

PROCEDURES AND POLICIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS (THE “BYLAWS”)

Approved by a majority of the Faculty of the Department via a Secret Ballot on September 18, 2009, with additional votes on December 18, 2012, and February 15, 2013.

Contents: (I) Membership, (II) Chair, (III) Associate Chair, (IV) Executive Committee, (V) Departmental Service Responsibilities, (VI) Evaluations, (VII) Minimal Expectations for Research Faculty in the Department of Classics, (VIII) Standards and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure, (IX) Promotion of Specialized Faculty, (X) Professor Emeritus, (XI) Florida State University Substantive Change Policy, (XII) Amending the Bylaws, Appendix I: Aid to Reading a Classics Dossier

The Bylaws of the Department of Classics adhere to and are consistent with University policies found in the Florida State University Constitution, the Board of Trustees-United Faculty of Florida Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Faculty Handbook, and the annual Promotion and Tenure letter.

I. MEMBERSHIP

Membership of the Faculty of the Department shall consist of all tenured and tenure-earning Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, regularly salaried Specialized Faculty, and Courtesy Faculty.

All tenured and tenure-earning faculty members have full voting rights, except where specified below.

A. Specialized Faculty

Specialized Faculty members are normally assigned only to teach, with only a minimal research or service assignment. As committee membership is construed to be service, Specialized Faculty members are not obligated to serve on committees or participate in departmental governance. Specialized Faculty members have voting rights only where specified below.

B. Courtesy Faculty

Tenured and tenure-earning, and Specialized Faculty members who hold a position in another department may be appointed as Courtesy Faculty in the Department. Such Courtesy Faculty members may teach courses in the Department. Those Courtesy Faculty members who hold Graduate Faculty Status in their home department may serve on M.A. and Ph.D. committees, and serve as major professor and thesis or dissertation director of M.A. and Ph.D. students. Courtesy Faculty members have no voting rights in departmental affairs.

C. Departmental Meetings

Meetings of the Faculty of the Department will be announced in advance by the Chair of the Department as needed, but at least once per term. A faculty meeting may be called by a request by three or more faculty members. The Secretary will provide minutes of the meetings.

II. CHAIR

A. Selection, Terms

The Chair of the Department is appointed in accordance with current College practices and regulations. The Chair serves at the pleasure of the Dean of the College, generally for a three-year term. There are no limits at the departmental level to the number of terms that a Chair can serve.

At the start of the third year of a chair’s term, the department will elect an ad hoc chair selection committee. This committee will have three members, with one member at each rank; the dean will also appoint a faculty member from outside the department to serve on the committee. The three members from the department will elect a chairperson of their committee. The committee will poll departmental members for nominations (including self-nominations), conduct an election by secret ballot, and forward the results along with its recommendation to the Dean. Full-time A&P and USPS staff members are allowed one combined vote, and full-time Specialized Faculty members (adjuncts excluded) are allowed one combined vote.

B. Duties of the Chair

The Chair is responsible for the administration of the Department. The Chair’s responsibilities include: the making the annual Assignment of Responsibilities for each faculty member; for annually providing each faculty member who has not achieved the highest rank possible for him or her a written evaluation of progress toward promotion (and tenure as the case may be); for annually evaluating the performance of each faculty member, in accordance with the duties specified in the faculty member’s annual Assignment of Responsibilities and taking into account the results of the Department’s Peer Evaluation results; for calling faculty meetings; for managing the financial resources of the Department; and for making salary adjustment recommendations to the Dean, taking into account the results of the Department’s Peer Evaluation results.

III. ASSOCIATE CHAIR

The Chair on an annual basis appoints the Associate Chair of the Department. S/He substitutes for the Chair when the Chair is not available.

IV. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee consists of the Chair, the Associate Chair, and two faculty members who are elected, one by one, by a majority vote of the Faculty. The Chair determines the precise responsibilities of the Executive Committee, but in general the Executive Committee serves as advisory to the Chair when the entire faculty cannot readily meet.

V. DEPARTMENTAL SERVICE RESPONSIBILITIES

Departmental service responsibilities, including committee membership, are appointed by the Chair, are elected by members of the Department, or are filled by volunteers. Additional committees or service responsibilities beyond those specified here may be created or appointed by the Chair. The responsibilities are included on the individual faculty member’s Assignment of Responsibilities, and the entire list of committee assignments and responsibilities will be made available to all faculty members in the Spring term.

SECRETARY (volunteer)

The faculty secretary provides the minutes of the faculty meetings in a timely fashion.

FACULTY SENATOR (elected by the Department)

One faculty member is elected for a two-year term in accordance with Faculty Senate rules. S/He is responsible for attending Faculty Senate meetings and informing the Department of developments affecting the Department or its members.

DIRECTOR OF GRADUATE STUDIES (appointed by the Chair)

The DGS is responsible for monitoring the progress of all graduate students and for approving their schedules. The DGS is in charge of fall orientation, and acts as liaison between the community of graduate students and the faculty. The DGS supervises the selection of the Rankin Prize for Outstanding Postgraduate. The DGS arranges the departmental graduation ceremony.

SUPERVISOR OF TEACHING ASSISTANTS (appointed by the Chair)

The TA Supervisor works under the direction of the DGS, and is responsible for the classroom teaching by graduate students, except for the Latin Program. The TA Supervisor makes all TA assignments in conjunction with the DGS, Chairman, and Office Manager. The TA Supervisor assigns faculty responsibilities for classroom observations. The TA Supervisor acts as the resource person for TAs who are in the classroom, meets with TAs on a regular basis, helps them to improve their classroom performance, reminds them of university and departmental policies, and works to develop a standard syllabus and a standard set of lecture outlines for the courses regularly taught by TAs. The TA Supervisor normally teaches FLE5810: Teaching Classics in the Spring Term.

