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 to bring graduate concerns to the agenda when appropriate. After business of common interest, the graduate representatives shall be dismissed. They should never be present for discussion of matters concerning personnel or individual students, graduate or undergraduate.

G. Faculty who are fully or jointly (at least 25%) rostered in the Department who are without voting privileges, e.g., faculty holding the rank of Lecturer, will each academic year elect one representative who will sit in on all regular department meetings. The representative will have no vote but is encouraged to bring concerns to the agenda when appropriate. After business of common interest, the representative shall be dismissed; they should never be present for discussion of matters concerning personnel.

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 Chair for correction. Upon approval by the Chair, minutes shall be circulated to the voting faculty for final approval at a regular meeting. Minutes for personnel meetings shall be taken by the Chair and also circulated to the voting faculty for final approval.

II. The Chair

A. The Chair of the Department must be a tenured member with the rank of Associate Professor or above.

B. The regular term of the Chair shall be three years. The incoming Chair shall take office on July 1 following the regular election to be held at the start of the preceding fall semester.

C. Normally, no Chair shall serve more than two consecutive terms.

D. The Department's vote for Chair shall be made by a secret ballot at a synchronous (in person or online) meeting of the Department. Members of the Department will put names in nomination. After each ballot, the nominee receiving the fewest votes shall be eliminated from the election until one nominee receives a simple majority.

E. The Chair may appoint an Acting Chair for the summer term or during any temporary absence. This appointment is subject to approval by the Dean.

F. The Chair shall appoint an Associate Chair for Graduate Studies and an Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies, who will normally serve three-year terms. The Chair shall likewise appoint an Honors Representative, a Library Representative, and such other committees as he or she may deem necessary to one-year terms. The Chair may serve on all committees ex officio.

G. The duties and responsibilities of the Chair are established in the Professional Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty Members and Roles and Professional Responsibilities of Academic Leaders (PRR), available on the Office of Faculty Affairs website.

III. Appointments, Tenure, and Promotions

A. New appointments at the rank of instructor or above shall be decided by a simple majority of members at or above the rank of the person under consideration, by secret ballot. All other appointments may be made by the Chair upon approval by a simple majority of the Executive Committee. Temporary summer appointments may be made by the Chair in consultation with the Executive Committee.

B. Reappointments, tenure, and promotions shall be decided at a synchronous (in person or online) meeting of the Department by a simple majority in secret ballot by members above the rank of the person under consideration. The Department will follow the guidelines set down in the document on Departmental Policies for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.

C. Early in their first year, new tenure-track faculty members in consultation with the Chair will decide on a mentor from among the tenured faculty in the Department. As a courtesy, potential mentors should be consulted by the Chair to confirm their assent. Once appointed, the mentor will meet regularly with the faculty member. Mentoring will be considered an important service to the Department. Early each academic year untenured faculty members will meet with the Chair to reconsider the choice of mentor. The Chair may either reappoint the same mentor or, for whatever reason, choose another for the next year. Upon promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, formal mentoring will normally end.

IV. Executive Committee

A. The Executive Committee shall consist of the Chair ex officio and two faculty of the Department elected by the members of the Department at the initial meeting of the Fall Semester. Tenure-track faculty at or above the rank of Assistant Professor past the Comprehensive Review shall be eligible for election, but at least one elected position shall be held by a faculty member with the rank of Associate Professor or above. Members of the Executive Committee (other than the Chair) shall serve for a one-year term.

B. The Executive Committee shall approve appointments to the standing committees, shall advise the Chair on such matters as may be raised, and will handle such matters as the Chair of the Department may assign to it. The Executive Committee will function as the Salary Committee of the Department in accordance with the College Policy on Annual Evaluation and Compensation. Individual members of the Executive Committee will absent themselves when their salaries are discussed. The Executive Committee, in consultation with the Associate Chair for Graduate Studies, shall determine extraordinary appointments to the Graduate Faculty.

C. The Executive Committee, in consultation with the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies and the Associate Chair for Graduate Studies, will establish the Department's course offerings for the following year, after polling the faculty about the courses they would like to teach.

D. It is expected that the Executive Committee will attempt to function by consensus. Matters requiring a vote will be decided by a simple majority.

