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Process

The committee read the self-study submitted by CANES in spring 2021; we then met on September 13, 2021, to discuss it and decide upon a plan for conducting the review. Given the major changes to the graduate curriculum for the Classics named option that the department had made since the previous review of the program undertaken in 2018, we decided to meet first with Professor Alex Dressler, the current Director of Graduate Studies, and we elected to follow the previous CANES graduate program external reviewers in meeting with the current department chair, Professor Jeremy Hutton, last. In between these two interviews we met with almost all of the Classics faculty as well as with the Academic Advisor/Graduate Program Coordinator Toni Landis. We also held two one-hour listening sessions with the graduate students pursuing the Classics named option; the first of these was attended by five students ranging from their first to their sixth year in the program, and the second was attended by four first-year students. Two first-year graduate students unable to make either listening session were invited to (and did) submit responses to a list of emailed questions. This means that we had contact in person or writing with all eleven of the graduate students currently pursuing the Classics named option. We also met with Graduate Administrator Toni Landis. We invited all graduate students and faculty to send us further thoughts and comments by email, and one faculty member did so. Professor Alex Dressler, in his current role as DGS, and Professor Grant Nelsestuen, in his role as last year’s Director of Graduate Admissions, sent us detailed and helpful follow-up emails with factual information we had requested during our meetings with each of them. Professor Jeremy Hutton also sent us an email responding to some informational queries that arose from our reading of the self-study. In addition to the self-study, we gathered information from the CANES website, particularly the portion devoted to the graduate program’s requirements. Finally, we met again for the second time as a committee on October 15 to discuss what we had learned and determine the process for writing up this review.

Meeting schedule

Monday, September 13, 4 pm: Review committee meeting
Wednesday, September 22, 10 am: Prof. Alex Dressler, DGS for Classics option
Thursday, September 23, 9:30 am: Prof. Laura McClure
Friday, September 24
   11:30 am: Prof. Grant Nelsestuen
   1:00 pm: Prof. Chontel Syfox
   3:00 pm: Graduate student listening session #1 (5 students)
Monday, October 4, 4 pm: Prof. James McKeown
Tuesday, October 5, 3 pm: Prof. William Brockliess
Friday, October 8, 10:30 am: Toni Landis, Academic Advisor/Graduate Coordinator
Friday, October 8, 11 am: Graduate student listening session #2 (4 students)
Wednesday, October 13, 9 am: Prof. Jeffrey Beneker
Friday, October 15
  9 am: Prof. Jeremy Hutton, Department Chair
  10:30 am: Review committee meeting

**Background and Context for this Review**

*Changes to the Graduate Programs in CANES*

The last review of the Classics and Ancient Near Eastern Studies (CANES) graduate programs took place early in the spring semester 2018. That review had been deferred from 2015-16 in response to the then recent merger of the Classics and Hebrew and Semitic Studies Departments, and it focused primarily on the integration, structure, and management of what became the two named graduate options under the CANES umbrella, “Classics” and “Hebrew Bible.” In 2018-19, however, and in the wake of the departures of two faculty members (Rosenmeyer and Mandell) whom CANES was not given permission to replace, the department, on GFEC’s recommendation, suspended its admissions to the Hebrew Bible PhD option; at the same time, two students in the Hebrew Bible MA program decided not to continue their studies, leaving only three students pursuing a PhD in Hebrew Bible. Given the staffing shortage, the student departures, and other challenges highlighted in the 2018 review of the merged programs, CANES petitioned GFEC first to discontinue its MA, and then, more recently, its PhD program in Hebrew Bible. The discontinuation of the MA program took place immediately, and that of the PhD program will be effective in Fall 2022, after the last three students pursuing a PhD in Hebrew Bible have graduated. This will leave the program with one named graduate option, that of “Classics,” which this committee was therefore charged to review separately from the waning option in Hebrew Bible.

