BYLAWS DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

I. CONDUCT OF DEPARTMENTAL BUSINESS

Section A. The department head is responsible to the College of Arts and Sciences for the conduct of departmental business. This responsibility is combined with the necessary authority to make decisions as to teaching assignments (including creation and maintenance of the long-term scheduling plan), committee appointments, apportionment of space (for offices, teaching, and research), expenditure of departmental funds, recommendations for hiring, tenure, promotions, and salary increases among department personnel, as well as to represent the department in matters involving other departments, persons, or agencies, and to implement the decisions of the department. Committee and faculty recommendations are normally followed by the head, although circumstances may require the head to exercise his/her own judgment. The head should inform the faculty as fully as possible of all decisions that concern them individually or the department as a whole. The head shall conduct annual personnel interviews with all voting members of the department. These interviews shall form the basis of the annual evaluation summary, which will be on file both in the department and in the College of Arts and Sciences. The head shall also negotiate annually with each voting member of the department the departmental responsibilities to be undertaken during the academic year (see Appendix). The faculty will evaluate the head annually using the mechanism and forms provided by the office of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Section B. The faculty of the Classics department shall consist of all full-time academic personnel with the rank of Lecturer or above. All faculty members shall have voting privileges on departmental matters, except on those personnel decisions where considerations of academic rank restrict voting.

Section C. Department meetings shall take place at least twice a semester. All regular department meetings shall be held at a time designated at the outset of each term and during which no Classics classes will be scheduled. Special meetings may be called at any time by the department head or upon petition of the department head by at least one-third of the voting members at least four days before the proposed meeting. Meetings called by the voting members shall be limited to consideration of those items specified in the petition.

Section D. Department meetings shall be open to faculty, staff, students, and all observers who are members of the university community or residents of Tennessee.

Section E. The agenda for departmental meetings shall be distributed to the voting members at least four days before the meeting. Items may be placed on the agenda at the request of the department head or of the voting members.

Section F. A quorum for department meetings shall consist of a majority of the voting members who are eligible to attend.

Section G. Department meetings shall be conducted in accordance with *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised*.

Section H. Summaries of department meetings shall be distributed to each voting member. Summaries shall include a record of attendance, votes taken, committee reports, new committee appointments, and other official business.

II. STANDING COMMITTEES

Section A. General Principles

Part 1. The standing committees of the department shall be: Curriculum, Prizes and Scholarships, Speakers and Outreach, Development, Access and Engagement, and Assessment.

Part 2. The Prizes and Scholarships Committee, Speakers and Outreach Committee, and Assessment Committee shall be committees of the whole chaired by the head. Other committees are likewise committees of the whole, but will have chairs appointed by mutual agreement with the head.

Part 3. Except for the Prizes and Scholarships, Speakers and Outreach, and Assessment Committees, the chair of each committee shall report the committee's activities in summary form at the final faculty meeting of the academic year, and at other meetings as necessary. These summary reports, affixed to the minutes of the last faculty meeting of the academic year, will constitute the permanent record of each committee's activity.

Section B. The Curriculum Committee

Part 1. The Curriculum Committee shall review curricular offerings and degree requirements and shall review all changes in the curricula proposed by committee members or by other faculty or students.

Part 2. The Curriculum Committee shall undertake the planning of any new programs the department wishes to propose.

Section C. The Prizes and Scholarship Committee

- **Part 1.** The Prizes and Scholarships Committee shall solicit, gather, and consider all applications and nominations for departmental scholarships and prizes.
- **Part 2.** The Prizes and Scholarships Committee shall determine the distribution of all departmental scholarships and prizes.
- **Part 3.** The Prizes and Scholarships Committee shall consist of the whole faculty of the department, and shall conduct its business at faculty meetings to be held in February and March, and at other times as needed.

Section D. Speakers and Outreach Committee

Part 1. Speakers and Outreach Committee shall undertake the planning and execution of the normal events of the academic year, such as the Rutledge Memorial Lecture, as well as ad hoc events funded by the department or the Haines-Morris Lecture Endowment. **Part 2.** The Speakers and Outreach Committee shall consist of the whole faculty of the department, and shall conduct its business at faculty meetings.