SUPERVISOR OF LATIN PROGRAM (appointed by the Chair)

The Supervisor of the Latin Program works closely with the Classroom Supervisor of Teaching Assistants. The Latin Supervisor is responsible for the classroom teaching of Latin by graduate students. The Latin Supervisor acts as the resource person for TAs who are in the classroom, meets with TAs on a regular basis, helps them to improve their classroom performance, reminds them of university and departmental policies, and works to develop a standard syllabus and a standard set of lecture outlines for the courses regularly taught by TAs.

DIRECTOR OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES (appointed by the Chair)

The DUS advises all undergraduates, and works closely with the Program Assistant. S/He is the liaison between the department and relevant college and university offices. S/He is responsible for guiding the department in the implementation of college and university policies. DUS acts as liaison between the department and the community of undergraduate majors. DUS is in charge of orientation and information sessions for undergraduates. S/He arranges the annual Meet the Majors Day. The DUS supervises the selection of the Rankin Prize for Outstanding Undergraduate and the Dorman Fellowships.

ADMISSIONS OFFICER (appointed by the Chair)

The AO supervises the process of graduate admissions from initial inquiries to the completion of the college and university admissions materials. The AO selects candidates for college and university fellowships. The AO actively recruits promising applicants and directs relevant faculty to assist in recruiting promising applicants. The AO chairs the Admissions Committee. S/He monitors the acceptance phase of admissions and provides a full report to the Chairman and to the DGS.

ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE (consists of the Admissions Officer as chair, Director of Graduate Studies, Supervisor of Latin TAs, and one or more additional faculty appointed by the Chair)

This committee, chaired by the AO, ranks applicants to the MA and PhD programs and determines the relative merits of new applicants and departmental alternatives. It reports its results to the department in early February. The department may ask the committee to reconsider specific points, but not to re-evaluate the rankings, which remain the responsibility of the committee. The decisions of the committee are ratified by the Faculty.

This committee will evaluate any student who applies for admission to the PhD program before completing the MA degree, in accordance with departmental policy.

PEER EVALUATION COMMITTEE (consists of one-half of all tenured and tenure-track Faculty in the Department)

The Peer Evaluation Committee consists of one-half of all tenured and tenure-track Faculty, serving in alternate years. The Committee conducts the annual peer evaluation of all faculty members of the Department, in accordance with the rules set out in the section of these bylaws on Evaluation. The results are used by the Chair in the annual evaluations, salary adjustment recommendations, and other evaluations.

PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE (all tenured faculty members of the Department)

This committee evaluates departmental candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure, and conducts the third-year review of Assistant Professors. In the case of candidates for tenure or promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, it consists of all tenured faculty members. In the case of a candidate for promotion from Associate to Full Professor, only those faculty members who hold the rank of Full Professor are eligible to vote.

FACULTY SEARCH COMMITTEE (consists of the Chair and two or three other faculty members selected on a volunteer basis, with preference for knowledge of subject area of the search)

A search committee prepares the position announcement (with approval by the Faculty), reads all applications materials and prepares a list of candidates to interview, subject to approval by the Faculty. This committee conducts interviews either at the annual national meetings or via telephone, as needed, and prepares a list of candidates to bring to campus for interviews, subject to approval by the Faculty. Determination of the area in which a hire is to be made shall be conducted by the entire faculty either during a regularly scheduled faculty meeting or at a faculty meeting called specifically for this purpose.

COMMITTEE ON ARCHAEOLOGY (consists of all faculty members in Archaeology and one additional faculty member selected by the chair; the committee chair is appointed by the Chair)

The Archaeology Committee supervises the graduate archaeology program including fieldwork credit, arranges for MA and PhD comprehensive exams, and prepares a coordinated offering of archaeology courses for the upcoming year. The committee shall periodically review course offerings and degree requirements, making recommendations for changes as it deems appropriate. All such changes will be subject to the approval of the entire faculty.

COMMITTEE ON PHILOLOGY (consists of all faculty members in Philology; the committee chair is appointed by the Chair)

This committee supervises the graduate philology program, arranges for MA and PhD comprehensive and other examinations, and prepares a coordinated offering of philology courses for the upcoming year. Subcommittees of the Committee on Philology will design and administer the Diagnostic Exams for entering graduate students, the M.A. and Ph.D. language exams, and the Graduate Reading Knowledge exams for students in other departments. The committee shall periodically review course offerings and degree requirements, making recommendations for changes as it deems appropriate. All such changes will be subject to the approval of the entire faculty.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORY (consists of all faculty members in History and one additional faculty member selected by the chair; the committee chair is appointed by the Chair)

This committee supervises the graduate ancient history program, arranges for MA and PhD comprehensive and other examinations, and prepares a coordinated offering of history courses for the upcoming year. The committee shall periodically review course offerings and degree requirements, making recommendations for changes as it deems appropriate. All such changes will be subject to the approval of the entire faculty.

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (appointed by the Chair)

This committee evaluates individual courses, both new and proposed. The committee also evaluates, plans, and proposes changes to degree programs and majors within the department. All plans and changes made by the Committee shall be submitted to the entire faculty for discussion and voted on by the members of the faculty.

COMMITTEE ON CLASSICS IN THE SCHOOLS/CLASSICS OUTREACH (appointed by the Chair)

This Committee provides one member to coordinate contacts with the K-12 schools.

COMMITTEE ON THE THOMPSON LIBRARY (elected by the Faculty annually in Spring)

Three members of the faculty shall be elected annually in the Spring to supervise the running and maintenance of the Thompson Library, to set policy and rules for use, to coordinate with the Religion Department, and to make decisions regarding the expenditure of funds from the Thompson Library Fund and the Golden Fund for the Thompson Library.

COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCES AND COLLOQUIA (elected by the Faculty annually in the Spring)

This committee coordinates all speakers, conferences, and colloquia given by members of the department or visitors. The committee will work closely with the departmental office staff on preparations and follow-through.