*Shifts in the “Classics” Mission Statement and Curriculum*

At the same time as the changes noted above, and in response to the 2018 review, to changes in the field of Classics, to the academic job market in the humanities in general, and to that of the Classics job market in particular, CANES undertook a major revision of the curriculum for the graduate named option in Classics. This was a process that began shortly after the 2018 review and is detailed in full in the department’s self-study of April 2021; its result is only as of this fall truly in place for all students enrolled in the Classics named option (there is currently only one dissertator, whose early years in the department took place entirely under the old curriculum). The changes are reflected in the department’s revised mission statement, which highlights the fact that CANES—while still providing rigorous training in Greek and Latin language and literature and the history and cultures of the ancient world—seeks to emphasize “ways of thinking over bodies of knowledge” and to provide its students with “transferable skills” of use beyond the academy. This new approach, to quote again from the mission statement, is meant to help students develop a “more personal research trajectory” far earlier in their Classics training than was previously possible, while also supporting their pursuit of training in more practical and public-facing fields such as digital humanities, language pedagogy, and public humanities.
In practice, the main way the department has made (and is still making) this shift within its curriculum is by way of a thorough overhaul of its exam structure. In essence, and as can be seen in compressed form via a comparison of the two tables on pp. 30-31 of the self-study of April 2021, the department has substantially reduced the number of written exams students must pass before continuing on to the dissertation (from 9 to 4, not including an oral “prelim” designed to make up for any gaps in coverage before the dissertation is commenced). Moreover, these exams (two in the first two years, devoted to Greek and Latin language, called “generals,” and two in the second two years, devoted to Greek and Latin literature, called “specials”) are now specifically tied to coursework, whereas previously they were not. Students use the syllabi for the courses they designate towards exam preparation; the syllabi provide the basis for the reading lists for those exams and are supplemented by each student in consultation with the professor for each course. These lists are filed as students move through the program, so that they will only be examined on material with which they have developed familiarity and, in some cases (particularly in the case of the later “specials”) in-depth knowledge.

While the review committee devoted much of its time to understanding the ramifications of these major changes to the exams for students, faculty, and staff, we also spoke with all stakeholders regarding the department’s efforts to increase diversity in its graduate student population, to support its graduate students financially through fellowships and teaching opportunities, to communicate with and advise graduate students about their progress in the program as well as future career options, and (relatedly) to support as well as provide opportunities for the pursuit of so called “alt-ac” opportunities. We also inquired about the department’s plans for the future, particularly given that CANES will not be able to continue to have only a single named option under its larger umbrella. We address all these issues below under the rubrics of “Strengths,” “Weaknesses,” and “Advice and Recommendations,” with particular action items emphasized in the report’s conclusion.

1. **Strengths**

   **Collegiality and commitment.** The review committee was struck by the degree of collegiality regarding the major changes to the curriculum on the part of both faculty and students. Despite the fact that not yet everyone fully understands the new requirements or exactly how exams will be put together and assessed under the new model, everyone we spoke with seemed essentially on board with the changes and willing to work together through difficulties as they arose. The climate of the department, despite recent faculty departures and upcoming retirements, appears very good; faculty expressed a great deal of mutual respect for one another as well as care for their graduate students, while graduate students expressed admiration and respect for their professors and the department staff. The committee was especially impressed by the graduate student cohort, whose commitment to and passion for their studies was very much on display in our conversations and email exchanges.

   **Streamlined curriculum (revised exam structure).** The new exam structure is a definite improvement over the previous one. It reduces workload for faculty and graduate students alike while still meeting disciplinary expectations in the field. The linking of exams to graduate coursework, allowing for less anxiety-producing but still challenging exams and for the development of student interests, is an extremely positive change and one about which graduate students and faculty appear by and large to be very enthusiastic. This revision, it is important to
note, not only responds to recommendations made at the time of the 2018 review, but also puts the department on the cutting edge of Classics departments nationwide, the majority of which still follow a more traditional model of set reading lists and exams that bear little to no relation to coursework. It was clear in our discussions with the first-year graduate students that the new flexibility offered by the program was a considerable factor in their decision to enroll.

**Attentive to contemporary developments.** The shift in exam structure corresponds to the department’s broader attention to important shifts in the field of Classics itself, particularly in terms of new theoretical methods (such as ecocriticism, digital humanities, critical race theory, and more) and the growing attention to diversity in the ancient world. The department is also highly aware of decreasing opportunities in the academy for Classics PhDs and is working hard to find ways to help its students think about future employment options (even as, the review committee recognizes, graduate faculty in Classics cannot truly be made responsible for training their students in skills other than those usually acquired in a Classics degree program). Particularly positive in this regard is the possible forging of a greater connection with the School of Education and its new offering of a qualification in the secondary-school teaching of Latin as part of a graduate degree (something previously only available to undergraduates).

