

BYLAWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

I. General Rules

- A. All faculty members at the rank of Assistant Professor and above who are fully or jointly (at least 25%) rostered in the Department of Classics (henceforth: "the Department"), including the Chair and excluding visiting and retired or emeritus faculty, are entitled to vote and to participate in discussions and decisions, with the exceptions noted below. Instructors on the Department's continuing roster on at least 50% appointments with multi-year contracts also have voting rights appropriate to their rank. Faculty rostered in other departments may be appointed Joint Members with voting privileges appropriate to their rank by a majority vote of the Department. Joint Members shall enjoy all the privileges and responsibilities of faculty fully rostered in the Department.
- B. Decisions shall be made, with the exceptions noted below, by simple majority vote in a synchronous (in person or online) meeting of the Department, with a quorum consisting of a simple majority of all voting members who are in service. Members may submit a proxy vote in writing on a specific issue through any voting member who will be present at the relevant meeting or the program assistant. Proxies will be accepted on personnel matters only upon approval by a majority vote (by secret ballot) of the voting members present.
- C. Voting shall proceed by secret ballot on all personnel issues and at other times upon the request of at least one member.
- D. Regular meetings shall be scheduled once per calendar month. The Chair may call additional meetings, and special meetings may be called upon the written request of three or more voting members.
- E. An agenda shall normally be circulated by the Chair two days prior to departmental meetings, except in cases of personnel decisions, curriculum revisions, or bylaw changes, when the notification period will be ten days. Personnel matters which require urgent action (e.g., offers to candidates for new appointments) may be dealt with two days after the members of the Department have been notified of a meeting. All notices of meetings must be by e-mail and/or in writing.
- F. The Graduate Students of the Department will each academic year elect two representatives who will sit in on all regular department meetings. They will have no vote but are encouraged

H. Department meetings will be conducted according to Robert's Rules of Order unless otherwise specified.

I. Minutes at regular meetings shall be taken by a program assistant and transmitted to the

C. Early in their first year, new tenure-

Graduate Studies and the Chair *ex officio*. The Graduate Studies Committee will handle matters pertaining to the graduate program, including, but not limited to, recommending offers of admission, financial aid, and graduate teaching appointments. The Committee may make recommendations to the Department on matters of general policy.

- 3) Lecture Committee, which shall consist of no fewer than three members of the Department, including the Chair *ex officio*, and may include a Graduate Student Representative.
- 4) Department Library Committee, which shall consist of three members of the Department, including the Chair *ex officio*, and may include a Graduate Student Representative. The Committee will be responsible for supervision of the Departmental Library, slide collection, computer facilities, other property directly related to teaching and research, and coordination with Norlin Library.

VI. Change in Bylaws

These Bylaws, once approved by a two-thirds majority of eligible faculty, will become effective at the beginning of the academic year 1995-96. Amendments to these Bylaws shall be made by a two-thirds majority of those members voting at a synchronous (in person or online) meeting of the Department. Drafts of proposed amendments shall be circulated together with the notification of the meeting, with the right of Faculty to alter such proposals during the meeting remaining unimpaired. The notification period for such a meeting is ten days.

Bylaws were adopted at the Classics Department Meeting on October 10, 1986; amended at a Classics Department Meeting on March 5, 1990; amended at a Classics Department meeting on September 10, 1991. New bylaws were adopted at the Classics Department Meeting on November 9, 1994; amended at a Classics Department Meeting on January 25, 1995; amended at a Classics Department Meeting on April 30, 1996; amended at a Classics Department Meeting on May 2, 1997; amended at a Classics Department Meeting on November 15, 2001; amended at a Classics Department Meeting on August 27, 2008; amended at a Classics Department Meeting on April 5, 2013; amended at a Classics Department Meeting on September 21, 2021 and October 18, 2021; amended at a Classics Department Meeting on January 24, 2022.

