

BYLAWS

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Approved October 2017 (except where noted)

1. **Composition**

1.1 The Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education shall consist of the faculty responsible for course offerings in the areas of foundations, school psychology, and higher education.

1.2 Hereinafter, the Department shall refer to the body of persons holding voting privilege. Faculty with academic rank in the Department, including tenured and tenure-track Faculty, Faculty-in-residence and Visiting Professors are entitled to voting privileges except for personnel decisions involving tenured and tenure-track faculty (for example, hiring decisions, promotion, tenure, merit). Other persons may attend Departmental meetings by invitation.

2. **Administration**

2.1 The Chairperson is responsible for the duties detailed in the College of Education Bylaws, and such other duties as determined by the Department.

2.2 The Chairperson will be recommended to serve a three-year term.

2.3 If the Chairperson is out of town for three weekdays, he/she shall appoint an interim replacement. If the absence is for longer than three months, an interim chairperson will be selected by procedures detailed in 7.1 - 7.7 to serve until the return of the chairperson or until expiration of the three-year term.

2.4 Program areas and faculty assignments within these areas will be determined by the Department. Program area coordinators will be selected by the faculty of each area for a one year term. Program area coordinators will be given duties with reduced teaching loads contingent upon the demonstrated needs and exigencies when the Department deems that such reduction is appropriate. Membership in curricular and administrative programs/areas within the Department will be determined by the interest and expertise of each individual faculty member. Faculty members may participate in more than one program/area but only have voting privileges in one.

2.5 Other coordinators/directors may be appointed by the Chair as necessary.

2.6 It is the faculty's responsibility to initiate, develop, and implement the Department's curricular offerings in concert with Departmental objectives.

2.7 The Department shall approve each new (or revised) curricular or program offering.

2.8 Student input on a broader scale will be sought in matters on which such input is deemed necessary by the Department.

3. **Department and Program Committee Responsibilities**

3.1 The Department shall create committees as deemed necessary including, but not limited to, the following committees:

3.1.1 A Promotion and Tenure Committee will be selected by the

Department.

3.1.2 Each program area in the department (foundations, school psychology, and higher education) shall act separately under the leadership of the program area coordinator. Each program area will be responsible for admissions, curriculum, conducting searches and recommendations in hiring new faculty, and monitoring student progress.

3.1.3 Additional committees may be formed as the need arises

4. Meetings

4.1 The Department will schedule a minimum of two meetings per academic semester. The frequency and placement of additional meetings shall be open to the decision of the Chair.

4.2 Agenda items may be submitted by any member of the Department five days before the scheduled meeting.

4.3 The transaction of Departmental business is dependent upon a quorum of two-thirds of the Department.

4.4 Proxies may be used within the Department and shall be consistent with College Bylaws, which state that absent members may designate a proxy. When necessary, such proxies may be communicated by telephone, email, or other written formats either to the department secretary or to the Chair.

5. Departmental Prerogatives

5.1 Promotion and Tenure

5.1.1. An individual faculty member may initiate action on matters of promotion and tenure.

5.1.2. Procedures and criteria for Departmental promotion and tenure recommendations will be established by the Department consistent with University System Code, UNLV, and College of Education guidelines. The Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines are attached as Appendix A in these Bylaws.

5.1.3. It is incumbent upon the individual faculty member to provide documentation supporting the promotion and/or tenure request.

5.1.4. Each member of the Department shall have the opportunity to confidentially evaluate faculty under consideration for promotion and/or tenure on the accepted criteria.

5.1.5. Departmental recommendations will be forwarded by the Chairperson to the Dean. For purpose of oral presentation to the Dean, the Chairperson may include a member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

5.1.6. The Department supports the principle that any written communication relating to the evaluation of any faculty member, for the purpose of reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure, shall be subject to review by that faculty member.

5.2. The recognition of the tripartite functions of the University (research-teaching service), dictates that the Department faculty operates on the basis of workload policies which permit accomplishment of these functions.

6. Procedures for Amending Department Bylaws

6.1 A change in the Bylaws may be proposed by 20% of the faculty or by the Department Chair.

6.2 The requested change in Bylaws is placed on the agenda of the next faculty meeting, if possible, or the one following. The issue is discussed in full and the final formulation of the proposed changes is determined by faculty discussion. If this step is not completed during the faculty meeting, it is to be completed at the next scheduled faculty meeting.

6.3 Faculty members vote on the proposed Bylaw changes at the faculty meeting following the one in which the final formulation of the proposed changes was made.

6.4 Voting on the proposed changes in Bylaws is done by secret ballot. Bylaws are passed only when 2/3 of the total faculty vote in their favor. A faculty member who cannot be present may leave an official proxy ballot with the Department secretary and the ballot will be inserted in the ballot box and counted with the others.

6.5 Bylaw changes become effective after a 2/3 majority is reached, unless the Chair or 20% of the faculty members requests reconsideration.

