

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 7717-to serve until the return of the chairperson or until expiration of the three-year term.

2.4

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

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 Chair. UHSUHVHQWDWLYH WR WKH 'HDQ¶V \$GYLVRU\ & CHAIR LWWHH

8.4 Annually, on the first work day closest to November 1st, the Evaluation Chair shall disseminate the Chair Evaluation

conclusive recommendation to be made to the Dean.

9.4 The Chair of the meeting is responsible for transmitting to the Dean 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 faculty, college, Chair/Director, or Academic Dean.
 - G * U D G X D W H & R R U G L Q D W R U V V K D O O E H H O H F W H G E V

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. % \ D P D M R U L W \ Y R W H R I W K H D F D G H P L F X Q L W \ V J U D
 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 documented ethical

- o Timely review and appropriate handling of graduate appeals.
- o Work with department chair and Academic Dean to establish, review, and revoke as necessary, graduate faculty status.
- o 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.
- o Mandatory participation in the Graduate Council, and at least one Graduate College Committee each year.
- o Serve as a conduit of information between the Graduate College and the Graduate Council to the academic unit faculty, staff, and graduate students.
- o Collaborate with the Chair/Director and faculty colleagues to ensure rigor, quality, and maintenance of high standards of scholarship and graduate instruction within the 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 Activé

11.1. Annually, L Q G L F D W R U V R I 3 shall be included in \$ F W M Faculty Annual Evaluation Reports.

11.2. * H Q H U D O J X L Research Active Rule 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

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

expected in all three categories.

7KH FRQVWUXFW RI FROOHJLDOLW\ LV LGHQWLILHG LQ 8QLY
work productively with FROOHDJXH VWDII DQG VWXGHQWV' 6HFWL
& ROOHJLDOLW\ LV D SURIHVVLRQDO FULWHULRQ UHODWLQJ

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.

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.

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

- x University or college wide awards for teaching excellence.
- x \$VVHVVP HQW RI WKH IDFXOW\ PHPEHU¶V LQVWUXFWLRQ COE Instructor Evaluations from the previous three academic years must be included.
- x 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).
- x Mentoring of PTIs and PTI/GAs (e.g. students mentored, courses supervised, and other evidence of mentoring impact).
- x Statements by peers (both in and out of the COE) relating to an individual faculty PHPEHU¶V LQVWUXFWLRQDO SHUIRUPDQFH DQG WR WKH

increased weight be given to an indicator.

Service Performance Indicators: Primary

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

Service Performance Indicators: Supporting

- x Involvement in department, college, university and university-community committees.
- x Speaker for local, education-related groups.
- x Committee or board member of district professional educational organizations.
- x Reviewer of professional journals, books, tests, proceedings or conference program proposals.
- x Officer, board member, or committee member of relevant professional organizations.

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:

- x The candidate has made outstanding contribution to the body of knowledge through published works and other sources of evidence of scholarship/research.
- x

The guidelines for satisfactory include but are not limited to:

- x Evidence of on-going scholarship agenda is present.
- x The candidate has made high-quality contribution through activities associated with the indices of research competence.
- x Manuscripts are being consistently published in refereed journals.
- x Recognizable as a focused line of inquiry an Tf 9 (8>Tj6 2yu-7 use)-6 (96 ti)-3(ripts a(7.544 6vf Bf0

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) encouraged to seek significant external research funding that contributes to the candidate

the construct of collegiality as defined in UNLV 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 exceptional cases.

Each candidate for promotion and/or tenure must present a dossier identifying appropriate
V X S S R U W L Q J H Y L G H Q F H & 2 (D Q G 8 1 / 9 % \ O D Z V V W D W H W K D
The University of Nevada System Recommendation for Tenure or Promotion form (The
Regents') R U P 9 - t e n u r e E v a l u a t i o n ; Annual Evaluations by Department Chair(s);
summaries of teaching evaluations; examples of course syllabi; and copies of scholarly work.

RI WKH FRPPLWWHH UHJDUGLQJ WKH FDQGLGDWH¶V SHUIRU
candidate may write a response to WKH FRPPLWWHH¶V UHSRUW E.H LQFOXGH
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 University will evaluate performance in the areas of teaching and administration/specialized assignments, as well as research and service, in the following section. Faculty-in-Residence are evaluated on either teaching or administration/specialized assignments. Faculty-in-Residence who perform both teaching and administration/specialized assignments may commingle teaching and administration/ specialized assignment to a level in which it is impossible to separate the two. In these cases, the University will evaluate the candidate on the basis of the primary duty. Faculty-in-Residence who perform both teaching and administration/specialized assignments may commingle teaching and administration/ specialized assignment to a level in which it is impossible to separate the two. In these cases, the University will evaluate the candidate on the basis of the primary duty.

Excellence Ranking in Administration /Specialized Assignments

Evaluative decisions based on excellence in Administration/Specialized Assignments rest on the impact of the 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 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, the department, or the university. Administration/Specialized Assignments:

- x Significant performance in a key administrative/specialized assignment role within the normal expectations of academic faculty (e.g. graduate or undergraduate coordinator, basic course director, debate/coach).
- x External awards or recognition of distinguished administration/specialized assignment activities from honorary, learned, and/or professional societies.
- x Internal awards for excellence; university awards are given the most weight, followed by college awards and then departmental awards.
- x Significant contributions to a service role in the college beyond the normal expectations of the appointment (e.g. sitting on or chairing college committees).
- x 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-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 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 many ways, and a detailed case should be made by the candidate. As a general standard, however, the accomplishment of the following is required:

- x A consistent record of effective teaching practice, as represented by independent evaluations
- x A consistent record of effective teaching practice, as represented by peer reviews of teaching.

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 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):

- x 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.
- x A record of leadership in university and/or professional service, including major administrative positions within the university that may be open to faculty-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 work. The necessary elements of these portfolios include the following:

Administrative/Specialized Assignment Portfolio:

- x Administrative/specialized assignment duties and contributions and academic activities (if applicable for the candidate).
- x External evidence of the quality and quantity of the work associated with these specialized assignment activities.

Teaching Portfolio:

- x A narrative summary of expectations surrounding teaching.
- x 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).
- x Evidence of the quality/significance of teaching-related activities (e.g., internal and external peer- reviews, awards, or other assessments of learning gains).
- x 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:

- x A listing of major service activities and roles (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).
- x Evidence of the quality and quantity of the work associated with these service activities.

Other required documents for promotion decisions include copies of:

- x Annual evaluations over the evaluative period in question.
- x Chair/Director evaluations within each area of administrative/specialized assignment, teaching and service.
- x

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-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:

x

EPHE Department Bylaws

- x Major innovations/developments in teaching related activities.
- x Authorship of textbooks.
- x Significant curriculum development, including the development of multiple classes for graduate and undergraduate concentrations within a departmental or multi-disciplinary program.

- x A substantial record of student mentoring as indicated
 - o Extensive supervision of undergraduate students in independent studies, practica, and internships.
 - o Chairing multiple M.A. and/or Ph.D. committees beyond departmental or college norms.
- x Addresses or other substantial presentations on teaching pedagogy at honorary/learned/professional societies.

EPHE Department Bylaws