**Teaching opportunities for graduate students.** Graduate students receive a variety of teaching opportunities through the department—as teachers of record for Latin language classes and as teaching assistants for large and high-enrolling undergraduate lecture courses offered by CANES faculty, such as Mythology. There are also some opportunities for summer teaching as well as involvement (pre- and hopefully post-pandemic) in the summer Classics Camp.

**Active pursuit of diversity.** The department is highly engaged in seeking to increase diversity among its graduate population. This is a particular challenge (and so all the more important) in Classics, a field long dominated by white scholars, often from privileged backgrounds. The committee particularly notes and commends the department’s ongoing efforts to recruit students of diverse backgrounds, races, and ethnicities by way of personal outreach (using the McNair Scholars list, the list-serv devoted to Classics students of color, and more); other efforts, such as international recruitment, the fostering of relationships with Classics undergraduates at HBCUs, and encouraging diversity among the undergraduate population of Classics majors at UW-Madison itself, are also all things with which the department is positively engaged and that should continue. The committee also was intrigued by the idea of a “Bridge” program which would serve students not yet fully prepared linguistically to pursue a graduate degree in their first year but understands that such a program is only now being discussed and would depend on the provision of a funding structure for such students.

**Awareness of staffing needs.** The department is thinking ahead in a number of ways regarding its staffing both academic and administrative. These include the awareness that there will need to be a second named option to replace that of Hebrew Bible (if, that is, the named option of Classics is to continue as such), about which the department has started holding conversations. The idea of adding another administrative staff person to the department (raised in our conversation with the chair) seems a very good one to the committee given that the current graduate advisor is split between two departments.
2. Weaknesses

Overly concentrated understanding of the curricular shift. Even as we commend the CANES program for revising its curriculum and exam structure, our understanding is that the particularities of these changes largely have been developed and implemented by the current director of graduate studies, who is completing his term this year. Although our interviews suggested widespread support for this new structure among faculty and graduate students, we also learned of concerns that the changes may be too directly tied to the current director of graduate studies and may not be sustainable over the long term through leadership changes.

Lingering confusion about exam preparation and structure. While the exam structure and reading lists have been revised to connect more to students’ graduate coursework, there is still a lack of clarity among some graduate students and faculty about the supplementary readings for the first round of exams (the general exams), as well as how and by whom the exams will be created and assessed.

Lack of centralized information. As we assembled information from faculty and graduate students about the program—including curricular changes, funding issues, campus life questions, and more—we discerned the lack of a central source of information available to graduate students to address these issues. Relatedly, the department website needs regular updating as adjustments to the curriculum are made, something that adds to administrative workload. International students new to the department also expressed discontent with the difficulties they had encountered in understanding U.S. tax law and healthcare bureaucracy, though they made clear that they felt this to be more of a failing on the part of the university as a whole and did not hold the department responsible.

Potential need for further curricular revision. As we appreciate that the department is effectively leading graduate students through the new curriculum for the first time, we also recognize the experiences and expertise of the current staff may not be able to deliver everything that the new curriculum promises (e.g., the “research and professional development” seminar).

Staff specialization vs. the new curriculum. We find that a number of faculty, because of their research and teaching specializations, lack a clear role in the new graduate curriculum.

Unclear relationship between the PhD learning outcomes, the new curriculum, and assessment. We discerned a lack of a clear connection between the stated PhD learning outcomes and the new graduate curriculum. Further, we did not discover an assessment strategy to be in place to access the learning outcomes through the curriculum.

Administrative overload. The administrative responsibilities seem to be unclear and existing administrative resources strained.

Constrained graduate student teaching. Some faculty and graduate students expressed concerns that graduate students are not permitted to teach Greek to undergraduate students.
3. Advice and Recommendations

**Handbook.** We highly recommend that the department create a detailed handbook, revised regularly, in which the department clearly lays out all requirements and procedures for the graduate degree, perhaps with samples or examples to illustrate the process. The handbook would also be a good place to centralize other helpful information pertinent to graduate student life, such as issues specific to international students.

**Smooth transition.** Because many of the recent changes to the curriculum were spearheaded by the current DGS, Professor Alex Dressler, a smooth transition to the next DGS will be crucial to the success of the program. It is wonderful to see that the department has also anticipated this issue: Professor Brockliss is currently shadowing Professor Dressler and slowly taking some of the responsibilities this year.