LIBRARY OFFICER (appointed by the Chair)

One faculty member serves as liaison to the University Libraries and coordinates faculty book requests.

DEPARTMENTAL HISTORIAN AND NEWSLETTER EDITOR (appointed by the Chair)

One faculty member is responsible for compiling materials related to the history of the Department. S/He edits and assembles the annual departmental newsletter.

ADVISOR TO ARCHAEOLOGY CLUB (volunteer)

One faculty member serves as faculty advisor to the Student Archaeology Club

ADVISOR TO ETA SIGMA PHI (volunteer):

One faculty member serves as faculty advisor to the Classics Honor Society Eta Sigma Phi.

WEBSITE (appointed by the chair)

One faculty member, assisted by a departmental staff person and College I.T. person, oversees the department’s website.

COMMENCEMENT

The department is obligated to send a faculty representative to the three yearly commencements. Normally an alphabetical rotation is utilized.

VI. EVALUATIONS

A. Annual Peer and Merit Evaluation

Each Spring all faculty members (other than courtesy faculty) will submit an evaluation binder covering the preceding three calendar years. Faculty members with fewer than three years at FSU will submit a binder based on the years available. The binder will include evidence on teaching, research, and service and will consist of the departmental Evidence of Performance Form, other items specified by that Evidence of Performance Form, and any other material a faculty member deems important. Faculty should NOT include CVs. An electronic copy of the departmental Evidence of Performance Form should also be sent to the Chair for transmission to the Dean’s Office as required for the annual evaluation.

Binders will be reviewed and rated by members of the Evaluation Committee. Committee members will rate each faculty member for teaching, research, service, as well as overall (i.e. four scores total). Scores will be on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating the highest possible score and 5 the lowest. Committee members shall not evaluate themselves, nor shall they evaluate a partner or spouse. The following ratings and guidelines shall be observed:

- (1) Substantially Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations;
 - (2) Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations;
 - (3) Meets FSU’s High Expectations;
 - (4) Official Concern;
 - (5) Unsatisfactory (Does Not Meet FSU’s High Expectations)
- Substantially Exceeds High Expectations – This describes a faculty member who far exceeds performance expectations during the evaluation period and achieves an extraordinary accomplishment or recognition in teaching, research, and service, which may include several of the following: highly significant research or creative activities; demonstrated recognition of the individual by peers as an authority in his/her field; securing significant external funding; attaining significant national or international achievements, awards, and recognition.
 - Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations – This describes an individual who exceeds expectations during the evaluation period by virtue of demonstrating noted achievements in teaching, research, and service, which may include several of the following: high level of research/creative activity, professional recognitions, willingness to accept additional responsibilities, high level of commitment to serving students and the overall mission of the Department, involvement / leadership in professional associations, initiative in solving problems or developing new ideas.
 - Meets FSU’s High Expectations – This describes an individual who demonstrates the requisite knowledge and skills in his/her field of specialty and completes assigned responsibilities in a manner that is both timely and consistent with the high expectations of the university.

If an individual’s overall performance rating falls below “Meets FSU’s High Expectations,” specific suggestions for improvement should be provided to the employee. There are two performance rating categories for individuals who are not meeting expectations:

- Official Concern – This describes an individual who demonstrates the requisite knowledge and skills in his/her field of specialty but is not completing assigned responsibilities in a manner that is consistent with the high standards of the university.
- Unsatisfactory (Does Not Meet FSU’s High Expectations) – This describes an individual who fails to demonstrate with consistency the knowledge, skills, or abilities required in his/her field of specialty and/or in completing assigned responsibilities.

A Performance Improvement Plan is required when a Specialized Faculty member receives a “Does Not Meet FSU’s High Expectations” rating. Tenured faculty members may be placed on a PIP if they receive an overall performance rating of “Does Not Meet FSU’s High Expectations” on three or more of the previous six performance evaluations.

Members of the Evaluation Committee will submit their scores to the Department chair, who will average and tabulate the scores according to percentages specified by each faculty member’s Assignment of Responsibilities.

The committee shall then meet, review, and discuss the ratings and revise scores as deemed necessary. Members shall leave the room when their binders or those of a partner or spouse are discussed. The committee will identify areas for improvement and report these to the chair for consideration in the chair’s annual evaluation of faculty members.

After completing the ratings of all faculty members, the committee will group faculty members into one of five categories: (1) Substantially Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations; (2) Exceeds FSU’s High Expectations; (3) Meets FSU’s High Expectations; (4) Official Concern; and (5) Does Not Meet FSU’s High Expectations (Unsatisfactory). The committee will submit these final rankings to the chairman. There shall be no quota system for each category, nor shall there be a forced distribution of evaluation ratings. The chairman will use the rankings of the Evaluation Committee in determining any merit salary increases. In the event that the chairman’s recommendation to the Dean deviates from that of the Evaluation Committee, the Chairman shall report such changes to the committee and shall forward to the Dean and Provost the original merit distribution plan along with the recommendations of the Chair. The Chair shall also inform the faculty along with appropriate justification at the next scheduled faculty meeting.

If salary merit increases are not available in any given year, the results of those years must be considered in the next year that merit increases are available.

B. Annual Evaluation – Specialized Faculty

Specialized Faculty will be evaluated on an annual basis by the Peer Evaluation Committee. The three-year cycle of reporting, based on the calendar year, will be employed. The Specialized Faculty member will prepare a binder or dossier that reflects his/her Assignment of Responsibilities and

submit it to the Peer Evaluation Committee. If the faculty member being evaluated is on a twelve-month contract, then the Summer Term is included in all evaluations.