V. Standing Committees

The Standing Committees handle routine matters, but refer all decisions or recommendations involving changes of policy to the Executive Committee or, if the Chair deems appropriate, to the entire Faculty of the Department. The Chair, in consultation with the Executive Committee and, where appropriate in consultation with the Chair of the Committee in question, shall appoint the following Standing Committees annually.

1) The Undergraduate Studies Committee, which shall consist of no fewer than three members of the Department with the rank of Instructor or higher, including the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies and the Chair ex officio. The Undergraduate Committee will handle all matters pertaining to the undergraduate program and may make recommendations to the Department on matters of general policy.

2) The Graduate Studies Committee, which shall consist of no fewer than three members of the Department with the rank of Assistant Professor or higher, including the Associate Chair for

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 number of ways. A spouse or partner may be considered in the course of an open faculty search, in which case normal search procedures shall be followed. Several other kinds of situations may also present a partner for consideration by the Department: for example, a finalist for a position in the Department may wish a spouse or partner to be considered for a position as a condition of considering an offer; a faculty member already on staff in the Department may wish a spouse or partner to be considered for a position; or a faculty member or prospective faculty member in another CU department may wish a spouse or partner to be considered for a position in the Department of Classics.

All hiring of partners into tenure/tenure-track faculty positions and rostered instructor positions will follow the Dean's/Provost's requirements on hiring and the Department's standing rules. This policy document amplifies how consideration of a spouse or partner for a position conforms to the Department's rules in a situation other than an open faculty search.

II. Role of the Dean's Office

For either a tenured or tenure-track faculty position or a rostered instructorship, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Associate Dean for Arts and Humanities should be consulted in the preliminary stages, and they should review the candidate's credentials. In conjunction with the Provost, they must approve funding for the position and any proposed use of the Department's faculty lines before the candidate may proceed to the campus-interview stage.

III. Consideration of a spouse or partner for a tenured or tenure-track or rostered instructor position.

The procedures for considering a spouse or partner for a tenured or tenure-track or rostered instructor position are designed to parallel as closely as possible the procedures by which candidates are considered in open faculty searches. The aim of this parallelism is both to assure the Department that regular procedures have been followed, and to ensure the successful candidate the same footing on the faculty as a colleague hired in an open search.

1. Consideration of a spouse or partner for a faculty position begins when the potential candidate makes a formal request to the Chair. This should consist of a letter of application, a CV, and a writing sample. In the instance of a tenured or tenure track position, at least three letters of recommendation should be sent to the Chair at this time. In the case of a rostered instructorship, one letter of recommendation is sufficient. This step is parallel to an application for a position in an open search.

2. The Chair must consult with the Executive Committee and, upon approval, bring the request and supporting material before the Department. The Department should meet and consider its needs and whether a hire in the candidate's field is appropriate at this time, taking into account current open lines, curricular demand, and the strategic plan. The Department will then vote on whether to move forward with the hiring process. If yes, it will appoint a review committee of at least three faculty members.

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 promotion. All policies and procedures held by the College of Arts and Sciences, the Offices of the Provost and Chancellor, and the Regents shall apply.

1. *Regent Law and Policy.* Regent Law Article 5 and Policy 5, define the basic requirements for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. These basic requirements cannot be overridden or superseded by departmental rules or interpretations.

   The University requires comprehensive review at least once during the probationary period, normally during the fourth year of full-time service. According to Regent Policy, the comprehensive review results either in reappointment or a one-year terminal appointment and the discontinuation of the tenure-track appointment. The question to be considered by the Department and by administrative review committees for the comprehensive review is whether or not the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure.

   According to the Regent Policy, the award of tenure, which is typically concurrent with promotion to associate professor, requires that a faculty member be able to demonstrate excellence in either teaching or scholarly/creative work and meritorious achievement in the other category, plus meritorious service. Promotion to the rank of full professor requires, according to Regent Policy, that Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent and (a) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (b) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other, and (c) a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work and service.

   The purpose of the departmental evaluation is to apply the general standards of performance in teaching, research, and service to the disciplines that are represented within the Department of Classics.

2. *Allocation of Effort.* Each faculty member has a specific allocation of effort to teaching, research, and service. The standard allocation for the Department is 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. This allocation will be assumed to apply unless specific, formal agreements are made to the contrary; any such agreements must be reported to the Dean and must be in accord with the Department's Differentiated Workload Policy Statement. The allocation of effort will be considered to apply as an average over the months of any given academic year.