**Continue to streamline the curriculum requirements to match staffing capability and communicate any and all changes clearly and promptly to the graduate students and faculty.**

**Anonymous survey of grad students.** Because the changes to the program are so new, it will be essential to regularly touch base with the students, especially those who are moving through the revised curriculum for the first time. Roundtable discussions might be helpful but may also prevent students from speaking honestly about challenges or problems they might be having. A regular, anonymous survey using Qualtrix or another method would be advisable, especially in the first few years of transition.

**Revisit mission statement.** While we appreciate how the revised mission statement is speaking to larger disciplinary trends in Classics, there also seems to be a mismatch in emphasis between the mission statement (which focuses on “ways of thinking”) and the curriculum (which focuses on “bodies of knowledge”), which is especially reflected in the exam structure. We recommend revisiting the mission statement to consider these areas of emphasis in the spirit of “both/and” rather than “either/or,” as they are now framed.

**Continue to pursue diversity efforts.** We recommend that the department continue the work they have been doing to increase the diversity of their graduate student population, and encourage them to continue discussions about a possible bridge program.

**Continue to discuss the place of faculty whose specializations are outside Classics.** As the department discusses its future and pursues a second named graduate option, we encourage them to think carefully about the place of faculty whose expertise is outside of Greek and Latin so that all faculty remain actively engaged in the graduate program.

**Develop methods of assessment for the new curriculum.** We encourage the department to develop and implement an iterative program of assessment (p. 9-10 of self-study), with direct and indirect measures, to measure the progress of the program over time. It might be especially useful to track graduate performance on the exams as one direct measure.

**Redesign the website.** The website for the graduate program was difficult to navigate, and confusing in places, and it doesn’t function as a resource for current graduate students. Because the website was built and maintained by an already overburdened staff member without web
expertise, we strongly recommend that the College provide professional support for the department’s website to make it more user-friendly.

Continue to discuss the possibility of grad students teaching introductory Greek as part of their training.

Continue conversations around making programmatic connections with Second Language training on campus. Many faculty and students spoke favorably about the prospects for program graduates in secondary education, especially with regard to Latin. We encourage the program to continue pursuing connections around campus to assist students who wish to pursue this path.

Conclusion

Despite its small size (it is one of the smallest, if not the smallest, Classics programs in the country), it is clear to the committee that CANES, in the words of one of its faculty, does indeed “punch above its weight.” The review committee found all stakeholders in the department to be thoughtful and purposeful in their discussions about and decisions around staffing changes, curricular shifts, and intellectual as well as practical aspirations for students in the graduate Classics named option. Given the major shifts in the curriculum to which everyone is still adjusting, there are a number of items to which we think CANES can and should attend by either the end of AY 2021-22 or by fall 2022.

- Given the changes to the graduate program as well as the comparatively large number of new PhD students, the CANES department should implement two tools for soliciting graduate student feedback and gauging this feedback by the end of the 2021-22 academic year: (1) an anonymous survey of all graduate students; (2) a listening session with all graduate students.
- The CANES department should create a graduate student handbook and make this handbook available online by fall 2022.
- The CANES department should streamline the website with the goal of making it more user-friendly for graduate students by fall 2022.
- The CANES department should prepare a specific plan of action for creating a bridge program for recruiting underserved minority students and/or another plan of action for recruiting underserved minority students to the CANES PhD program with the goal of implementing this program for the 2022-23 admissions cycle.
Self-Study for [CANES Dept.] – [Classics Grad Option]

Date submitted: April 1, 2021

Primary Contact: Jeremy Hutton (Chair)

Department(s)/Academic Unit(s): Department of Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies

School(s)/College(s): Letters & Sciences, Humanities Division

A. Response to previous program review recommendations

   Summarize recommendations from the previous program review and how they were acted upon.

   The most recent review of the CANES graduate program was conducted in 2018, subsequent to the merger of the former Hebrew and Semitic Studies Department and the Classics Departments. Three significant recommendations emerged from this review:

   (1) The GFEC recommends the department assess its advising strategy to ensure students feel confident asking questions of the right people.

   (2) The GFEC recommends the department engage in efforts to make information about alternative career options outside of academia available to students.

   (3) The department should outline its continuing strategy to mitigate both of these weaknesses (i.e., a 35% non-completion rate and a time-to-degree beyond those of our peers).