6.6 If the Chair or 20% of the faculty members wish to call for reconsideration, it must be requested within one week of the vote. A meeting will then be convened to discuss it. During this meeting, the Chair or other faculty members may present arguments against the earlier faculty decision. The faculty has the option to terminate the discussion and vote a second time on the original approved formulation. If a 2/3 vote is achieved, the Bylaws become effective. If the faculty wishes to vote on new changes in the language of the originally approved Bylaws, then the vote on these is postponed until the following faculty meeting or a mail ballot several days later.

6.7 The Bylaws Committee is an ad-hoc committee appointed by the Chair from time to time as needed, and is to include all faculty members interested in attending. Its meetings are open to all faculty members, its voting is open, and minutes detailing majority and minority views are distributed to all faculty members.

7. Nomination and Election of Department Chair

7.1 The Department Chair is recommended by a two-thirds vote of the Department and such recommendation shall be forwarded to the Dean.

7.2 The procedure for recommending the Department Chair is handled by an ad-hoc Nominations and Elections Committee. This committee is elected by the faculty and consists of three members, tenured or untenured, with full-time positions in the Department, who have no intention of running for the office of Chair.

7.3 A list of eligible candidates for the Nominations and Elections Committee is circulated to all faculty members with instructions to cross off one's name if one does not wish to serve on the Committee.

7.4 An amended list of willing candidates is circulated with instructions to check off three (no more and no less) names. The three members with the highest number of votes are

elected, and they select the Chair of their Committee from their ranks.

7.5 This Committee is responsible for all phases of the nomination and election process, including the procedure whereby faculty members register their choice for Chair.

7.6 The Committee transmits to the Dean of the College the minutes of the election meeting and the results of the secret ballot. Proxy ballots are permitted.

7.7 With the exception of candidates being considered from outside the Department, the Chair must be a tenured, full-time faculty member of the Department.

7.8 The nomination of the Department Chair shall take place during the first (Fall) semester of the third year of office of the incumbent Chair.

8. Evaluation of the Department Chairperson

8.1 In accordance with Section 4.3 of the COE Bylaws, the department chair will be evaluated annually by the department faculty. Results of the evaluation will be made available to the Dean of the COE.

8.2 The Department Chair will be evaluated by the Department beginning their second year in the position.

8.3 The procedure for evaluation of the Department Chair is overseen by the department representative to the Dean's Advisory Committee, herein after referred to as "Evaluation Chair."

8.4 Annually, on the first work day closest to November 1st, the Evaluation Chair shall disseminate the *Chair Evaluation* (see Appendix ?) to the faculty for completion. All tenure-track, FIRs, and research professors shall participate in the evaluation. New hires shall participate in the evaluation process after one full year of employment in the Department. The faculty will have two weeks to complete the evaluation.

8.5 Upon completion of the *Chair Evaluation* by faculty members, the Evaluation Chair shall calculate the means of each of the 15-items on the *Evaluation*. In addition, he or she shall compile a comprehensive list of comments from the evaluations.

8.6 The Evaluation Chair shall then forward the results of the *Chair Evaluation* to the Dean of the COE by December 1st.

9. Procedures for Recommending Termination of Office of the Department Chair

9.1 The request to consider termination of office of the Department Chair is made in writing by at least 20% of the faculty.

9.2 The issue is discussed in a special meeting conducted by a tenured faculty member elected by 2/3 vote of the faculty. If no one receives a 2/3 vote, then the meeting is chaired by a tenured faculty member chosen at random from those willing to serve in that capacity.

9.3 The vote on 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 is required for a

conclusive recommendation to be made to the Dean.

9.4 The Chair of the meeting is responsible for transmitting to the Dean the minutes of the special meeting(s), and the results of the secret ballot.

10.0 EPHE Graduate Coordinator Bylaws

Selection of Graduate Coordinator

- I. In keeping with UNLV Graduate College Bylaws, the following delineate selection of Graduate Coordinator in the Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education:
 - a. Candidates for Graduate Coordinator shall hold Full Graduate Faculty Status.
 - b. Graduate Coordinators shall be tenured faculty within the unit, unless staffing circumstances within a unit or the particular characteristics of the unit dictate otherwise. In case of the latter, the Chair/Director, Academic Dean, and Graduate Dean must approve of the appointment.
 - c. Candidates for Graduate Coordinator shall be self-nominated or nominated by a faculty, college, Chair/Director, or Academic Dean.
 - d. Graduate Coordinators shall be elected by a majority of the academic unit's graduate faculty in a blind vote.