Section E. Development Committee

Part 1. The Development Committee shall formulate all fund-raising strategies for the department. The chair of the committee shall be a member ex officio of the Classics Department Board of Advisors.

Section F. Access and Engagement Committee

Part 1. The Access and Engagement Committee shall be responsible for ensuring that principles of diversity and inclusivity are fully heeded in faculty, staff, and student recruitment, and shall take the lead in keeping the faculty aware of issues of diversity and inclusiveness that affect the department and the larger university community.

Section G. Assessment Committee

Part 1. The Assessment Committee shall be responsible for carrying out the direct assessment of the quality of student work in the framework of the department's annual program assessment mandated by SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools).

III. AD HOC COMMITTEES

Section A. Ad Hoc committees shall be appointed by the head as needed.

Section B. Any voting member of the faculty shall be eligible for service on an Ad Hoc Committee.

IV. COMMITTEES TO ADVISE IN THE SELECTION AND REAPPOINTMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD

Section A. The faculty committee to advise in the selection of a department head will be constituted in accordance with the language of the *Faculty Handbook*, section 1.6.4.

Section B. The faculty committee to advise the dean on the reappointment of the department head will be constituted in accordance with the language of the *Faculty Handbook*, section 1.6.6. The voting members of the faculty will select among themselves a chair to preside at the meeting in which the reappointment vote is taken.

V. SEARCH COMMITTEES FOR NEW FACULTY

Section A. In a search for a new member of the departmental tenure-line faculty, the head, in consultation with the tenured and tenure-track faculty (or "probationary faculty"), will appoint a search committee of at least three tenured or tenure-track faculty.

Section B. In a search for a new Non-Tenure-Track Faculty member, the Head, in consultation with the faculty, will appoint a search committee of at least three faculty, which should include at least one tenured faculty member and may include one Non-Tenure-Track Faculty member.

VI. DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES FOR RETENTION, ANNUAL REVIEW, AND TENURE AND PROMOTION DECISIONS CONCERNING TENURE LINE FACULTY

Section A. Generalities

The following guidelines for performance evaluation are specific to the Department of Classics. They are designed to supplement the criteria and procedures for implementation set down for the University in general in the most recent *Faculty Handbook* and its appendices. These guidelines should inform and be reflected (A) in annual reviews by the head of individual faculty and (B) in intermittent reviews by the faculty, or components thereof, and by the head on specific, formally prescribed occasions when faculty are considered for the granting of tenure and promotions. Tenure-Line Faculty should be able to assume that discussions center on, and judgments follow from, performance in three areas—research, teaching, and service—and are based on evidence made available before and during deliberations.

Section B. Workload Statement

Research: Tenure-Line faculty members are engaged in ongoing research agendas with clear goals. Tenure-Line faculty members publish books, peer-reviewed articles, site reports, papers in edited proceedings, and reviews. Faculty members also work toward producing professional presentations, and, where appropriate, acquiring external funding. Associate and full professors are expected to maintain a research productivity of at least the same quantity and quality as assistant professors, see Section D below.

Teaching: The annual teaching load for research-active Tenure-Line Faculty is 4 courses. Variation is available through annual discussion with the head. Examples of reasons for reduction are grant-writing, directing an extra-departmental program, and advising. Faculty members can provide oversight and direction of undergraduate and graduate research including theses and dissertations. Faculty of all ranks are expected to perform their teaching duties very well.

Service: Tenure-Line Faculty members participate in departmental governance and committees, college and university committees and task forces, community outreach

activities, and service to the profession. Faculty members' advising duties are considered service to both the department and the college. Assistant Professors are expected to participate in departmental activities. Associate Professors are expected to contribute amply in service to the College and University as well as the profession. Professors are expected to maintain at least the same level of service as Associate Professors.