   HISTORICAL CONTEXTUALIZATION: The recommendations given to us by GFEC in spring, 2018, were aimed at both the Classics Grad Option and the Hebrew Bible Grad Option. However, at the beginning of the AY 2018–2019, CANES was informed that we did not have permission to hire to replace two professors who had left UW at the end of the previous academic year (Rosenmeyer and Mandell). In response to this decision, the GFEC invited CANES to suspend its admissions to the HB Grad option and to develop a teach-out plan for the few students remaining in the program. CANES voted to follow this route early in the 2018–2019 AY. Because this decision made it clear that the PhD program option in HB was flagging, this decision has had further deleterious effects in two ways: First, two students who were in the HB MA program option at the time decided not to continue on to the PhD program option (Harvey graduated with an MA degree; Kisman, who had matriculated only that year, left the program after one semester). The three others in the HB PhD program option (Brown, Olanrewaju, Pruett) have chosen to continue on, and are now in their fifth year. Previously, Profs. Troxel and
Hutton had worked to streamline the HB MA+PhD program option, so that it could be completed in five years. This goal had finally been achieved with the class completing their degrees in 2019 (Kumon and Atwood), but the disruptions and loss of morale following the suspension of the program, in combination with the adverse effects of the COVID-19 pandemic has now occasioned an increase in time-to-degree. We have recently petitioned GFEC to discontinue the HB MA program option (effective immediately, since no more students are in it) and the HB PhD program option (effective fall 2022). Therefore, in the following description, we are not including either of the HB degrees in our current figures; to the extent that the HB programs were responsible for many of the deficiencies cited by the Committee regarding the CANES graduate program as a whole, we trust that the Committee will understand these measures to respond in part to both recommendations (2) and (3), above.

**Changes to Advising Strategies:** The arrival of our current Undergraduate Advisor and Graduate Coordinator, Toni Landis, in 2016, has helped to broaden and clarify the channels through which graduate students can gain access to advising. Students currently have two important contacts: for more logistical questions regarding policies and academic offerings, they take up the issue with Landis. For the academic and professional side of things, their primary point of orientation is the DGS. Because the CANES department is small, relative to many other units on campus, the DGS and the Advisor are able to remain in close contact with one another and typically coordinate responses to students. Further, during the AY 2018–2019, we held two listening sessions with the Graduate Student populace; the faculty communicated directly with the graduate students and many good ideas were exchanged regarding the structure of the graduate curriculum, publishing and professionalization, and DEI issues. For further changes to the Advising Strategies, see §E. Advising and Student Support.

**Informing Students Regarding Alternative Career Options:** Our graduate program revisions (ongoing and in process) have been executed with an eye towards introducing and informing students regarding various non-academic career paths and tracks. Within the last three years, we have sponsored two CANES career days (fall 2018, spring 2019), in which alumni from the undergraduate and graduate programs have video-conferenced with our current crop of students to discuss “alt-ac” career paths in which they have continued to employ the tools with which our program equips them. The Undergraduate Advisor/Graduate Coordinator presented “Imagine PhD” to a group of matriculating graduate students in our grad student welcome event (fall 2018). See especially §D. Recruiting, Admissions, and Enrollment, for our discussion of “alt-ac” advising in the light of admissions consideration, and §H. Career Services and Post-Graduation Outcomes, for our approach to alternative career options.

**Strategies for Retention and Minimization of Time-to-Degree:** According to the data compiled at https://dataviz.wisc.edu, the internal UW-Madison Retention/Completion Rates show that by the end of year 10, 31% of matriculants have dropped out of their programs and 3% have still not completed their degrees. This is only slightly lower than
the AAUP averages of 30.8% and 2% respectively. Further, both UW and AAUP programs hit a 65% PhD completion rate only at year 8. If the completion rate of Classics graduate students hits 65% in year eight, then it would seem that we fall within the normal range of UW programs (see further below, §G). Moreover, we find the implication that students choosing to leave the graduate program after earning their MA degree is a mark against the program to be problematic. This is especially the case when those alumni then go on into careers that are alternative to academia (see the list below in §H), a career track that is justifiably viewed as increasingly important by the Graduate School (as borne out by the heft of questions regarding alt-ac training in this report’s template). Since our PhD admits necessarily enter first into an MA degree, and since many of our MA students (some of whom experience a change in career goals while earning that degree) find gainful employment in the alt-ac workforce using skills they have gained in our program, we would question the premise that completion of the PhD is the only possible metric of “success“.
B. **Overview of the Program**

*Describe the mission and goals of the program and how its structure (both of the program and of its governance) support them. Consider the following questions:*

The following is the thoroughly revised mission statement and overview of the graduate program (see Appendix 4 for the language at the time at which we were last assessed).