Specialized Faculty are to be evaluated in only the areas specified on the Assignment of Responsibilities using the following scale: “Substantially exceeds FSU’s High Standards,” “Exceeds FSU’s High Standards,” “Meets FSU’s High Standards,” “Official Concern,” and “Does Not Meet FSU’s High Standards.” They are evaluated for the whole of the three-year period reported in this form. New faculty may not be able to provide material for the whole of the three-year period, under which circumstance evaluators will take that fact into consideration. Scores will be reported (on ballots that are signed by the evaluator) at a meeting held in the Spring term during or following the evaluation period, and submitted to the Chair. Specialized Faculty who meet or exceed FSU’s High Standards are eligible for merit increases (the exact distribution of which will be the responsibility of the Chair, who makes such recommendations to the Dean of the College). The evaluation will also be employed by the Chair as part of the annual evaluation of each faculty member’s performance.

In the evaluation of Specialized Faculty, the Chair is advised not only by the Peer Evaluation Committee, but also by any other Specialized Faculty in the department. If there is only one Specialized Faculty member in the department, he or she may, if he or she chooses, select an additional Specialized Faculty member or members from within the College of Arts and Sciences to serve in this advisory capacity.

C. Annual Evaluation by Chair (“Progress Letter”)

Each untenured faculty member, each tenured faculty member, and each Specialized Faculty member who has not achieved the highest rank possible for her/him shall be evaluated on an annual basis by the Chair to ascertain progress towards promotion and/or tenure, and will be informed of such in a letter, taking into account the results of the annual Peer Evaluation or Specialized Faculty Evaluation, the recommendations of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and any other evaluations conducted during the year (classroom visits, student evaluation forms, etc.). Faculty members eligible for promotion or for tenure (except for Assistant Professors in the years in which they receive third-year reviews) shall be apprised annually in writing of progress towards promotion or tenure in order to provide assistance and counseling in working toward that goal. If the Specialized Faculty member is on a twelve-month appointment, the summer term performance is subject to evaluation. Upon receipt of the evaluation letter, an individual faculty member may request a meeting of the full Committee to discuss the letter.

Assistant Professors hired July 1, 2019 or later shall receive a tenure review in their third year. Assistant Professors hired before July 1, 2019 and who have not yet had a 2nd-year review may choose between a 2nd and 4th year set of reviews or a 3rd year review. Assistant Professors hired before July 1, 2019 and who have already had a 2nd year review shall have a 4th year review. These reviews are mentoring opportunities during which the department/unit’s Promotion and Tenure Committee shall provide specific feedback and advice reflecting expectations for tenure and how the faculty member is progressing toward meeting those expectations. The faculty member shall meet with the department/unit’s chair to discuss the report. Tenure Review Report(s) shall be included in the tenure binder. Assistant Professors hired with credit toward tenure shall have credited years included in the determination of the timing of the third-year review unless an alternative schedule is mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and his or her supervisor.

D. Annual Evaluation by Chair

All faculty members of the Department, whether tenured, tenure-earning, or Specialized Faculty, shall be evaluated on an annual basis by the Chair, taking into account the results of the annual Peer Evaluation or Specialized Faculty Evaluation. This evaluation will be conducted according to the performance of the duties assigned in the annual Assignment of Responsibilities, and the Annual Evaluation Summary Form provided by the University. At the request of the individual faculty member or the Chair, the Evaluation Committee may be present. If the Specialized Faculty member is on a twelve-month appointment, the summer term performance is subject to evaluation. All faculty members, including those ineligible for promotion, shall receive a narrative evaluation appended to The Evaluation Summary Form.

All evaluations shall contain a narrative explanation attached to the Annual Evaluation Summary Form.

E. Aftermath of Process

The Committee may meet after the Dean has determined merit raises and consider revising procedures and criteria. Any member of the Committee may request such a meeting. The Department shall vote on any Committee recommendations.

VII. MINIMAL EXPECTATIONS FOR RESEARCH FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

In order to guide the Chair in evaluating productivity in research, the Department has established the following standards for minimal productivity in research.

1. Over any **three-year period**, a faculty member is expected to have **two refereed articles or book chapters accepted for publication** by **reputable** journals or in volumes published by **reputable** presses. The Department emphasizes acceptance instead of appearance in recognition of the fact that many good journals and presses have slow production schedules and that the rate of appearance may not in itself be a fair indication of scholarly activity. The Department does not establish expectations of length for the above-mentioned articles or chapters, but there it is understood that these articles or chapters should represent original research (not popularizing pieces or newspaper articles).
2. Reasonable divergence from this standard is acceptable. Obviously, the acceptance or publication of a book or monograph will suffice to justify a faculty member’s research time over a three-year period.
3. Less obvious substitutions may also be considered acceptable: for instance, a case might be made for a sequence of scholarly reviews (that is, detailed reviews that constitute learned contributions in their own right, not mere summaries, even lengthy summaries, of the contents of a book). Similarly, a single article or chapter of impressive length (not the same thing as an article or chapter that is merely long) or importance, one that clearly represents the results of sustained research over a period of three years, might be deemed sufficient. And, in certain circumstances, a faculty member might adduce the results of research in progress (e.g. chapters or papers read at

academic conferences) that indicate that the completion and acceptance of a book or similarly significant body of work is imminent. Along these same lines, evidence of successful grant-writing, as well as archaeological progress reports, might be adduced to demonstrate an active research program, though again there must be a solid indication that the completion and acceptance of a significant body of work is imminent.

4. The examples in the previous paragraph are not meant to be exhaustive, but rather to make it clear that the Department is more interested in each faculty member’s production of good scholarship than in any specific quantitative measure. Nevertheless, it must be understood that it will be the responsibility of any faculty member who does not meet the standard established in I and II above to make the case that his or her productivity constitutes a satisfactory divergence from those expectations.

5. The standard discussed in this document is the minimal standard. Faculty who meet this minimal standard should not assume that by doing so they are necessarily making satisfactory progress toward promotion or tenure.

6. Any faculty member who falls below this minimal standard should expect to receive an expression of official concern in his or her annual evaluation by the Chair.