Terms and Conditions

- I. In keeping with UNLV Graduate College Bylaws, the following delineate terms and conditions of the Graduate Coordinator in the Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education:
 - a. Graduate Coordinators shall serve three (3) year terms of service.
 - b. Graduate Coordinators shall uphold the highest standards in execution of their service.
 - c. Graduate Coordinators shall faithfully and effectively serve their graduate faculty colleagues, department, program and graduate students, and fulfill the expectations outlined herein.
 - d. Graduate Coordinators shall be recognized for their contributions and leadership, and receive appropriate compensation for their time and service by way of workload adjustments, salary supplement if available, and student, administrative or professional support staff assistance where appropriate and viable.
 - e. Graduate Coordinators shall be reviewed on their performance in this role during their annual evaluation, and recognized for the merits of their service.
 - f. Graduate Coordinators who receive an unsatisfactory evaluation, who fail to effectively fulfill the requirements of the position, or commit an unethical act in violation of campus and community standards of research ethics, professional ethics, and NSHE Code, or who for some other reason are deemed unfit to continue serving to the end of their term may be removed in one of the following ways:
 1. By a majority vote of the academic unit's graduate faculty.
 2. By written notice from the Chair/Director, signed by the Academic Dean, but only in the case of an unsatisfactory review, when there has been a documented ethical

- breach, or a similar extreme situation that is documented and that would prohibit the Graduate Coordinator from faithfully fulfilling his/her responsibilities.
3. By written notice from the Graduate Dean and Academic Dean, but only in the rare case when there has been a documented ethical breach, or a similar extreme situation that is documented and that would prohibit the Graduate Coordinator from faithfully fulfilling his/her responsibilities.

Participation on the Graduate Council

Through their appointment to the Graduate Council, graduate coordinators also serve as members of at least one, and not more than two, Graduate College Committees each year, and assist with the formation and implementation of key Graduate College policies and programs. As needed, Graduate Coordinators may be invited to provide advice and counsel to the Graduate College Dean on a variety of issues.

Responsibilities to Graduate Students, Faculty, and Programs

In keeping with UNLV Graduate College Bylaws and in recognition that the exact responsibilities of Graduate Coordinators vary between departments and graduate programs, Coordinators are responsible for the management and oversight of both the day-to-day operations of graduate programs, and of graduate students, in their academic unit. This typically includes:

- Coordinating graduate student recruitment into department programs.
- Oversight, coordination, or direct handling of graduate admissions, including coordination and oversight of the evaluation of admissions applications according to Graduate College and specific program guidelines & requirements.
- Manage communications between the department and graduate students, both new and continuing.
- Graduate student mentorship and appropriate, timely matriculation.
- Appropriate handling and documentation of program milestones.
- Coordinate, review, and sign annual departmental evaluations of graduate students.
- Timely and accurate submission of required forms with integrity of review and signatures.
- Ensure departmental FERPA protections and appropriate handling of student documents, records, and information.
- Work with the Academic Dean, department chair and Graduate College on the appointment, assignment and supervision of graduate assistants.

- Oversight of student graduation requirements graduation requirements and proper procedures related to culminating experiences.
- Recommend student probation and separation, when appropriate, through appropriate unit and College channels, and then on to the Graduate College.
- Educate students and colleagues about Graduate College policies, and enforce the same.
- Ensure the accuracy of the graduate portion of the department website, the department's segment of the Graduate Catalog, the unit's handbook, and related informational materials and communications.

- Timely review and appropriate handling of graduate appeals.
- Work with department chair and Academic Dean to establish, review, and revoke as necessary, graduate faculty status.
- Collaborate with the department Chair/Director and Academic Dean, as appropriate, to facilitate graduate student policies, assignment of lab and/or office space, and mediation of graduate faculty and graduate student issues as necessary.
- Mandatory participation in the Graduate Council, and at least one Graduate College Committee each year.
- Serve as a conduit of information between the Graduate College and the Graduate Council to the academic unit faculty, staff, and graduate students.
- Collaborate with the Chair/Director and faculty colleagues to ensure rigor, quality, and maintenance of high standards of scholarship and graduate instruction within the unit's graduate programs, and the appropriate development of, and modification to, curriculum and programs.

Responsibility to Understand, Fairly Apply, and Enforce Standards

Graduate Coordinators are required to know and follow the relevant State of Nevada and Federal laws, the NSHE Code, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas Bylaws, the Graduate College Bylaws and the Graduate College Handbook. No policies or procedures employed in an academic unit or graduate program may supersede or contradict standing law or policy.

Responsibility to Coordinate and Collaborate with the Graduate College

Graduate Coordinators shall be responsive to inquiries, emails, phone calls, and requests from the Graduate College and its staff. Close collaboration with the Graduate College is required to ensure proper and efficient integration.