The Department of Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies at the University of Wisconsin in Madison was created as one of the university’s original academic units in 1850, when the Board of Regents established a Professorship of Ancient Languages and Literature. While remaining faithful to the linguistic, historical, and philological foundations of our field, students and faculty also conduct research in such varied areas as Gender Studies, Literary Theory, Translation Studies, and Classical Reception. We are a vibrant and supportive community of professors, graduate students, and undergraduates, committed to the study of the ancient Mediterranean and Near East, and to the training of new generations of teachers and scholars.

The Department of Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies offers an innovative curriculum designed to foster new research in Greco-Roman studies, including cross-disciplinary scholarship in Ancient Near Eastern Studies and in a variety of other disciplines, such as Anthropology, Art History, Environmental Studies, Linguistics, Gender and Women’s Studies, History, Philosophy, Political Science, and Visual Culture. Emphasizing ways of thinking over bodies of knowledge, our curriculum helps students develop transferable skills based on critical approaches to areas in which the department excels, including the study of gender and sexuality, translation theory, intellectual history, ecocriticism, the biblical tradition, early Christianity, epic, drama, and reception.

To meet the challenges of the changing market for PhDs in the twenty-first century, students develop a personal research trajectory based on course work in the ancient languages (Ancient Greek, Latin, and Biblical Hebrew), as well as training in practical applications, such as digital studies, language pedagogy, and public humanities. In contrast with many peer programs, the department allows students to supplement established methods and canonical authors and periods of Greco-Roman antiquity with currently “marginal” authors, experimental methods, and original approaches to scholarship. From the moment they enter the program, students work closely with faculty to design their own reading lists and provide significant input into their own assessment. By cultivating a fluid curriculum, the department builds upon students’ interests and capabilities, and helps them think beyond the dissertation. Our aim is to foster students who break the mold of the traditional classicist.

Outside of this constellation of values, faculty and graduate students participate in a wide range of professional networks, with affiliations in the Society for Classical Studies, the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, the American School of Classical
Studies in Athens, the Society of Biblical Literature, the American Schools of Oriental Research, and the Lambda and Women’s Classical Caucuses. In addition to a world-class research library, numerous teaching opportunities, and dedicated funding for student travel and graduate-led initiatives, the department provides regular workshops in career development, which regularly include speakers from a range of backgrounds and professional orientations, both inside and outside academia. Our graduates have found employment in traditional academic positions and in a variety of other professions, from university administration and government to public humanities and the private sector.

- **Provide current degree/major requirements as approved.**

In a combination of course work, exams, advising, individual assessment, and oral and written feedback. See Guide [here for MA](#) and [here for PhD](#). These are the results of the above-mentioned curricular development undertaken in consultation with the Associate Dean for Academic Planning Elaine Klein and the Graduate Guide Coordinator Emily Reynolds.

- **How does the mission of the program fit with the home department/unit, the school/college, and the mission of the university?**

As the above language and the far-reaching curriculum redesign demonstrate, the program is aiming to help students develops skills and perspectives that will bring the field forward, including a revised internal mission, reflected in the outward facing statements included above, to change the emphasis of study from bodies of knowledge to critical approaches. Emphasizing method more than matter, we hope to contribute directly to the Wisconsin Idea of “sifting and winnowing” in search of the truth, in the belief that “sifting and winnowing” are matters of method—that is, how our students approach the material to get to “the truth” identified in the Wisconsin Idea, rather than what the material itself is. In addition to training PhDs for traditional tenure track positions, we are also providing our PhDs with new skills to bring their enhanced methodological understanding of and critical approach to the Ancient Mediterranean to more diverse audiences through various forms of outreach, including fostering closer ties with high school programs statewide. Because of the many years of training required of PhDs in Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies, we may encourage students in those high school programs to start early—even before matriculation as undergraduates at the university—and thus ensure the preservation of classical antiquity for future generations of students and scholars.

- **What are the approved learning outcomes for each of the programs being reviewed (i.e. bachelor’s, master’s or doctoral degrees)?**

According to [The Guide](#), our MA learning outcomes are:
1. Articulates, critiques, and applies the philological and theoretical approaches established in the field of Classics or Hebrew Bible.

2. Identifies appropriate sources and assembles evidence relevant to questions and challenges in Classics or Hebrew Bible.