VIII. DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS: STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

Promotion to Associate Professor

Assistant professors in the Department of Classics will ordinarily become candidates for promotion to the level of associate professor and for the award of tenure when they reach their sixth year of service in a tenure track position. Consequently, candidates will be evaluated primarily on the basis of the research, teaching and service that they will have carried out during the previous five years.

The promotion decision shall take into account the following: (1) Annual Evaluation and Progress-Towards-Promotion letters; (2) Third-year evaluations of Assistant Professors; (3) Annual Assignment of Responsibility forms; and (4) Fulfilment of the Department’s written promotion criteria, as related to the candidate’s assignments. Evaluation of teaching shall not be based primarily on student perceptions.

The Department seeks to promote candidates who have displayed excellence in research, teaching and service and who, moreover, show promise of continued excellence in the future. The prospect of future success is, in fact, an important consideration when determining whether or not an assistant professor should become a permanent member of the Classics faculty.

Research:

The overall assessment of research must take into consideration both the quantity and the quality of a candidate’s publications. There is no specific quota the publication of which will guarantee tenure, nor is there a prescribed list of presses and publications. The Department seeks to promote candidates who display a vigorous and promising program of research. Consequently, the quantity of a candidate’s publications is one factor in evaluating his or her standing as a scholar; moreover, it

supports a candidate’s claim to excellence if he or she has published with the best presses and journals. In addition, a candidate’s stature as a researcher will also be gauged by taking into regard his or her activities in presenting papers at academic conferences, involvement in fieldwork, and success in winning research grants.

(1) Quantity. No fixed number of published articles or books will guarantee promotion, since other factors also play a role in promotion decisions. Nevertheless, candidates for promotion are normally expected to have published or have had accepted for publication five major articles, or their equivalent, or a book or monograph. An article can be regarded as ‘major’ if it is placed in an elite journal, engages a serious intellectual issue, demonstrates a significant point, or attracts wide scholarly attention and approval. While length is one factor in determining whether or not an article is to be deemed ‘major,’ it is not the only one or even the most important one. The Department has introduced the phrase ‘or their equivalent’ on the grounds that a promising scholar might produce a series of notes that, while brief, nevertheless represent valuable contributions to the discipline. The scholar who prefers notes to larger pieces must recognize that he or she will be expected to produce rather more than five pieces, unless those notes prove to be of such extraordinary merit that they can fairly be said to be the equivalent of major articles.

The Department does not strictly require a book for promotion to associate professor, but it must be noted that, in the university at large, there exists an apparent predilection for assistant professors (in arts subjects) who produce a book at the earliest possible stage. In view of the reality of such an expectation outside the confines of the Department, the Department urges assistant professors to publish a combination of articles and a book before they become candidates for promotion.

In assessing a candidate’s standing in the discipline, attention will also be given to papers read at academic conferences and to a candidate’s success in winning research grants.

(2) Quality. More important than quantity of publication is its quality. This point must be underscored: it is not at all satisfactory for one simply to meet the Department’s expectations of quantity in order to receive the Department’s endorsement of one’s research. Which raises the question of how quality is to be appraised. One criterion, though only one, will be the status of the journal or press that has accepted a candidate’s work for publication. During the promotion process itself, letters are solicited from outside authorities who evaluate a candidate’s research. These letters are advisory to the Department and to the university, and they, too, will be a factor in determining the quality of a candidate’s research. However, the most important element in the appraisal of a candidate’s research must remain the professional judgment of his or her senior colleagues. In other words, the Department will consider the status of the press or journal by which a work is published and it will give due regard to letters from outside authorities, but it will not consider itself required to surrender its own capacity for reading and appraising classical scholarship. In the end, then, the Department will render its own judgment on the quality of a candidate’s research.

Inasmuch as the decision to award tenure to an assistant professor is critical to the future of any department, it is necessary to consider a candidate’s academic promise as well as his or her prior attainments. To this end, it is desirous that an assistant professor demonstrate a steady and continuing scheme of research over the whole of his or her early career. Furthermore, it speaks well for the future if a candidate can demonstrate that his or her research has begun, even before promotion, to reach into new areas of investigation, an aspect of one’s research program that can be displayed in academic presentations as well as in publications. If, on the other hand, the bulk of a

candidate’s publications derive directly from his or her dissertation, the Department may ask to see the dissertation in order to determine the extent of revision that the candidate’s work has undergone. To put matters negatively, the Department does not seek to promote candidates for whom the most productive stage of their career will be over at the time of their promotion.

Teaching:

The Department values excellence in teaching. Members of the Classics Department are expected to teach courses that range from introductory to advanced. They are expected to contribute to the Department’s mission by teaching elective courses to the larger university community and by teaching specialist courses to majors and to postgraduates. The horizon of expectations for teaching in the Department is high, and will remain so. A teacher for whom the description ‘average’ is the best that one can say cannot be regarded as a successful teacher in the Classics Department. The quality of an assistant professor’s teaching is assessed each year through student evaluation forms, through the Department’s peer review procedure (which includes an examination of teaching materials, examinations, etc.), and through one or more visitations by the chairman of the department and/or faculty member (it is required that the chairman observe the teaching of every assistant professor at least once in the academic year). Service on MA and PhD committees and extraordinary out-of-class contact with students may also be taken into consideration in evaluating a candidate’s teaching record.

Teaching and research are deemed by the Department to be of equal importance to its future success. Consequently, the evaluation of a candidate’s teaching is far from pro forma. Again, to put it negatively, the Department is unlikely to recommend for promotion a productive researcher who is a failure in the classroom.

Service:

The Department expects all members of its faculty to contribute to the smooth operation of departmental life. It encourages faculty to participate in college and university service, and it especially encourages faculty to participate in professional organizations. But it cautions junior faculty against becoming excessively involved in service outside the Department too early in one’s career. During the early stages of an academic career, it is simply more important to earn distinction in research and in teaching.