11. Research Active¹

11.1. Annually, indicators of “Research Active” shall be included in submitted faculty Annual Evaluation Reports.

11.2. General guidelines for “Research Active” include the following indicators:

11.2.1. Publications, as indicated by the number of publications, quality of journal, and contributions (percent of contribution accompanied by description of role played, e.g., conceptualization, data collection, data analyses, section of manuscript written);

11.2.2. Grant activity, as indicated by grant writing, grants submitted, grants awarded, and grant continuation;

¹ Approved September 13, 2018

11.2.3. Active engagement in student mentoring in research, as indicated by co-authorship with students on publications and presentations, director of research lab involving students, and advisement of research team involving students;

11.2.4. Research credibility as indicated by membership on editorial boards, ad hoc reviewer entries, special issues, and grant review teams; and

11.2.5. Research in progress, as measured by data collection, manuscript preparation, and manuscript submission.

11.3. The Department Chair shall determine if a faculty member will be considered “Research Active” for the following academic year, based upon the faculty member’s previous Annual Evaluation Report.

11.4. The Department Chair shall then forward “Research Active” recommendations to the Dean’s office for final approval.

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education

INTRODUCTION

The intent of this document is to assist candidates for tenure and/or promotion and to assist faculty and administrators charged with evaluation of the applicants with guidelines specific to the function and mission of the Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education. Because the eventual recommendation for tenure and promotion involves review according to university and college minimum requirements, some degree of consistency with such requirements is required. To facilitate that objective, the current UNLV Bylaws and COE promotion and tenure guidelines are used as a template for this document.

UNLV Bylaws: (Chapter 6, Section 16) requires promotion and tenure criteria to be established at the department level and enables departments to have additional criteria beyond the minimum standards. COE Bylaws indicate “each department shall specify in its bylaws the criteria and procedures for determining the basis for the unit recommendation regarding rank promotion.” We have interpreted this as enabling the department to establish expectations equal to or greater than are specified in the UNLV Bylaws and COE document but within what appear to be reasonable limits, consistent with the mission of the department, COE, and University. We have attempted to provide more specificity than is found in the COE document and UNLV Bylaws, as this is appropriate at the department level, but with understanding that these department bylaws serve to establish **general parameters rather than a set of absolute minimum requirements.**

I. GENERAL DEFINITIONS

Traditional roles and responsibilities of faculty members in major universities focus on three categories: research, teaching, and service. We have ordered these three categories in the order of expected contribution, by the faculty member seeking tenure and/or promotion. Collegiality is

expected in all three categories.

The broad definitions below for the Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education mirror those in the COE Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion and were written in consultation with UNLV Bylaws, Chapter 6, Section 16.

Research:

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 Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education also recognize 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.

Teaching:

Teaching is an activity or function performed by a faculty member on behalf of students and their learning. It includes (a) course instruction (b) advising and mentoring (c) all planning and related program and curricular endeavors, (d) supervision of students including directing field experiences of students in practica, internships, or other comparable clinical and field-based activities, (e) directing dissertations and theses, (f) mentoring students in the preparation of professional papers and publications, and (g) all communication and coordination activities related to instruction.

Service:

Professional service is defined as those activities that provide assistance to the Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education, the College of Education, the University, and to professional clients in the field and in the profession generally. Included under professional service are contributions to local, state, regional and national committees and professional organizations: to schools, postsecondary institutions, government agencies, and other organizations to plan, organize, conduct, or review programs appropriate to the area of specialization; advocacy of educational policies or leadership in groups devoted to such advocacy; and appropriate publications that do not fall into one of the research/scholarship categories. Also, it includes work on all Program, Department, College, and University committees, and assignments at all levels of the University.

Collegiality

The construct of collegiality is identified in University Bylaws as a “demonstrated ability to work productively with colleagues, staff, and students” (Section 16.4, B.4; Section 16.5, B.4). Collegiality is a professional criterion relating to the faculty member’s performance of duties within the college and department. It should not be confused with sociability and like-ability. Collegiality should include a respect for freedom of inquiry and differing professional views. The candidate’s professional abilities and relationships with colleagues should be compatible with the departmental and college missions and long-term goals. The candidate should exhibit ability and willingness to engage in shared academic and administrative tasks that departmental and college groups often must perform. The candidate should participate with some measure of reason and knowledge in discussions germane to departmental and college policies and programs. The candidate should maintain high standards of professional integrity.

II. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Research:

UNLV and COE Bylaws do not specify particular requirements for research that merit promotion and/or tenure at the department level. The Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education 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 refereed journals
- Articles published in nationally recognized non-refereed journals
- Evidence of articles in press in either of the above
- 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

The Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education has further specified the indicators in scholarship that will receive primary consideration and other supporting indicators that will be considered but given lesser weight in the review.

It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide evidence for the items below for which consideration is requested, including any instances where the candidate is requesting that increased weight be given to an indicator.

Scholarship Performance Indicators: Primary

- Publication of peer-reviewed scholarly articles in national/international refereed journals.
- Publication of single or co-authored books, chapters in books, monographs, when such materials are peer-reviewed and accepted for publication or distribution by an editorial staff.
- College, university, or national awards for research excellence.
- Obtaining new funding for scholarly research or training from an external source.
- Invited or competitively accepted presentations at professional, recognized meetings of national and international organizations.