3. *Evaluation of Teaching.* In the first year after being appointed to a tenure-track position, faculty should create a teaching portfolio that will contain all written records pertaining to teaching. The portfolio will be used as evidence in the evaluation of teaching. The Department may obtain evidence from other sources to the extent that the information contained in the portfolio is incomplete with respect to any of the criteria identified below.

   The question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of teaching is as follows: Is the faculty member's demonstrated performance in teaching consistent with the general standard for reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Rules of the Regents?

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 development, or other related matters.

   Beyond formal classroom instruction, the following criteria will be included by the Department in its evaluation of teaching: advising services to undergraduate students, independent study or independent research projects involving undergraduate students, and activities promoting faculty-student interaction. In addition, a faculty member may submit, or the Department may consider at its own initiative, other evidence of teaching performance that seem appropriate for a particular individual.

   Faculty members can request that the Chair arrange a peer evaluation that will assist them in making improvements in teaching prior to evaluation. Other mechanisms for consultation on teaching include the Faculty Teaching Excellence Program and the Presidential Teaching Scholars consultation program. Faculty members are not required to use these mechanisms of self-improvement, but are encouraged to do so.

   b. Graduate instruction. Consideration of graduate instruction is an important component of teaching evaluation. Graduate instruction comprises not only formal instruction of graduate students in regular courses and seminars but also supervision of individual graduate students (for theses and dissertations but also in independent study courses), service on M.A. and Ph.D. committees, participation in graduate admissions, and service on the Graduate committee. Faculty members should maintain, as part of the teaching portfolio, syllabi for all courses (including reading lists for independent study courses) as well as detailed records of all their contributions to the graduate program. These records are considered part of the evidence pertaining to achievement in teaching.

4. *Evaluation of Research.* Achievement in research is the second mandatory component of the Department's evaluation of faculty members who are under review for reappointment, promotion, or tenure. The question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of research is as follows: Is the faculty member's performance in research consistent with the general standard for reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Rules of the Regents?

   Publication is the most important criterion for departmental evaluation of research. All publications (books and articles) should be judged on the basis of originality and significance to the relevant field. The Department will form its own judgment as to the quality of the candidate's publications, but will also take into account such considerations as range, amount, variety, and venue of publication (e.g., reputation and stringency of review process of publishing houses and journals, with major academic presses and peer-reviewed journals carrying the most weight).

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 extend well beyond the Department to include the candidate's work on campus committees, college committees, or in professional societies. Criteria related to service also include the extent of editorial and reviewing for professional journals or professional societies, or professional services to the nation, the state, or the public. All service is evaluated with regard to its importance and its success, as well as the faculty member's dedication to it.

   Evidence related to service will consist of a description of the service and of its duration and significance. This information should be compiled on a continuous basis by candidates for promotion, reappointment, or tenure. At the time of evaluation, evidence of service may be obtained from the candidate, from the Department, or from external sources.

   The question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of service is as follows: Is the faculty member's performance in service consistent with the general standard for reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described by the Rules of the Regents?

   If the policies of the College, Offices of the Provost and Chancellor, and the Regents give no explicit expectation for service, no separate evaluation of service is necessary; achievement in service may be considered as contributory to achievement in teaching and research.

Approved by the Department of Classics,
_____, 1995: _____
Approved by Charles Middleton, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
_____, 1995:_____
Approved by Bruce Ekstrand, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
_____, 1995: _____

MILESTONES FOR EVALUATION

Timetable for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Individuals who are hired as beginning assistant professors will have at least one evaluation for reappointment prior to a mandatory tenure decision. The last reappointment prior to a tenure decision must be based upon comprehensive evaluation. A standard pattern would be for an assistant professor to receive a three- or four-year appointment initially and, upon positive comprehensive review at the end of this first appointment, to receive a second appointment that would extend to the mandatory tenure decision.

Tenure is required by the end of the seventh year. Faculty members are typically evaluated for tenure in the seventh year; the seven-year probationary period will include any years of credit toward tenure that are specified in writing at the time of hiring. In unusual cases, tenure can be awarded a year early. However, because it is customary for review committees to apply standards strictly and without discounted expectations based on shorter time in rank, it is inadvisable for faculty members to seek early promotion unless there are compelling reasons to do so.