Section C. Annual Review and Retention Review

The Annual Performance and Planning Review of all Tenure-Line Faculty takes place in a timely way each fall semester according to the procedures outlined by the *Faculty Handbook, Section 3.8 and appendix*. This annual review plays an important role in merit salary increases and promotion. Annual Retention Review for probationary faculty coincides with the annual review of all faculty, but is a separate process governed by section 3.11.4.5 of the *Faculty Handbook*. The probationary faculty member should submit to the department head for timely distribution a current curriculum vitae and a summary statement containing separate paragraphs highlighting his or her accomplishments in the previous academic year and goals for the current academic year in the three areas of teaching, research, and service. The faculty member may include any other information that he or she deems relevant. The head will distribute this document to the tenured faculty in a timely way before the tenured faculty meets for the retention vote. In the case of non-retention, every effort should be made to notify the faculty member as soon as possible.

In addition to the quantitative measures articulated in the Workload Statement above, there are other measures that come to bear in order to "meet expectations" in the process of the annual review of faculty by the head.

Research:

- 1. Tenure-Line Faculty members are expected to be engaged actively in a research program with clear goals.
- 2. In a three-year rolling total, faculty members are expected to publish one substantial article and make three conference presentations or their equivalent. Faculty members who have not published a book-length study or equivalent in the previous three academic years are also expected to report annually to the head on the shape and progress of a current book-length project.
- 3. External funding is expected where it is appropriate to advance one's research activity goals, and to an extent that is appropriate.

These are valuable considerations in the review process:

- Does the research program have defined goals?
- Are appropriate funding efforts undertaken?
- Are publications appearing in appropriate and prestigious peer reviewed outlets?
- Are professional papers being presented at appropriate and prestigious venues?
- Are graduate students and undergraduates involved in research?
- Are there special considerations that need to be taken into account (such as length of time to produce a book, collecting long-term field data, and so on)?

Teaching:

- 1. Unless negotiated differently, the teaching load for Tenure-Line Faculty is four courses per academic year.
- 2. Quality of teaching is expected to be high.
- 3. Measurements of teaching quality should be multiple, and include student evaluation, peer review (see part VIII, below), self-assessment, and regular participation in the departmental curricular process. Less formal teaching observation by faculty colleagues may be included. Tenure-Line Faculty members are expected to oversee and direct student research, including theses and dissertations as appropriate.

The following are important considerations in the evaluation of teaching:

- Are course offerings and content appropriate?
- Are grading/evaluation techniques appropriate for course level?
- Are teaching methods effective?
- Is the information taught up-to-date and accurate?
- Are new and relevant courses being developed?

Service:

Probationary faculty members are expected to participate in departmental activities. Tenured faculty members are expected to show leadership within the department, to participate, when asked, in the work of the college and the university, including outreach, and to put effort into the service of the discipline through the refereeing process and/or membership/leadership in regional, national, and international organizations.

The following considerations are important to evaluate service:

- Does professional service advance the department and university missions?
- Does outreach improve community relations and/or provide educational opportunities to the general public?
- Does outreach improve K-12 education?
- Are one's "fair share" of departmental, college, and university service duties undertaken?
- Can one discern a difference between leadership and membership in campus and disciplinary committee work?

Section D. Promotion, Tenure and Criteria for Rank

The Department wholly adopts the criteria for tenure and promotion set forth in the College of Arts & Sciences bylaws, the *Faculty Handbook*, and its concomitant appendices. In accordance with the general criteria set out in sections 2.2, 3.2, and 3.11 and appendix of the *Faculty Handbook*, and consistent with the Workload Statement in Section B of these bylaws, the department normally expects that candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor have published at least a book and two substantial articles or, in the judgment of the evaluators, the equivalent thereof (which may mean a number of articles, a combination of a number of articles and presentations, or a

significant work of archaeological excavation). The candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is expected to have executed his or her teaching duties very well and to have performed service within the department.

A candidate for promotion to Professor is expected to have established a sustained research record of the same quantity as for tenure and of at least the same quality; a candidate for Professor should have demonstrated excellence in the classroom and contributed amply in service to the College and University as well as the profession.

Section E. Outside evaluation for tenure and/or promotion

In this respect we follow the guidelines of the Faculty Handbook, Section 3.11.6.1.A.f.