3. Demonstrates understanding of Classical or Hebrew Bible literature in a historical and social context.

4. Selects and utilizes the most appropriate methodologies and practices.

5. Evaluates and synthesizes information pertaining to questions and challenges.

6. Communicates complex ideas in a clear and understandable manner.

7. Recognizes and applies principles of ethical and professional conduct.

For our PhD, The Guide describes the historical importance of our constituent options and the PhD learning outcomes (when the Hebrew Bible PhD option has officially closed after summer 2022, we will remove references to that option.):

Soon after the founding of the University of Wisconsin in 1848, the department was created as one of the first academic units at the university. The Department of Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies (CANES) has enjoyed a long tradition of excellence in philological scholarship, literary criticism, archaeology, and ancient history. At the graduate level, the department offers the master of arts and doctor of philosophy in classical and ancient near eastern studies. Students may follow one of two courses of study, classical languages and literatures (Classics), or Hebrew bible.

The primary goal of the program is to familiarize students with the core linguistic, historical, and philological aspects of classical and ancient near eastern studies. Students also learn to conduct original research in such varied areas as gender studies, literary theory, translation studies, and classical reception under the guidance of established scholars in these areas.

In addition to specified coursework, students participate in directed readings with individual faculty members in their areas of specialization and gain valuable professional experience teaching in courses on the languages, literature, and culture of the ancient world. Additional work may be done in allied fields such as anthropology (archaeology), art history, linguistics, comparative literature, history, philosophy, and political science. Affiliated faculty in many of these fields regularly offer courses, supervise theses and dissertations, and participate in department activities.

A wide range of professional networks provides graduate students with enhanced opportunities for education and career development. In addition to faculty connections to scholars and institutions in their fields of study, the department has formal affiliations with the Society for Classical Studies, the Classical Association of the Middle West and
South, the American School of Classical Studies in Athens, the Society of Biblical Literature, and the American Schools of Oriental Research.

- **What is the program’s structure? For example, is it a single program or does it have informal tracks/concentrations, formal named options or certificates?**

In agreement with the Graduate School (as mediated by Elaine Klein over the fall 2020 and spring 2021 semesters), the Classics graduate option (for both MA and PhD) currently under review comprises the sole “daughter”-program of the CANES Graduate Program. (This is the result of the recent closure of the Hebrew Bible MA and PhD graduate options.) The Graduate School, in an agreement communicated to us by Elaine Klein, has accepted our rationale that our current graduate students will fare better in their field with a degree entitled “Classics”, and have kindly agreed to CANES’s request to allow us some time to develop over the next AY (2021–2022) a new graduate option utilizing former HB option faculty (Hutton) and our recent hire (Syfox) along with current Classics faculty. If we decide to propose a new option, it will be a “sister” to the current Classics option, both of which will fall under the current heading of the CANES graduate program.

The current Classics graduate option allows for two informal tracks to be taken within the program: one is a specialization in Latin language and literature, the other is a specialization in Greek language and literature. Nonetheless, because of field-level requirements in academia, it is essential that graduates demonstrate facility in both languages and their associated literatures. For more information regarding the flexible structures of the Classics MA and PhD options, see Appendix 2 (“Classics Exams and Assessment Handbook”), below.

- **Describe any substantial and structured collaborations with other programs, such as dual, double or joint degrees and benefits of these arrangements?**

We currently do not have any standing collaborations with other programs. However, we are currently exploring the possibility of creating a Bridge program, introducing students into the MA-PhD, which would allow us to extend our pool of recruitment candidates beyond those who have already demonstrated sufficient Latin and/or Greek language experience. One of the options we are exploring alongside this is to partner with the School of Education’s World Language Education MA program, which would then act as a feeder into secondary education systems. This partnership currently remains under discussion, and would be in compliance with the GFEC’s new policy (circulated March 22, 2021) regarding breadth requirements.

- **If the program is not the only program within the home unit, what are the other programs? If there are several programs in the same academic home, how are they related to one another and what impacts do they have on student learning?**
We continue to maintain a Hebrew Bible doctoral minor (see here). The requirements for this doctoral minor are 9 credits in Biblical Hebrew courses beyond the elementary level. With the closure of the Hebrew Bible grad option, however, we are at risk of losing our capabilities of delivering this doctoral minor for two reasons. First, the closure of the HB grad option has occasioned a shift of the pertinent instructional staff from the upper-level courses (Hutton, Syfox) into more general Classics courses that are not language-specific. Second, because we have historically relied on our graduate student teaching assistants to deliver not only Introductory but also Intermediate Biblical Hebrew language classes, we will no longer have the necessary instructional staff to deliver Intermediate Biblical Hebrew beginning in the AY 2021–2022. Without an infusion of support from the Graduate School or College to continue Biblical Hebrew, these changes are likely to result in the department’s curricular inability to deliver a Biblical Hebrew doctoral minor in the future.

