specific date determined by the Department Chair and the Chair of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee. Mid-tenure reviews are primarily for the faculty member's information but are considered personnel actions. The review, jointly directed by the Department Chair and the Chair of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, essentially mirrors the eventual application process, culminating in a written report to the faculty member prepared by the department chair, summarizing the evaluation and providing feedback relevant to progress and needed growth by April 1. The process should begin early enough to meet the college due date of April 15 and candidates must submit their materials by February 1 to the Chair.

APPENDIX B

INDICATORS OF SIGNIFICANCE (QUALITY AND IMPACT) OF THE WORK:

TEACHING, SERVICE, AND RESEARCH

Teaching

Indicators of quality and significance may include (but are not limited by or to) the following factors:

- External awards for teaching from honorary/learned/professional societies.
- Internal awards for teaching excellence--university awards are given the most weight, followed by college awards and then departmental awards.
- Refereed publications on teaching pedagogy.
- A consistent record of innovative and effective teaching that is validated by multiple indicators, e.g., course evaluations, peer-reviews, learning outcomes, demonstrated commitment to professional development as a teacher (iterative course improvements over time, self reflection of strengths and areas for growth, plan for growth).
- Major innovations/developments in teaching related activities.
- Authorship of textbooks.
- Significant curriculum development, including the development of multiple classes for graduate and undergraduate concentrations within a departmental or multi-disciplinary program.
- A substantial record of student mentoring as indicated by
 - Extensive supervision of undergraduate or graduate students in independent studies, practica, and internships.
 - Significant service on multiple M.A. and/or Ph.D. committees beyond departmental or college norms.
- Addresses or other substantial presentations on teaching pedagogy at honorary/learned/professional societies.

Service

Indicators of quality and significance may include (but are not limited by or to) the following factors:

- Significance of the specialized assignment within the candidate's unit and/or the university
- Significance of the specialized assignment within the candidate's professional and/or academic area of expertise
- Curriculum/program development, accreditation.
- Administrative/fiscal management.
- Key administrative/specialized assignment role within the candidate's unit beyond the normal expectations of academic faculty (e.g. graduate or undergraduate coordinator, basic course director, debate/forensic coach).
- External awards or recognition of distinguished administration/specialized assignment activities from honorary, learned, and/or professional societies.
- Internal awards for excellence --university awards are given the most weight, followed by college awards and then departmental awards.

- Significant contributions to a service role in the college beyond the normal expectations of the appointment (e.g. sitting on or chairing college committees).
- Significant advisory roles within the university (e.g. sitting on or chairing university committees, serving as the graduate college representative on graduate student committees).
- External awards of distinguished service from honorary, learned, and/or professional societies.
- Internal awards for excellence in service--university awards are given the most weight, followed by college awards and then departmental awards.
- Writing grants that help support the unit's teaching or service missions
- University-based service activities:
 - Major administrative appointments (e.g., graduate or undergraduate coordinator, basic course director, debate/forensics coach).
 - Chairing university, college, and departmental committees.
 - Active participation as a member of multiple committees at all levels (i.e., university, college, and departmental).
 - Individual service initiatives that benefit the University (e.g., writing accreditation reports, coordinator of student service organizations).
- Professional service activities:
 - Membership on editorial boards and other review bodies.
 - Reviews of textbooks and manuscripts for professional journals.
 - Organization of professional conferences.
 - Elected positions or appointments to leadership positions in professional organizations.
 - Individual service initiatives that benefit the profession (e.g., workshop coordinators, site coordinator, web-based development).
- Community service activities:
 - Appointments to leadership positions within community-based organizations.
 - Active participation in multiple collaborative partnerships between the university and community organizations.
 - Individual service initiatives that benefit the community (e.g., service training, outreach).

Research and Scholarship

Impact

The quality of research, or impact, is the influence of the work on research, teaching, and practice in one's discipline, profession, and broader society.

The primary evidence of impact are the external letters of support by peers and communities served (e.g., community based research).

For multiple authored publications, the candidate should note his/her contribution to the work with a short description of what he/she did (e.g., conceptualization, data collection, data analysis, wrote introduction) and also note the percentage contribution he/she made to the work. ^{[[1]]}_{[[2]]}

The measurement of impact should be demonstrated by a variety of multiple indicators. Traditional and novel indicators of impact should be used to assess impact comprehensively some of which include these as examples:

- Grants
- Journal ranking
- Journal impact factor
- Citations of work
- Manuscript downloads
- Altmetrics
- Use of work in practice
- Readership or audience reached
- Social media
- News
- Policy change