Promotion to Professor

The Department seeks to promote to the level of professor those associate professors who have earned national or international distinction for their research and for their overall contribution to the discipline. Consequently, the whole of a candidate’s career must be taken into account, though the greatest degree of attention will be paid to the period since his or her promotion to the level of associate professor.

Research:

The reader should refer to the preamble to the discussion of research provided above in this text’s treatment of the promotion to associate professor.

(1) Quantity. It seems reasonable that a candidate for promotion to professor will, since the time of his or her appointment to the level of associate professor, have published (or have had accepted for publication) a quantity of scholarship comparable to that expected for an assistant professor who is

a candidate for promotion to the level of associate professor. In other words, a candidate for promotion to professor should normally have published (or have had accepted for publication) five major articles, or their equivalent, or a book or monograph. However, strict expectations of quantity are less important than expectations of quality. A candidate may have published somewhat less than this amount and yet, owing to the sheer excellence and distinction of his or her work, prove to be an appropriate candidate for promotion to professor.

(2) Quality. The quality of a candidate’s work will be assessed in the manner cited above when describing the Department’s expectations for candidates for promotion to the level of associate professor. In the case of the candidate for professor, however, the Department’s expectation of quality must be nothing less than exacting. The candidate must be viewed as making or having made a significant and lasting contribution to the field of Classics.

A candidate’s research will be the single most important criterion in the Department’s evaluation of his or her suitability for promotion to professor.

Teaching:

Candidates must continue to meet the Department’s expectations for good teaching. It is not anticipated that anyone who has been awarded tenure in the past will deteriorate as a teacher, but, should that occur, it must have an adverse effect upon that individual’s candidacy for promotion to professor. In other words, the Department is unlikely to recommend for promotion to professor anyone who has failed in his or her obligations as a teacher.

Service:

Senior faculty members are expected to take on an increasingly important role in departmental, college and university life. Furthermore, they are encouraged by the Department to be active in professional organizations. Nevertheless, the Department’s recommendation of a promotion to professor will be based mainly on excellence in research and on continued success in teaching.

X. PROMOTION OF SPECIALIZED FACULTY

Specialized Faculty have the opportunity to be considered for promotion in rank, from Assistant Teaching Faculty to Associate Teaching Faculty, or from Associate Teaching Faculty to Teaching Faculty.

Specialized Faculty will be evaluated according to their Assignment of Responsibilities, which currently will be 100% teaching. The same criteria for teaching that applies to Assistant Professors will be applied to Specialized Faculty; the appropriate portion of Section VIII above is repeated here, modified for the positions under discussion here. If the Specialized Faculty member being evaluated is on a twelve-month contract, then the Summer Term is included in all evaluations.

The Department values excellence in teaching. Members of the Classics Department are expected to teach courses that range from introductory to advanced. They are expected to contribute to the Department’s mission by teaching elective courses to the larger university community and by teaching specialist courses to majors and to postgraduates. The horizon of expectations for teaching in the Department is high, and will remain so. A teacher for whom the description ‘average’ is the best that one can say cannot be regarded as a successful teacher in the Department. The quality of

an assistant professor’s teaching is assessed each year through student evaluation forms, through the Department’s Specialized Faculty Evaluation procedure (which includes an examination of teaching materials, examinations, etc.), and through one or more visitations by the chairman of the department and/or faculty member (it is required that the chairman observe the teaching of every Assistant in Classics or Associate in Classics at least once in the academic year). Service on MA and PhD committees and extraordinary out-of-class contact with students may also be taken into consideration in evaluating a candidate’s teaching record, but are not a requirement.

X. FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE POLICY

Faculty and staff members are expected to be familiar with, and follow, the Florida State University Substantive Change Policy as found on the university web site at <http://provost.fsu.edu/sacs>.

XI. PROFESSOR EMERITUS

Any retiring faculty member can request that the Faculty of the Department consider recommending him or her to the Dean for emeritus or emerita status. The request will be discussed and voted on by the Promotion and Tenure Committee (viz. the tenured faculty of the Department). A simple majority will determine the Department’s recommendation. If the recommendation is positive, that recommendation (but not the particulars of the vote that determined it) will be sent to the Dean. If the recommendation is negative, it will not be reported to the Dean and the matter will thereby be concluded.

The Department will recommend emeritus or emerita status in recognition of meritorious contributions to the University and to the Department in scholarship, in teaching and/or in service.

XII. AMENDING THE BYLAWS

Changes to these bylaws (Departmental Policies and Procedures) may be proposed by any member of the faculty. Discussion and approval by a majority vote shall take place at the next faculty meeting after an announcement of the proposed change. Changes to comply with University policy or regulations or United Faculty of Florida contract demands may be made by the chair with appropriate notification of the faculty members.

Appendix I. AID TO READING A CLASSICS DOSSIER FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

CLASSICS: WHAT IS IT?

Classics is most naturally, and most correctly, associated with the comprehensive study of the ancient Greek and the ancient Roman worlds. What actually constituted (and constitutes) those worlds is not so easy to say in 2009 as it was in 1898, and it must be observed that there are many classicists whose research focuses most sharply on societies and times that are rather distant from Periclean Athens or Augustan Rome. And there are classicists who write about the manifold

influence of the classical past. It might prove useful in situating Classics in the overall mission of the university to refer to the following brief excerpt from the university’s General Bulletin:

The influence of the art, languages, literatures and cultures of the Greco-Roman world pervades every western and many non-western societies. Modern America is no exception. A meaningful appreciation of our classical past is vital both for understanding the impressive continuity of western institutions and values as well as for recognizing how recent innovations and transformations of received assumptions have rendered aspects of the classical world alien and sometimes exceptionable. The Classics are crucial both to the perpetuation and to the critique of the western liberal arts education.