Section F. Evaluation of Information

- **Part 1.** The department head will provide to faculty members who are eligible to vote all the materials submitted to him/her in a given case at least one week before the date for evaluation of such information and voting.
- **Part 2.** Additional information may be submitted during the week prior to voting if a request by a faculty member eligible to vote is transmitted through the department head to the individual whose case is being considered.
- **Part 3.** To ensure thorough consideration of all relevant information in a given case, all voting faculty members should come to the meeting both prepared and willing to present arguments for and/or against the candidate.
- **Part 4.** On request of the candidate, he/she will be permitted to address a meeting of those eligible to vote in the case in question, but he/she may not be present at the vote.

Section H. Voting

Part 1. In accordance with section 3.11.6 of the *Faculty Handbook*, the tenured faculty will meet to discuss the candidate's application for tenure. This meeting will be chaired by a member chosen by the group. After discussion, voting will follow by secret ballot. The ballot will be marked "yes," "no," or "abstain." The chair of the meeting is responsible for making and transmitting to the candidate and to the head a formal record of the faculty deliberation and the vote.

Part 2. To be recommended for retention, tenure, or promotion, the faculty member must receive a majority of "yes" votes from those eligible to vote.

VII. DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT, ANNUAL REVIEW, AND PROMOTION DECISIONS CONCERNING NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Section A. Generalities

University policies governing the appointment of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty are outlined in sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the *Faculty Handbook*. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in the Classics Department are co-equal colleagues of the Tenure-Line Faculty. They are hired on limited, but typically renewable, appointments to fill specific needs typically related to

the Department's teaching mission.

The following guidelines for performance evaluation are specific to the Department of Classics. They are designed to supplement the criteria and procedures for implementation set down for the University in general in the most recent *Faculty Handbook* its appendices. These guidelines should inform and be reflected (A) in annual reviews of individual faculty by the head or the head's substitute, and (B) in intermittent reviews by the faculty, or components thereof, on specific, formally prescribed occasions when Non-Tenure-Track Faculty are considered for the granting of promotion. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty should be able to assume that discussions center on, and judgments follow from, performance in teaching and, whenever appropriate, service in relation to the Department's teaching mission (see section VII.B below).

Section B. Workload Statement

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in the Department of Classics typically are hired as instructional faculty, and their work is 100% in the teaching function. They typically teach 24 semester hours per year unless otherwise negotiated with the head. While the Department hopes to foster their research, and is deeply grateful for service that they may voluntarily undertake, research and service are typically not within their position description. A notable exception is the institutional or disciplinary service in support of the Department's instructional mission that is required by the University from a Senior Lecturer in order to be promoted to Distinguished Lecturer (see below), and which is expected from Distinguished Lecturers. Although they are not required to do so, Non-Tenure-Track Faculty have the option of participating in departmental governance. They may also engage in academic advising, assisting student organizations, and supervising undergraduate research. When significant service is expected or required from full-time NTT instructional faculty, it should be compensated via course release(s) and/or extraservice pay. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty will be informed annually, in writing, by the department head, of the percentage of effort that they are expected to devote to teaching, service, and professional development that year.

Section C. Annual Review

All Non-Tenure-Track Faculty must undergo an Annual Performance and Planning Review, which at a minimum reviews the prior year's accomplishments and establishes appropriate objectives for the coming year (see *Faculty Handbook*, section 4.3). This annual review plays an important role in merit salary increases and promotion. The annual review of non-tenure-line faculty is concluded annually each spring; it closely resembles the review of tenure-line faculty outlined above (section VI.C), but focuses on the workload distribution and responsibilities outlined in the appointment letter and recorded in previous annual performance and planning reviews (vel sim.; cf. *Faculty Handbook*, section 4.3 and appendix).

- 1. Unless negotiated differently, the teaching load is 24 semester-hours per academic vear.
- 2. Quality of teaching is expected to be high.

3. Measurements of teaching quality should be multiple, and include student evaluation, peer review (see part VIII, below), and self-assessment.

The following are important considerations in the evaluation of teaching:

- Are course offerings and content appropriate?
- Are grading/evaluation techniques appropriate for course level?
- Are teaching methods effective?
- Is the information taught up-to-date and accurate?