Spousal and Partner Hiring Policy

I. Introduction

The consideration of spouses or partners for positions in the Department of Classics may arise in a

3. The review committee should review the candidate's dossier and may request additional material from the candidate as appropriate. Its recommendation about proceeding to a campus interview will be considered and voted upon by the Department at a personnel meeting. All tenure-track faculty and instructors rostered at 50% or above are eligible to vote at this stage.
4. The campus interview should follow the Department's customary procedures and be followed by a vote (by secret ballot) by faculty members at or above the rank at which the candidate seeks to be hired. This step is identical to the process for an open faculty search. The Chair should communicate the result of this vote to the candidate and, if the vote is positive, should arrange the terms of offer with the Deans just as in the case of an open faculty search.
5. If the candidate's spouse or partner is a member of the Department, he or she must recuse himself / herself from all deliberations and votes on this matter.

Approved at a meeting of the Department April 5, 2013

Departmental Policies for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

*Department of Classics
College of Arts and Sciences
University of Colorado, Boulder*

The Department of Classics explains by means of this policy statement the procedures and standards that it will use in evaluating tenure-track personnel for reappointment, tenure, and

- a. Undergraduate teaching. Undergraduate instruction is important in the evaluation of teaching. However, no single measure of effectiveness in undergraduate teaching will be the sole basis of judgment by the Department. Criteria to be used in the evaluation of achievement in undergraduate teaching include:
1. examples of course outlines, syllabi, examinations, and other items that indicate the nature of instruction;
 2. descriptions of the development or improvement of course work;
 3. faculty course questionnaire scores from all classes;
 4. peer evaluation (by class visitation or other mechanisms);
 5. range of subjects covered in courses; variety of course offerings; levels of courses; class size;
 6. statements of teaching philosophy or self-evaluation of teaching;
 7. written statements that may have come from the Chair or others concerning willingness to teach, rapport with students, important contributions to curriculum develop-3.8 (-0.6 (pC17.3 (u)-1

Other types of publications may be considered but will be given less weight. Examples are: translations, textbooks, anthologies, creative writing, and items for popular media.

A second important criterion for evaluation of research is the candidate's national or international reputation for achievement in research. The Department will gather evidence of the candidate's standing in the field from authoritative reviewers external to the University; these will include some individuals from a list provided by the candidate for evaluation and some individuals who are selected independently by the departmental evaluation committee rather than by the candidate.

In addition, the Department will consider other evidence of achievement in research and scholarly activity that seems appropriate to a particular individual's case for promotion, reappointment, or tenure. Such evidence may include: public lectures, book reviews, edited volumes, conference organization and participation, work as referee of publications or research proposals, grants, awards, and prizes, and proposals for future research and writing projects.

5. *Evaluation of Service.* A candidate's record of support of academic programs in the Department is for evaluation of service. However, evaluation of service can also exte6 (d)12.5 (er)1.2(d)18b, of,nM (e6

MILESTONES FOR EVALUATION

Timetable for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Individuals who are hired as beginning assistant

committee. It is the responsibility of the personnel committee to obtain any additional information that it may require in order to make a complete presentation to the Department.

Following the assembly of materials, the personnel committee will have a final meeting in which it decides by vote its opinion on the case. The personnel committee will write a detailed letter of evaluation giving its own view of the case and reporting its vote. The letter will be addressed to the Department Chair, and will be added to the file. The committee will also assign to its members responsibilities for presentation of the case to the Department. The committee will make the entire file available on a confidential basis to those faculty who will participate in the discussion two weeks prior to the Department's discussion of the case.

Discussion of personnel cases by the Department is announced in advance by the Department Chair. The discussion is scheduled for a regular meeting of voting members, except under extraordinary circumstances as determined by the Chair. The candidate for a particular decision will be absent on the day of the discussion, and the personnel committee will be asked to make a presentation. This will be followed by detailed discussion of the case by all voting faculty. When the Chair is satisfied that discussion is complete, there will be a vote by closed or secret ballot. The right to vote is limited to those faculty members who have the professional status to which the candidate aspires, or a higher status. For example, only full professors would vote on the case of an associate professor being considered for promotion to full professor.

In a letter addressed to the Dean, the Chair reports the Department's vote, summarizes faculty discussion, and gives the Chair's opinion of the case, which may or may not support the faculty's vote.