The Department of Classics is committed to advancing our knowledge and critical appreciation of the ancient Mediterranean world through excellence in research and in teaching. The department seeks to create an atmosphere that fosters traditional scholarly approaches to the classical past at the same time as it welcomes and encourages innovative methods and perspectives. The department values the interdisciplinarity of the Classics and strives to achieve an integrated understanding of the ancient world that includes a full appreciation of history, literature, and material culture. Students are encouraged to view the Classics within the context of the traditional humanities as well as in terms of the contemporary criticism of received cultural canons.

Classicists sort themselves variously. Basic subdivisions will include (i) archaeologists, who are concerned with the recording and interpretation of the material remains of the past, (ii) historians, who study cultural, political and social developments, and (iii) philologists, whose scholarship includes literary criticism as well as investigations of grammar, meter, and textual criticism. Each of these basic categories can (unsurprisingly) be broken down further. But particular specializations can differ in unpredictable ways. For instance, a literary critic might concentrate exclusively on the Latin literature of a certain period or, on the other hand, might chose to work on a genre that occurs in both Greek and Latin (and in several distinct historical periods). It is not uncommon for classicists to do advanced work in more than one facet of the discipline, such as a combination of archaeology and history or of literary criticism and history. Consequently, classicists may appear in diverse guises from an outsider’s perspective, one moment an art historian, the next a field archaeologist, in another an interpreter of poetry, or again a political or social historian. This is owing to the discipline’s traditional commitment to the *Totalitätsidee*, the ideal thick description of the classical past and its significance that, however unattainable in practice, remains the goal of classical scholarship.

RESEARCH IN CLASSICS: GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Research in Classics, as in every discipline, values creativity, insight, imagination and accuracy. But there are certain aspects of classical scholarship that may diverge from the practices even of other arts subjects, and it will therefore be useful to set out the conventions that render a publication in Classics unexceptionable.

1. Publications must demonstrate complete familiarity with the ancient sources, by which is meant not merely all relevant Greek and Latin texts but also any relevant articles of material

evidence. These sources must be cited in such a way that their deployment can be verified by any expert reader.

2. Publications must demonstrate complete familiarity with the scholarly history of any controversy it addresses. A proper article will be informed by all relevant contributions, which will normally mean that the article either demonstrates or reflects an awareness of all work done since the late nineteenth century (though it is sometimes obligatory to deal with even earlier scholarship).

3. Much of the foundation of the discipline of classics was laid in Germany in the nineteenth century, and German has remained the language of classical scholarship in many European countries (this is significantly the case for classical scholarship in Scandinavia and in eastern Europe). Since the late nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, scholars working in England, France, Italy and the United States have made significant contributions to every aspect of the field of classics. Consequently, publications must demonstrate complete familiarity with relevant research published in the principal languages for classical scholarship, viz. English, French, German and Italian. (Important work is published in other languages as well, of course, but these four remain crucial.)

Such erudition is not mere display. Mastery of the ancient evidence is obviously crucial for accuracy. The classicist’s veneration of scholarly tradition, far from being simple antiquarianism, tends to preserve the insights of previous generations and to prevent the recycling of ideas when the work of their original authors has been forgotten. Furthermore, different nations approach the study of art, literature and history in significantly different ways: the expectation that classicists will be familiar with the histories of scholarly issues in different academic traditions means that they will remain aware of (and, under the best of circumstances, profit from) the varying methods used by classicists throughout the world.

The international and genuinely multicultural nature of classical scholarship is one of its enduring strengths. But the point of this commentary is to draw attention to one effect of the classicist’s approach to research that is relevant to the process of tenure and promotion: the very comprehensiveness of classical scholarship often makes it difficult for classicists, even those who are superb linguists, to publish articles and books at the same rate as other specialists in arts subjects whose research does not take them outside (or does not take them far outside) the confines of work done in English. This is hardly surprising, nor does this distinction reflect badly on disciplines of either sort (it can hardly be held against one that one’s discipline operates solely in English, nor if it does not). Nevertheless, it is a distinction that must be borne in mind.

Naturally enough, books are important to classical scholarship. But so are articles, and most of the very technical work in all facets of Classics, and especially of historical and literary studies, is done in articles. Classics, then, is a field in which both forms of publication matter significantly.

Articles come in many varieties, as in all disciplines, but some attention should be drawn to two types that remain important in Classics: the note and the learned review. Classicists write, read and value notes, such as textual notes or exegetical notes. Though small, they count, not least because scholars appreciate how labor intensive for the author the composition of a note is, while at the same time it unpretentiously and economically delivers valuable information to the reader. Learned reviews also matter: in Classics they are read avidly, largely because they, at the very least, augment or correct the book or books under review and because, not infrequently, the reviews become

contributions to scholarship in their own right. A perusal of the bibliographies and footnotes found in classical publications will reveal how often learned reviews are cited by scholars.

Archaeologists produce many types of publications. The book format may be used for a full and final report of the findings (both descriptive and interpretive) of an excavation or survey, as well as for synthetic, interpretive studies of material culture. Preliminary excavation reports, often required by sponsoring organizations and government agencies, and shorter studies may appear as articles or notes. Often these publications include visual documentation prepared by or supervised by the author of the book or article; such documentation is of considerable importance for the dissemination of knowledge and should be taken into account when such studies are evaluated.

The presentation of papers at academic conferences constitutes another medium in which the classicist may present research. There are various international conferences, which tend not to be organized by professional associations in the style of American academic assemblies. In the USA (and Canada), the most important regular meetings for classicists include the following: the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA), which is the national organization for all classical archaeologists in the USA and Canada; the American Philological Association (APA) [soon to be renamed the Society for Classical Studies], the organization for all historians and philologists (of every sort, though the majority will be literary critics) in the USA and Canada; the Classical Association of the Middle West and South (CAMWS), which, despite its cumbrous name, includes most of the USA and Canada and is the second largest classical organization of all; the Association of Ancient Historians, which is limited to ancient historians in the USA and Canada. Other regional organizations include: the Classical Association of the Atlantic States; the Classical Association of New England; the Classical Association of the Pacific States; the Rocky Mountain Classical Association. The most important sites for reading papers are the AIA and the APA, with CAMWS coming slightly behind these two. A peculiarity of the APA is that it accepts for its annual meeting no more than half the abstracts offered to it. As a result, presentations at the APA have come to be regarded, amongst historians and philologists, as a distinction. For archaeologists two of the most important forums for delivering papers outside of classics are the Society for American Archaeology and the European Association of Archaeologists. In addition to giving papers, archaeologists are often called upon to give full-length, illustrated lectures on their research. The major sponsor of such lectures around the US and Canada is the AIA.