Typically, promotion to associate professor is considered simultaneously with the consideration of tenure, although formally the two are separate decisions. Under unusual circumstances, individuals may be hired as associate professors without tenure (mainly because the University is reluctant to hire individuals without a probation prior to tenure), and in this case the issue of tenure is separated fully from the issue of promotion to associate professor.

There is no mandatory point of decision for promotion to full professor. A customary waiting interval is approximately equal to the interval between the ranks of assistant professor and associate professor, because significant incremental achievement is expected between ranks. In unusual cases, an individual can be considered for promotion to full professor after only a few years in rank as an associate professor, but this is not advisable on a routine basis because review committees can be expected to apply criteria strictly and not in such cases take into account shorter time in rank. Individuals who have doubts about the timing of promotion should seek advice from their Chair, who may appoint an ad hoc personnel committee to evaluate the situation.

Any individual can ask to be considered for promotion or tenure at any time, and the request will be considered by the Department unless it is contrary to the rules of the University. Indviduals who believe that they are promotable or tenurable should not hesitate to ask their Chair for an evaluation

The Departmental Review Process. Departmental judgments that involve the application of standards are based on peer review. The recommendation of the Department is ultimately determined by a vote of the appropriate faculty following discussion of the evidence that was collected for the review. The process of personnel review begins for the Department with the Chair's appointment of a personnel committee, which performs two functions. First, if there is some doubt as to the likelihood of a favorable outcome, the personnel committee may advise the candidate to withhold the case until more time has elapsed, except in the case of a mandatory tenure decision or mandatory comprehensive review. The committee may give this advice either initially, or after accumulating information indicating that the case needs to be stronger in order to be successful. The candidate is not bound to the advice of the personnel committee, however, and can proceed against it.

The second purpose of the personnel committee is to solicit external letters of reference and to collect other confidential information that the candidate cannot collect independently. The candidate is responsible for assembling the bulk of the personnel file, but can seek the help or advice of the personnel committee as appropriate. The Administrative Assistant of the Department will receive the file and will review it for completeness. The file should meet the requirements of the College of Arts and Sciences and of the Campus as outlined on specification sheets that are available from the Dean's office. It is the candidate's responsibility to see that the file is attractively prepared, complete, and well-ordered, and that it has places for the insertion of confidential materials by the personnel

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 considered a recommendation to the Vice Chancellor, who may or may not accept the recommendation. The Vice Chancellor's decision is relayed to the Chancellor.

Beyond the Vice Chancellor's level, review occurs by the Chancellor, the President, and the Regents. However, review above the Vice Chancellor's level at present (1992/93) is typically pro forma. Difficult cases may be scrutinized by all levels, but the typical case is not usually examined closely at higher levels.

A negative decision by any level of review can be overruled by a positive decision at a higher level. For example, a negative decision by the Department could be overruled by the Dean or by the Vice Chancellor. Similarly, a positive decision at any level can be overruled by a negative decision at a higher level. When any decision is overruled, the case is sent back to the lower level with advice from the upper level and a request for clarification, reconsideration, or additional information. The case is then reconsidered by the lower level and forwarded again to the upper level for final review. The rights of appeal for tenured or tenure-track faculty member denied reappointment, tenure, or promotion are outlined in Regent policies 5.D.6 and 5.G.

Return of cases from an upper level to a lower level cannot always be taken as a sign of weakness in the case. Sometimes, review committees find critical pieces of information missing from the file and ask for additional information, even though they fully expect to approve the case. Individuals

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, 11-13-2025)

I. Annual Faculty Evaluation

As specified in the Professional Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty Members and Roles and Professional Responsibilities of Academic Leaders (PRR), the Chair is ultimately responsible for the evaluation of academic personnel within the Department and makes recommendations for merit increases in consultation with colleagues. The Department Bylaws (IV.B) establish the Executive Committee as the consultative body.