Scholarship Performance Indicators: Supporting

- Publication of non-peer-reviewed scholarly articles in national refereed journals.
- Publication of scholarly articles in non-refereed journals.
- Publication of edited books or books with academic content that are not peer-reviewed.
- Research or training proposals submitted to obtain funds that have been reviewed or critiqued by qualified peers.
- Securing external funding for "continuation" grants and/or for grant administration.
- Preparation and documentation of new methods and materials of instruction (if non-published, or unevaluated by professional peers, include under "evidence of teaching").
- Publication of book, test, or monograph reviews.
- Publication of tests.
- Work in progress or submitted manuscripts (include dates of submission).
- Obtaining funds for a research proposal from an internal source.
- Invited or competitively accepted presentations at professional, recognized meetings of local, state, and regional organizations.

Teaching:

UNLV and COE Bylaws do not specify particular requirements for teaching that merit promotion and/or tenure at the department level. The Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education 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 teaching performance. This does not imply that the candidate must provide evidence in all of the areas identified, nor is the list exhaustive.

- Copies of syllabi
- Student ratings of courses taught
- A statement of philosophy of teaching
- A record of courses taught during the evaluation period
- Evidence of new strategies, techniques, processes and technologies used in teaching
- Evidence of development, teaching, and/or assessment of new courses
- Evidence of creating new teaching environments
- Attendance at professional development conferences, workshops and seminars related to the improvement of teaching
- A record of advisement, particularly at the masters and doctoral level
- Honors and awards for teaching
- Peer evaluations of teaching

The Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education has further specified the indicators of teaching performance that will receive primary consideration and other supporting indicators that will be considered but given lesser weight in the review. The Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education has operationally defined "advisement" to refer specifically to professional mentoring activities in work with graduate students as opposed to general program advisement and course selection. The latter is an essential and invaluable responsibility of a faculty member but is interpreted as evidence for department service rather than instruction.

It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide evidence for the items below for which consideration is requested, including any instances where the candidate is requesting that increased weight be given to an indicator.

Teaching Performance Indicators: Primary

- University or college wide awards for teaching excellence.
- Assessment of the faculty member's instructional performance based on student opinion. COE Instructor Evaluations from the previous three academic years must be included.
- Mentoring of graduate students (e.g. joint presentations at conferences, joint publications, graduate student awards, serving as a methodological consultant or other substantial involvement on graduate student committees).
- Mentoring of PTIs and PTI/GAs (e.g. students mentored, courses supervised, and other evidence of mentoring impact).
- Statements by peers (both in and out of the COE) relating to an individual faculty member's instructional performance and to their depth of understanding in their field of

specialization as well as their ability to relate it to other areas, when such statements are based on direct observation of instruction and/or evaluation of course syllabi and course materials. The content of a faculty member's course, including methods of evaluation, is an important consideration in teaching efficacy.

Teaching Performance Indicators: Supporting

- Solicited or unsolicited statements by students.
- Solicited or unsolicited statements by supervisors and/or administrators relating to performance of former students of a faculty member.
- Development of new instructional programs, program sequences, courses, and course material.
- Research consultation to peers.

Service:

UNLV and COE Bylaws do not specify particular requirements for service that merit promotion and/or tenure at the department level. The department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education 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 service performance. This does not imply that the candidate must provide evidence in all of the areas identified, nor is the list exhaustive.

- Chair or membership in program, department, college and university committees
- Participation in special university programs
- Service to the local community (workshops, presentations, serving on local boards, seminars, colloquial)
- Participation in local, state and national organizations including offices held, committee memberships, editorial board membership, serving as a reviewer, serving as journal editor
- Service on special panels, task forces, committees and accreditation teams
- Consultation services in related fields, including for educational, governmental, non-profit, and for-profit organizations
- External funding for service grants
- Honors and awards for service

The Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education has further specified the indicators for service that will receive primary consideration and other supporting indicators that will be considered but given lesser weight in the review.

It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide evidence for the items below for which consideration is requested, including any instances where the candidate is requesting that

increased weight be given to an indicator.

Service Performance Indicators: Primary

- Chairing of department, college and/or university committees.
- Major departmental, college and/or university administrative assignment (e. g., coordinator).
- Officer, board member, or committee member of relevant regional, national, or international professional organization
- General Editor, column Editor, or Associate Editor of a recognized professional journal.
- Member of an editorial review board.
- Service in area of expertise to local, regional, national, or international institutions or organizations (e. g., service to CCSD, postsecondary institutions, non-profit organizations, etc.).
- Organizational activities related to conventions at regional, national, or international level.
- External funding for service grants

Service Performance Indicators: Supporting

- Involvement in department, college, university and university-community committees.
- Speaker for local, education-related groups.
- Committee or board member of district professional educational organizations.
- Reviewer of professional journals, books, tests, proceedings or conference program proposals.
- Officer, board member, or committee member of relevant state or local professional organization
- Editor of newsletter.
- Organizational activities related to conventions at local or state level.