Multiple authorship is not common in classics, and there is no standard method for listing the contributing authors. Generally, though, unless the names are listed in strict alphabetical order, the first person listed receives the majority of the credit.

RESEARCH IN CLASSICS: CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

Archaeology is both a discipline of study and a set of methodologies and techniques. Archaeology is concerned with the physical remains of the past. As such, archaeologists interpret data as well as collect new data. Unlike physical sciences that can replicate an experiment, archaeology literally destroys its contextual data in the process of excavation or removal of material and thus documentation is extremely important. The term Classical Archaeology is generally used for the work of archaeologists around the Mediterranean, especially the territories covered by the Greek and Roman civilizations and cultures. In terms of methods and techniques it is not different from other forms of archaeology. What does distinguish classical archaeology from other forms of archaeology, such as biblical archaeology or anthropological/ “New World” archaeology, is that it developed out

of classics, history and art history. It can thus have a different focus of interest from other forms of archaeology. Those classical archaeologists who deal with historical periods will make extensive use of textual and historical data in their interpretations. Those classical archaeologists who deal with prehistoric periods will make more extensive use of the physical and social sciences in their interpretations. Classical archaeologists can have interests that are closely allied with art history, with classics and history, with anthropology, or even with the physical sciences.

The major difference in research by archaeologists from that of other classicists is fieldwork. Antiquities laws of host countries generally dictate that all materials remain in the host country, and strict governmental oversight of archaeological research can severely affect the extent and duration of projects, and even the type of project. For instance, Americans are limited to three excavation permits (one of them the permanent American School project at Corinth) and three survey permits each year in Greece. Fieldwork can range from individual, single-year projects in a museum or on a site to large-scale, multi-year interdisciplinary efforts. Publication by an individual of research results from such a large-scale project often means cooperative publication within the overall publication plans of the project. The time needed to study and interpret the data collected can greatly exceed the length of time spent in the field.

Field projects undertaken by an individual often do not necessitate the securing of grants. Larger scale projects generally do necessitate the securing of grants that are obtained by the overall project director, and not necessarily by the individual researcher. For an individual scholar not to have secured a personal grant for his or her participation in a project is the usual practice. But that scholar's reputation will be a factor in the evaluation of the project's application.

RESEARCH IN CLASSICS: SPECIFICS

The Classics Department's statement of criteria and standards for tenure and promotion is found in the following section of this document.

RESEARCH IN CLASSICS: FURTHER SPECIFICS

Presses and Journals. It will be helpful to outsiders to possess some sense of which presses and which journals carry what status in the field of Classics (though it will be borne in mind that one does not tell a book or an article by its cover).

Presses: Generally speaking, all major university and private presses that carry a series in Classics will be reviewed in the most important journals and will attract the attention of the scholarly community. Certain presses, of course, emphasize certain aspects of the discipline. Johns Hopkins, for instance, concentrates on literary and cultural studies, whereas Routledge devotes most of its titles to history. There are also important monograph series produced as supplements to distinguished periodicals, like the Supplements to the Bulletin of the Institute for Classical Studies, the Hermes Einzelschriften, or the Mnemosyne supplements, and independent monograph series such as Aegaeum.

Leading presses in Classics include (but are not limited) to the following:

American School of Classical Studies at Athens
ARCA

Beck
 Blackwells
 Les Belles Lettres
 Brill
 Cambridge University
 Cornell University
 De Boccard
 Duckworth
 Gieben
 Harvard University
 Johns Hopkins University
 Oxford University
 Paul Åströms Förlag
 Princeton University
 Routledge
 Scholars Press
 Stanford University
 Steiner
 Thames and Hudson
 University of California
 University of Michigan
 University of North Carolina
 University of Wisconsin
 Von Zabern
 Yale University

Journals: There are many journals in Classics, some of them quite ancient. Herewith is a list of many of the top journals in Classics. This list, however, is *not* comprehensive.

American Journal of Archaeology (USA)
 American Journal of Philology (USA)
 Annual of the British School at Athens (UK)
 Archeologia classica (Italy)
 Athenaeum (Italy)
 Bulletin de correspondance hellénique (France)
 Classical Quarterly (UK)
 Classical Philology (USA)
 Les Études Classiques (Belgium)
 Greece & Rome (UK)
 Harvard Studies in Classical Philology (USA)
 Hermes (Germany)
 Hesperia (USA)
 Historia (Germany)
 Journal of Hellenic Studies (UK)
 Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology (UK)
 Journal of Roman Archaeology (USA)
 Journal of Roman Studies (UK)
 Klio (Germany)

Mélanges de l'École française de Rome, Antiquité (France)
Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts: Athenische Abteilung (Germany)
Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts: Istanbul Abteilung (Germany)
Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts: Römische Abteilung (Germany)
Mnemosyne (Holland)
Museum Helveticum (Switzerland)
Papers of the British School at Rome (UK)
La Parola del Passato (Italy)
Philologus (Germany)
Revue des Etudes Ancienne (France)
Revue des Etudes Latines (France)
Revue des Etudes Grecques (France)
Rheinisches Museum für Philologie (Germany)
Studi Etruschi (Italy)
Transactions of the American Philological Association (USA)
Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik (Germany)

Grants: There are few granting sources available to classicists. Consequently, it is a signal distinction for a classicist to win a grant. At the same time, it is by no means a stigma for a classicist not to win grants.