Each year the Chair will evaluate the annual performance of Department faculty in teaching, research, and service. The evaluation will be weighted to reflect the faculty member's workload, which is normally distributed as 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. In individual cases this distribution may be adjusted to take into account a differentiated teaching load or administrative assignments. In the case of new faculty members and faculty members on leave, the evaluation will be prorated for the full year. According to University policies, faculty are rated in each area of performance as "Far Exceeds Normal Expectations, Exceeds Normal Expectations, Meets Normal Expectations, Below Expectations, or Unsatisfactory." The basis for the evaluation is the data submitted in the last three annual Faculty Reports of Professional Activities and the current Professional Plan. For example, the basis for an evaluation carried out in 2005 will be the accomplishments reported on the FRPAs covering 2002, 2003, and 2004, and the current Professional Plan. Within each category a numerical equivalent is assigned to each rating, based on the workload distribution. Thus, for example, a record that "far exceeds expectations" in research will be assigned 40 points for a normal workload distribution, one that "exceeds expectations" 30 points, one that "meets expectations" 20 points, one that is "below expectations" 10 points, and one that is "unsatisfactory" zero. The cumulative total will determine the overall rating, distributed as follows:

Far Exceeds Normal Expectations	81-100
Exceeds Normal Expectations	61-80
Meets Normal Expectations	41-60
Below Expectations	21-40
Unsatisfactory	0-20

Guidelines for Annual Evaluation

Expectations for faculty performance vary for different individuals at different stages of their careers and it is therefore impossible to provide specific, quantifiable measures to account for every situation. While there is no formal correlation between the annual merit evaluation and personnel reviews, in general it may be asserted that in the earlier stages of a career, there is some correlation between annual expectations and the standards for reappointment, promotion and tenure. Thus, newly appointed tenure-track faculty who are implementing a research agenda, developing a teaching portfolio, and performing service as asked of them may be judged to be meeting or exceeding expectations, even though their quantifiable accomplishments—for example, in the form of completed publications—are fewer in number than colleagues at a more advanced stage of their

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:
   - Performance in regularly assigned courses.
   - New contributions to the curriculum.
   - Teaching of difficult or undesirable courses.
   - Teaching of lecture courses without TA support.
   - Supervision of TAs, GAs, or GPTIs

2. Teaching outside the classroom, which includes, but is not limited to:
   - Supervision of undergraduate or graduate theses
   - Supervision of undergraduate or graduate independent study

3. Other activities, which may include, but are not limited to:
   - Innovation in pedagogy.
   - Membership of Masters or Ph.D. Qualifying Exam Committees
   - Uncompensated advising

In evaluating these activities the Department refers to the following components drawn from Appendix A of the University's Administrative Policy Statement on Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation (https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1009), listed according to relative weight:

1. Faculty Report of Professional Activities
2. Colleagues' opinions
3. Student evaluations (FCQs)

The Committee will consider additional components (e.g. instructional materials, course syllabi and examinations) upon a faculty member's request at the beginning of the evaluation process. The Committee will also take account of additional factors (e.g. effort required to prepare a course or its research component, receipt of teaching awards, unsolicited opinions from students or alumni, special incidents) when appropriate.

The Department attaches greatest weight to performance in classroom teaching, but it has expectations in all three areas of teaching activity, and an evaluation of "Meeting Expectations" will require not only effective performance in assigned teaching, but appropriate contributions in other categories as well. An evaluation of "Far Exceeding" expectations will require exceptional performance in a significant range of teaching activities. The Executive Committee will weight the specific characteristics of an evaluation of "Exceeding Expectations" consistent with these standards.

B. Research. There are no absolute criteria by which scholarly achievement may be easily quantified. For example, an article appearing in a less prestigious journal might nevertheless make an important contribution to scholarship. In general, single authored works are more valued than co-authored ones, but the Department recognizes the value of collaborative scholarship, which in some cases might be rated more highly than individual projects. The annual evaluation will take into account

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 (300-1700words), 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 in consultation with the Executive Committee. Raises will be distributed in five categories, depending upon the annual raise allocation to the Department, with the highest raises set for faculty rated as Far Exceeding Expectations and the lowest set at no raise for faculty rated as Unsatisfactory. The raise pool allocated to 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 retention raises, to address inequities, and/or to reward career merit, in that order. Up to 15% of

the raise pool may be moved into the reserved pool by the salary committee. If the salary committee determines that less than 15% is required, then it will allocate all unneeded funds to the normal pool. The percentage allocated to the reserved pool can only be increased above 15% by a majority vote of the Department. All retention offers must also be approved by a majority vote of the Department.

The normal pool will be divided in half. Half will be distributed according to percentage increases allocated to each of the five possible merit ratings. The other half will be distributed according to flat dollar amounts allocated to each of the five possible merit ratings. Faculty members who receive a retention raise will not be allocated a salary increase from the normal pool in the year in which the retention raise is awarded. In exceptional circumstances, the salary committee may request authorization from the Department to implement a different distribution of the normal pool.