III. PROMOTION GUIDELINES: ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

UNLV faculty members are evaluated on a four-point scale of excellent, commendable, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. The minimum evaluation standard for performance from assistant to associate professor, according to UNLV Code, is a record of excellence in either teaching or scholarship and at least satisfactory in the other. In addition, the candidate must demonstrate a minimum of satisfactory record in service.

Teaching:

The COE rubric for evaluation of teaching, using the broad definition and the indicators on previous page, is that for promotion from assistant to associate professor the candidate needs to demonstrate a record of effective teaching.

The Department of Educational Psychology & Higher Education further refines this rubric with the following guidelines for evaluation, with further understanding that these indicators are intended to be illustrative of the quality of performance expected and are not a checklist for approval:

The guidelines for excellent include but are not limited to:

- Peer evaluation of excellence based on observation and review of course materials.
- Consistent record of strong positive student evaluations throughout the probationary period.
- Evaluation of syllabi, examinations, student projects, and other teaching materials suggests consistent implementation of quality learning environments.
- Evidence of leadership in development and implementation of new courses, extensive revision of existing courses, or development of new department program
- Consistent pattern of successful mentoring of graduate students in preparation of scholarly products through chairing and/or serving on committees.
- Evidence of mentoring Graduate students toward refereed publication and/or national presentations.

The guidelines for commendable include but are not limited to:

- Peer evaluation of at least commendable based on observation and review of course materials
- Consistent record of positive student evaluations by the end of the probationary period.
- Evaluation of syllabi, examinations, student projects, and other teaching materials suggests that progress is being made toward the successful implementation of quality learning environments.
- Evidence of mentoring of graduate students in preparation of scholarly products through chairing and/or serving on committees.
- Consistent evidence of ability to and interest in utilizing a variety of teaching strategies.
- Evidence of mentoring Graduate students toward presentation proposal submission to national conferences.

The guidelines for satisfactory include but are not limited to:

- Peer evaluation of at least satisfactory based on observation and review of course materials.
- Efforts to keep abreast of new knowledge and the incorporation of that knowledge into student learning experiences are evident.
- Participation on theses and dissertations committees.

Scholarship:

The COE rubric for evaluation of scholarship, using the broad definition and the indicators on previous page, is that for promotion from assistant to associate professor the candidate must demonstrate evidence of continuous quality 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.

The Department of Educational Psychology & Higher Education further refines this rubric as follows with 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 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.

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.
- Evidence of focused efforts toward securing external funding for research.
- Six to twelve refereed national journal publications with at least three as first author and with the record to include at least two publications in a journal identified as top level in the relevant discipline, or a comparable combination of journal publications, book chapters, and scholarly books.
- Two grant proposals submitted to major external funding source with candidate as primary or secondary investigator, or one major externally funded grant with candidate as primary or secondary investigator.
- An average of two or more refereed presentations at major national conferences each year during the probationary period.

The guidelines for commendable include but are not limited to:

- Evidence of a record of continuing on--going scholarship agenda is present.
- 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.
- Evidence of efforts to secure internal and/or external funding for research.
- Five refereed national journal publications with at least three as first author and with the record to include at least two publications in a journal identified as top level in the relevant discipline, or a comparable combination of journal publications, book chapters, and scholarly books.
- At least one grant proposal submitted to major external funding source with candidate as primary or secondary investigator.
- An average of one or more presentations at major national conferences each year during the probationary period.

The guidelines for satisfactory include but are not limited to:

- Evidence of on-going scholarship agenda is present.
- The candidate has made high-quality contribution through activities associated with the indices of research competence.
- Manuscripts are being consistently published in refereed journals.
- Recognizable as a focused line of inquiry and recognition as an authority is emerging.
- Evidence of efforts to secure internal funding for research.

Service:

The COE rubric for evaluation of service, using the broad definition and the indicators on previous page, is that for promotion from assistant to associate professor the candidate is expected to engage in both intra-university and extramural service. In evaluating service, emphasis is placed upon evidence of contributions to the department, college and university, the local community and the profession in general.

The Department of Educational Psychology & Higher Education, recognizing that a satisfactory level of service is sufficient expectation for promotion from assistant to associate professor, refines this rubric as follows with understanding that these indicators are intended to be illustrative of the quality of performance expected and are not a checklist for approval:

The guidelines for satisfactory include but are not limited to:

- Evidence of participation in at least one university, one college, and one department faculty governance committee during the probationary period
- Evidence of at least one significant community service activity at the local or state level
- Evidence of satisfactory performance in assigned student advising
- Evidence of participation in organization of at least one local, state, regional, or national conference during the probationary period

IV. PROMOTION GUIDELINES: ASSOCIATE TO FULL PROFESSOR

The Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education endorses the general expectation in the UNLV Bylaws (Chapter 6, Section 16.5) and COE Guidelines that characterize a full professor. These characterizations are aligned with the department's expectations that promotion to Professor requires that individuals participate in research, teaching, and service, and that, in the years under consideration, the candidate demonstrates leadership in these three areas.