Review above the Level of the Department. Following the departmental vote, the candidate's file is sent from the Department to the Dean. The Dean refers the case to a standing College committee (Dean's Personnel Committee), which discusses the case and votes on it. The Dean then writes a letter to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. This letter gives the Dean's personal evaluation of the case and a recommendation for action, as well as reporting the vote and, if appropriate, the opinions of the Dean's Personnel Committee. The Dean is not bound to agree with the Dean's Personnel Committee, with the Department, or with the Chair.

Beyond the Dean's office, the personnel file passes to the office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Vice Chancellor's office receives files on all personnel decisions from all colleges on the Campus. The Vice Chancellor relies heavily on the Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee (VCAC), which considers all cases for comprehensive reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The VCAC discusses each case in detail and votes on the disposition of the case. The vote is

under review should not be unduly concerned by a request for additional information, unless the request is accompanied by a negative vote from a review committee.

The candidate is directly advised through the Chair by the Dean's office of all review committee decisions. In addition, the candidate will receive a copy of the letter that passes from the Dean to the Vice Chancellor and will be notified of the reasons for any negative action or concern on the part of the Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee about degree of documentation.

Personnel cases are prepared in the fall semester of the year before they take effect. The order of preparation is typically by increasing rank: comprehensive review, promotion to associate professor with tenure, promotion to full professor. Under the current scheduling system, the comprehensive reappointment cases will leave the Department in October and the full professor cases may leave the Department as late as January in the year of the proposed personnel action.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

POLICIES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, SALARY RECOMMENDATION, AND GRIEVANCE
(rev. 11-07-2015, 1-24-2022, 12-09-2022)

I. Annual Faculty Evaluation

As

careers. Expectations may be similarly scaled over the entire spectrum of a career. The evaluation of faculty is a good faith exercise of the best professional judgment on the part of the Chair and the members of the Executive Committee.

A. Teaching. The Department's evaluation of teaching assesses the performance of faculty in three areas, listed according to relative weight:

1. Regular classroom teaching and associated activities, which include, but are not limited to:

-

works-in-progress, as appropriate and on substantial evidence that satisfactory progress is being made toward completion. Published books will be considered for a period of three years after the year of publication. The Department considers the following types of publications in evaluating scholarship:

1. Book reviews, including notices (less than 300 words), short reviews (300-1700 words), and review articles (more than 1700 words.)
2. Articles and book chapters
3. Books edited.
4. Books and monographs authored.

In addition, the Department considers other types of scholarly activity, as reported on the FRPA, including:

1. Grants from external sources.
2. Lectures (convention papers and invited lectures to an academic society or department)
3. Work in Progress

Submission of supporting documentation, including copies of current publications, works-in-progress, letters of acceptance of articles or books, reviews, award letters, etc. may be required as part of the review process.

C. Service. The evaluation of service includes the following activities: There is considerable variation in expectations of service over the course of a career. In particular, service is a less significant component in the record of tenure-track faculty in the probationary period before tenure, since excellence in service is not a standard for tenure and promotion.

1. Service to the Department, including attendance at Department meetings, service on Department committees, participation in graduate examinations, service beyond normal expectations, e.g. as ACUS or ACGS, success in securing funding for the Department.
2. Service to the College, Campus, and University, including A&S Committees, ASC, etc., Graduate School Committees, Campus Committees, BFA, etc., and the system.
3. Service to the Profession, including service to professional associations and peer institutions (e.g. tenure reviews, program reviews).
4. Editing of journals, either as editor or as a member of an editorial board
5. Evaluation of scholarly work of others, including refereeing of journal articles or book manuscripts, evaluation of research proposals, conference proposals, etc

II. Salary Recommendation

A. Annual Merit

The Chair will prepare a salary recommendation for each faculty member based on the annual merit evaluation as described above, to be reviewed by the Department Committee. The Department will be divided into two pools: reserved and normal. The reserved pool will be used to pay for the Department's share of retirement and health insurance. The normal pool will be used to pay for the Department's share of retirement and health insurance.

III. Grievance Procedures