The Department aspires to award faculty whose performance meets expectations with a raise at least equal to the rate of inflation when the pool of available funds makes this possible.

B. Career Merit

The salary recommendations will be evaluated by the Chair, in consultation with the Executive Committee, to assure that salary of all faculty are in an equitable relationship to their career merit. For the purposes of this evaluation, career merit is defined in terms of teaching, research, and service. In evaluating career merit a faculty member's previous professional experience at other institutions shall be duly credited. The criteria for evaluating career merit in each of these areas include:

Teaching

- Contribution to undergraduate programs both in the Classics major and in the Core Curriculum
- Contribution to teaching in other departments
- Contribution to graduate programs with respect to the academic and professional preparation of candidates for the M.A. and Ph.D.
- Adherence to accepted standards of professional behavior in meeting responsibilities to students.

Research

- Quality and quantity of productivity of both short-term and long-term research programs and contributions.
- Recognition by the academic community of work accomplished.

Service

- Contribution to the orderly and effective functioning of one's Department and University.
- Contribution to the University community.
- Contribution to scholarly and professional associations, as well as to local, state, regional, and national communities.

In recommending adjustments for Career Merit, reference may be made to the cumulative record of annual merit evaluation.

C. Final Recommendation

Upon completion of the reviews of Annual Merit and Career Merit, the Chair proposes a salary recommendation for each faculty member, which is approved by a simple majority of the Salary Committee.

III. Grievance Procedures

Before initiating a formal grievance, a faculty member who feels that his or her performance has been unfairly evaluated may ask the Executive Committee to reconsider its evaluation. Formal grievances may be submitted under two headings, as described below. The Executive Committee will hear all grievances originating within the Department of Classics. In the event that a sitting member of the Executive Committee files a grievance, a replacement will be appointed by the remaining members of the Committee to hear this case.

1. Annual Merit
    - *Basis of Grievance*: A grievance on the basis of Annual Merit must be based on errors of fact in the annual evaluation, unless the overall rating is Below Expectations or Unsatisfactory. In the event of such a rating, appeals may be submitted according to the policies adopted by the campus in connection with Post-Tenure Review.
    - *Procedure*: In the event of a grievance of the annual evaluation based on errors of fact, the grievant must submit a narrative statement, not to exceed 400 words, detailing the errors in the evaluation. Full documentation supporting the statement must be provided.
    - *Deadlines*: The grievance must be submitted by the faculty member to the Executive Committee within 10 days of receipt of the Faculty Performance Rating.
    - *Disposition*: The Executive Committee will notify the grievant of the outcome of the case before the end of the spring semester.
    - *Appeal*: None. Faculty have the right to file a salary equity appeal if they believe that their current base salary is not equitable (see below, section III.2).

2. Career Merit
    - *Basis of Grievance*: The conditions which allow for a salary equity appeal are described the College's "A&S Salary Equity Policy" (2025) and the campus's "Academic Affairs Policy on Salary Equity" (2025).
    - *Procedure*: The faculty member must submit a narrative statement, not to exceed 400 words, detailing the appeal. Full documentation supporting the statement must be provided.
    - *Deadline*: The grievance must be submitted by the faculty member to the Executive Committee by September 15 for resolution during that academic year.
    - *Disposition*: The Executive Committee will report their recommendations in writing to the chair and the petitioning faculty member, noting how the decision was determined, and the dollar amount they recommend for resolution of the salary inequity, by November 1.
    - *Appeal*: If the faculty member disagrees with the department's salary recommendation and the faculty member's proposed salary differs significantly from the department/primary unit's salary recommendation (i.e., by more than 5%), then the faculty member may petition the College of Arts and Sciences using the process outlined in the College's "A&S Salary Equity Policy" (2025). Questions about the A&S Salary Equity Appeal Process should be directed to the A&S Associate Dean of Faculty Success (ADFS).

The Executive Committee will decide on all grievances by simple majority.

IV. Salary Equity File

The Department maintains a salary equity file which is available to all faculty on request. It includes the following: the department's definition of career merit for each category of faculty, a copy of the most recent version of the "Academic Affairs Policy on Salary Equity," a copy of the department's

procedures for determining salaries, a copy of its salary equity appeal procedure, the most recent departmental scatter plot, and current vitae of faculty members.