Promotion to the rank of Professor is in recognition of the candidate's academic maturity. It is largely based upon the candidate's accomplishments since promotion to Associate Professor. While there are variations in the manner in which faculty members meet the standard of distinction required for promotion to this senior rank, all are expected to demonstrate a clearly discernible pattern of growth and achievement, along with a degree of national prominence within their area of specialization. For these reasons, it is expected that an individual promoted to Professor would provide for colleagues and students a perspective that is broader than that of the

home institution (i.e., the candidate has received recognition beyond the home institution, and this recognition results from contributions made to the profession). This recognition may be demonstrated in a variety of ways through multiple sources of supporting evidence.

Expectations of effectiveness and collegiality are inherent in the notion of leadership. Therefore, it is expected that an individual promoted to Professor will also demonstrate a continuation of the collegiality required for, and implied in, the tenure process. The department performance guidelines for research, teaching, and service, as they pertain to promotion to full professor include:

Research:

The candidate for Full Professor shall provide evidence of national/international recognition in research through publications, books, national organizations, research or grant projects. 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.

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.

Teaching:

The candidate for Full Professor should provide evidence of active mentoring and leadership in teaching and advising and maintain a record of acceptable student evaluations.

Service:

The candidate for Full Professor should provide evidence of national/international recognition as evidenced by the Service Indicators in Section II of the Educational Psychology and Higher Education P&T Bylaws. Candidates are encouraged to seek external funding in the form of service/training, which also demonstrates service excellence at the rank of Professor. Service also embraces the organizational citizenship behavior of the candidate. To be considered service the activity must be clearly related to the professional competence or position of the faculty member.

The Department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education endorses the guidelines above with emphasis that for promotion to full professor, the department expectations for both research and service assume significant national recognition. When appropriate for the discipline of the candidate, the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) may be used as an indicator of national recognition of scholarship. In other disciplines represented in the department, it is the responsibility of the candidate to provide comparable evidence.

V. TENURE

Although tenure is not a job guarantee, it does provide due process protection; thus permitting professors the academic freedom so often needed in their research and teaching. The tenure applicant must demonstrate a balance of success in research, teaching, and service. In addition,

the construct of collegiality as defined in UNVL bylaws at the beginning of this document is endorsed by the department of Educational Psychology and Higher Education and expected of all applicants: those applying for tenure and promotion to the Associate level and those applying for promotion to the Full Professor level.

At the Assistant Professor level, the criteria for tenure are essentially parallel to those for promotion to Associate Professor. UNLV bylaws (Chapter 6, Section 16.4) provide guidelines for essential requirements, and this document provides departmental guidelines for specific accomplishments in consideration of the department and the field in which Associate Professors work in Educational Psychology and Higher Education. Tenure and promotion are generally concurrent at that level. For faculty at the Associate level, the criteria are essentially the same, but the probationary period may be shortened for credit given during the hire.

Full professors and associate professors with well-established careers that are tenured at other accredited universities may be tenured at the time of initial employment provided he/she meets UNLV basic standards and is recommended by a vote of tenured faculty of the appropriate department. UNLV bylaws (Chapter 6, Section 16.5) provide guidelines for essential requirements, and this document provides departmental guidelines for specific accomplishments in consideration of the department and the field in which Full Professors work in Educational Psychology and Higher Education.

VI. 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.

VII. APPLICATION PROCESS

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

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.

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 University of Nevada System Recommendation for Tenure or Promotion form (The Regents' Form); Vita; Mid-tenure Evaluation; Annual Evaluations by Department Chair(s); summaries of teaching evaluations; examples of course syllabi; and copies of scholarly work. UNLV Bylaws further 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 of Educational Psychology and Higher Education requires that the external referees must be at the same rank or higher as the rank for which the candidate is applying.

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.

VIII. 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.

Guidelines for Promotion and Merit for Faculty-In Residence²

Department of Educational Psychology & Higher Education

Preamble

Decisions about the promotion and merit of faculty-in-residence within the Department of Educational Psychology & Higher Education (EPHE) are guided by three basic principles. First, a candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, administration/specialized assignments, and service will be evaluated primarily in terms of the significance of the work. Significant work is defined by its quality and impact. Benchmarks of significant work are suggested in Appendix A. Second, it is the candidate's responsibility to demonstrate the significance of his/her work by using these benchmarks or other direct evidence that clearly reveals its impact. Third, the Department's P & T Committee will be

² Approved January 11, 2018

used in all evaluative decisions to supplement and validate claims about the significance of the candidate's work. In general, since faculty-in-residences are not expected to conduct research, evaluations for promotion and merit are based on the significance of the teaching, administration/specialized assignments, and service activities. However, if a faculty-in-residence engages in 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.