The annual performance review for retention should be based on the quality of the individual's instruction. The faculty member will be provided with a written evaluation that will remain on file in the Department. In the case of non-retention, every effort should be made to notify the faculty member as soon as possible.

Section D. Promotion of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Non-Tenure-Track instructional faculty members holding regular appointments (≥75%-time) are eligible for promotion, as described in the *Faculty Handbook*. Annually, the Head shall solicit from full-time, tenure track faculty nominations for promotion to Senior Lecturer or Distinguished Lecturer. The Head also shall notify Lecturers annually whether they can apply for promotion. Lecturers who wish to be considered must submit a portfolio for departmental review. The Head shall make a recommendation for promotion to the College after evaluation of the candidate's dossier by an ad-hoc committee consisting of at least three faculty members, including at least one tenured faculty member and one Non-Tenure-Track Faculty member holding higher rank than the candidate. One member of this ad-hoc committee will be chosen by the Head, one by the NTTF candidate, and one will be chosen jointly. The faculty ad-hoc committee will record a vote in favor or against promotion by majority vote; this vote is advisory to the Head. The Head may solicit other faculty advice as deemed appropriate.

Lecturers can be promoted to the rank of "Senior Lecturer" and "Distinguished Lecturer." In accordance with the Faculty Handbook, Sections 4.2 and 4.5, the department expects that candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer have a PhD degree; will have taught a minimum of five years full-time at the rank of lecturer at the time of their promotion; provide evidence of outstanding teaching--typically of undergraduate courses--as documented in student evaluations, peer evaluations and annual supervisor or departmental evaluations; provide evidence of professional development in teaching and of notable contributions to the university's instructional mission. Research and service may be considered in the promotion process, but teaching excellence is the principal criterion. A Senior Lecturer who is a candidate for promotion to Distinguished Lecturer typically will have served three to five years at the rank of Senior Lecturer by the time of promotion, and has provided evidence of consistent excellence in teaching-typically of undergraduate courses--as documented in student evaluations, peer evaluations and annual supervisor or departmental evaluations; of continuing professional development in teaching, including some or all of the following: attendance at campus, regional, national, or international meetings directed at improving instruction; development of new courses

and/or revision of existing courses; incorporation of innovative course materials of instructional techniques; scholarly or creative work in the scholarship of teaching as well as in the discipline; awards or other recognition for teaching. The candidate for promotion to Distinguished Lecturer also must provide evidence for outstanding contributions to the university's instructional mission as well as evidence of institutional or disciplinary service.

Successful promotion to Senior Lecturer is recognized by the University with a three-year appointment and a centrally-funded 10% increase to base salary. Successful promotion to Distinguished Lecturer is recognized with a five-year appointment and a centrally-funded 10% increase to base salary.

In addition to recommending Senior Lecturers for promotion, the Department may designate certain contingent faculty as "Distinguished Lecturers" as a term appointment for persons who have distinguished themselves in careers in research, high school teaching, university teaching, and other fields related to Classics. Distinguished Lecturers who meet these criteria should be hired with the title. They would offer departmental lecture series or courses during an academic year. These appointments shall be made by the Head upon the advice of an *ad hoc* committee convened by the Head for this purpose.

VIII. PEER TEACHING EVALUATIONS

The Faculty Handbook 3.11.6.1.A.2.b requires that each tenure-track faculty member be reviewed twice during their probationary period, and a tenured faculty member be reviewed at least once prior to consideration for promotion. Likewise, for non-tenure track faculty members, the College of Arts and Sciences requires two peer teaching reviews for promotion to senior lecturer, and one peer teaching review for promotion to distinguished lecturer; these stipulations are being incorporated into the Faculty Handbook 4, Appendix B.5.iv, but have not yet been approved. The Peer Review Guide of the Tennessee Learning Center recommends that the first formal review take place in the second semester of the second year or the first semester of the third year of the assistant professor's or lecturer's appointment to allow for feedback, reflection, and improvement. The second review should take place shortly before the application for promotion.

In accordance with *College of Arts and Sciences Peer Review of Teaching Policy*, if the annual review of a full professor indicates that he or she falls short or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank in teaching, a peer-review of teaching should be conducted no later than the following term in which the person teaches. The results of this initial review may be used as a base against which expected improvements will be compared both from student survey and subsequent peer-review(s) of teaching.

Any faculty member may request a peer-review of teaching at any time.

The department's best practices guide to the *Peer Teaching Evaluation Process* approved by the Classics faculty on 11/13/2012 requires that reviews be conducted by two tenured faculty members, one selected by the department head, another selected by the faculty member under the review. One of the reviewers may be the department head. If it seems desirable, someone from another department may be included. For non-tenure track faculty members, at least one of the reviewers may be a senior or distinguished lecturer.

The departmental guide to the *Peer Teaching Evaluation Process* recommends the following points of feedback:

- consider whether the courses of the faculty member have appropriate content and offer students sufficient opportunity to acquire appropriate skills.
- consider whether the grading system and review/assessment tools are consistent with course content and student skill development.
- examine the teaching methods of the faculty for effectiveness.
- assess the degree to which faculty actively engage students in their learning process (through engaged interaction in-class or through out-of-class activities and assignments).

Review procedure:

- 1. Gather background information such as syllabi, online site information (Canvas), teaching materials, assessment examples, end-of-course student evaluation forms, etc. This will include a statement of teaching philosophy by the member.
- 2. Meet with faculty member to discuss the review process.
- 3. Observe two classes.
- 4. Prepare the final report and meet with the faculty member afterwards as appropriate to provide feedback.
- 5. Submit to department head.
- 6. Department head meets with faculty members.
- 7. Faculty member must have an opportunity to respond in writing.

IX. RATIFICATION AND AMENDMENT

Section A. These bylaws must be ratified by a majority of the voting members of the faculty and will become effective immediately upon ratification.

Section B. These bylaws may be amended by a majority of the voting members of the faculty at a department meeting, provided that the text of the proposed amendment has been printed in the agenda for the meeting.

APPENDIX: INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITIES WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

Here follows a list of activities and responsibilities that will be covered by individual faculty members following negotiations between head and individual faculty members. The list is not intended to be exhaustive. One of the purposes of this list is to remind the faculty of the many things the department considers worthy of its attention in the course of the academic year.

Advisor to Eta Sigma Phi

Advisor to Classics Club

Associate head of the department

Chair of departmental Assessment Committee

Chair of departmental Curriculum Committee

Chair of departmental Development Committee

Chair of departmental Access and Engagement Committee

Chair of departmental Outreach and Student Engagement Committee

Class scheduler

Coordinator of Tennessee Undergraduate Classics Research Conference

Coordinator of introductory and intermediate Latin teaching

Coordinator of Latin Day

Coordinator of Latin Placement Exam

Coordinator of large regional and national translation exams

Coordinator of student recruitment

Curator of the departmental image collection

Departmental representative to the Arts & Humanities Divisional Curriculum Committee

Departmental representative to UT Humanities Center Steering Committee

Departmental representative to UT Humanities Center Heads Committee

Departmental review committee probationary faculty

Departmental review committee non-tenure track faculty

Development Committee Chair

Director of Undergraduate Studies

Director of Graduate Studies

Departmental representative to the East Tennessee Chapter of the Archaeological

Institute of America

Editor of the Classics Newsletter

Faculty mentor

GTA supervisor

Liaison for *Elements*, College of Arts and Sciences

Liaison for *iThenticate* software, ORIED

Liaison for undergraduate research funding and programs

Liaison to the Anthropology program

Liaison to the History program

Liaison to the Marco program

Liaison to the Tennessee secondary schools

Library representative

Member of the Faculty Senate, if elected

Member of the World Language Board of Admissions for Teacher Certification in the

College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty retention committee
Representative at Classics Advisory Council
Representative to the American Academy in Rome
Representative to the American School of Classical Studies in Athens
Representative to the Dean's Advisory Council
Secretary-treasurer of the East Tennessee Society/AIA
Social Media Advisor
Web liaison to College Communications Office