Definition

Faculty-in-Residence are non tenure-track faculty who are not specifically addressed in either Board of Regents or the University of Nevada Las Vegas codes or handbook. Nevertheless, faculty-in-residence typically carry increased teaching loads, heavy service and administrative obligations and/or specialized assignments, and stand for promotion and merit along with all other faculty. Faculty-in-residence have earned terminal degrees and bring both experiential and academic credentials to their positions in the college. Faculty-in-residence contribute to both the undergraduate and graduate programs within the college, serve on and chair student committees, and provide service in significant administrative positions.

Promotion Review

The promotion review, which occurs during the sixth semester in rank, is intended to assist, support and evaluate faculty-in-residence as they progress toward promotion in the EPHE Department. The process provides feedback to candidates in regard to their performance in teaching, administration/specialized assignments, and service activities. If submitted, feedback will also be given in the area of research, although this area is not required. The promotion review occurs before promotion to Associate Professor-in-Residence and before promotion to Professor-in-Residence. The following materials will be considered at the time of promotion review:

1. Current vita
2. All existing annual evaluations
3. All existing teaching evaluations
4. Evidence of administration/specialized assignments
5. Evidence of service
6. Evidence of research (if submitted)

All members of the P & T Committee will review the candidate's dossier. The committee chair will call a meeting of the P & T Committee at which members will discuss the candidate's dossier. A written report 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. The candidate may write a response to the committee's report be included in the candidate's file. The candidate can then decide to apply for promotion or wait a longer period of time to do so.

Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor-in-Residence

Because the UNLV code does not address criteria for promotion of faculty-in-residence; this section of the document provides guidance in the absence of codified criteria.

Distinctions between excellent and satisfactory performance within the EPHE Department are based on the quality and impact 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 administration/specialized assignments, as well as the specific benchmarks for "satisfactory" performance in the area of service, are summarized in the following section. Faculty-in-residence should meet the "excellent" benchmarks in either teaching or administration/specialized assignments, as well as the "satisfactory" benchmarks for the other. A rating of "commendable" represents performance that falls between the benchmarks for satisfactory and excellent. A candidate's specific contractual duties may commingle teaching and administration/ specialized assignment to a level in which it is impossible to separate the two. In these cases, it is the candidate's responsibility to make the argument for an "excellent" ranking

Excellence Ranking in Administration /Specialized Assignments

Evaluative decisions based on excellence in Administration/Specialized Assignments 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-residence serve their respective units in key administrative posts and spend as much or more time in administrative activity as in teaching. For this reason, faculty-in-residence 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 Administration/Specialized Assignments 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 Administration/Specialized Assignments:

- 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, 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).

Satisfactory Ranking in Administration/Specialized Assignments

A satisfactory rating in the above 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 A for specific indicators).

Excellence Ranking in 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:

- 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 undergraduate concentrations within a departmental or multi-disciplinary program.
- A substantial record of extensive and successful mentoring of students, as indicated by (but not limited to) (1) active supervision of numerous undergraduate students in independent studies and internships; or (2) chairing or major participation in student committees beyond departmental or college norms; or (3) multiple instances of mentoring student work and projects.

Satisfactory Ranking in Teaching

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., M.A. thesis, independent studies).

Satisfactory Ranking in Service

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 A 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 significant administrative/specialized assignment roles, 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 faculty-in-residence 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 A 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 both the undergraduate and graduate levels.
- A record of leadership in university and/or professional service, including major administrative positions within the university that may be open to faculty-in-residence (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.

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 after the candidate has spent three years in rank as an Associate Professor-in-Residence.

Documentation for Promotions

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:

Administrative/Specialized Assignment Portfolio:

- A narrative summary (1 page) of the general nature of one's administrative/specialized assignment duties and contributions and academic activities (if applicable for the candidate).
- External evidence of the quality and quantity of the work associated with these specialized assignment activities.

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 (e.g., internal and external peer- reviews, awards, or other assessments of learning gains).
- 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 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.

Other required documents for promotion decisions include copies of:

- Annual evaluations over the evaluative period in question.
- Chair/Director evaluations within each area of administrative/specialized assignment, teaching and service.
- Department P & T Committee reviews of portfolios.

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 A 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 (journal articles, scholarly books, etc.), since these fall outside of expectations for faculty-in-residence.

Appendix A: Indicators of the Significance (Quality and Impact) of the Work

I. Administrative/Specialized Assignment

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).

II. 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 peer-reviews.

EPHE Department Bylaws

- 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 students in independent studies, practica, and internships.
 - Chairing 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.

III. Service

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

- 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.

EPHE Department Bylaws

- 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).