- **How do the program’s governance model, program committees, and membership criteria lead to active faculty engagement? How does succession planning work for leadership?**

    The Department’s faculty remains intimately associated with and invested in the Classics MA and PhD grad option. The Department Chair assigns faculty leadership to the appropriate committees and positions (including the DGS). The Department Chair, in collaboration with the Curriculum Committee, also makes curricular assignments. This vests a single point person (the Chair) with the responsibility to rotate faculty through the typical graduate offerings and to ensure that students in the program are exposed to the vast majority of the faculty during the course of their study. (Typically, this occurs in consultation with the DGS, the Department Administrator, and the Graduate Coordinator.) Faculty are regularly encouraged to participate in departmental lectures and other events, in order to provide graduate students with a variety of experiences with faculty, including developing a wide network of formal and informal training. Students also frequently take courses with faculty affiliates in Religious Studies (Rosenblum), Art History (Cahill), History (Kleijwegt, Taylor), and Philosophy (Fletcher, Gottlieb).
C. Program Assessment and Evaluation

Summarize the assessment plan used to evaluate the extent to which students are meeting program learning outcomes and how the program is engaged in a coherent process of continuous curricular and program improvement.

- Provide annual assessment reports.

The same document (submitted Oct. 30, 2018) is contained in both folders linked by the template (“2017 ARC pdfs” and “2018 ARC pdfs”); it is included as Appendix 3.

The PhD students and MA students regularly perform exit surveys administered by the Graduate School at completion of both the MA and PhD. These are commonly withheld until a critical mass (>10) has been reached for purposes of anonymity. For example, currently, only two graduates are listed in https://tableau.wisc for PhD graduates. The system does not allow us to see data, instead giving the message “Insufficient data! Please adjust filters.” We do not administer in-house assessments for the same reason. Therefore, we frequently do not have sufficient recent data from these yearly assessment data to be able to respond in a timely manner and are forced to wait for each batch of exit responses.

- What has the program learned through assessment of learning outcomes? Provide key evidence.

In 2018, we directly assessed the MA learning outcome “Recognizes and applies principles of ethical and professional conduct.”

Assessment of this learning goal was conducted by the DGS, instructors in language courses and seminars, area advisers for language exams, the instructor of record or supervising instructor for TAs. We assessed four out of four students who at that time were working towards the MA. Students were assessed on the basis of course work, especially presentations; regular articulation of personal professional profile (with DGS and in a year-end dossier submitted to whole faculty with application to continue from MA to PhD); through regular classroom observation, with a report submitted to department and student evaluating ability to integrate research into teaching and present to students and peers.

- What changes have been made as a result of assessment?

Over the past two years, we have completely revised the graduate curriculum in order to increase breadth, including practical training and professional development, streamline time to degree, and, in intellectual/academic terms, expand the range of specializations that students may pursue through more individually designed self-study. We have included more frequent milestones for departmental assessment of the
students, including providing written feedback to the student through a dossier system that provides each student a yearly report on their progress including both quantitative and qualitative data. In terms of developments that the program has made as a result of communication and past assessment, included as Appendix 1 (“NGC proposal and outline”) is a rough draft of the original document used to discuss and approve changes to the curriculum at the department level. Because it is a rough draft that was used at the proposal stage, it does not reflect the final allocation of exams and curriculum, which can be found in abbreviated form on the department website and in the Guide or in the document entitled “Classics Exams and Assessment Handbook” as Appendix 2. The former document, (Appendix 1=“NGC proposal and outline”) will give a general idea of the condition before the most recent report and the condition after, including explanations for how we would address the problems raised in the most recent assessment and in our own internal interviews with current and recent graduate students.

Furthermore, in the 2018 Assessment report, we concluded:

it was resolved to proceed with greater supervision of MA dossiers and earlier advising with more mentors and written feedback: dept. is currently discussing means of implementing this through Qualtrix surveys of whole faculty, earlier advising on dossier preparation with GPC, and formal written feedback to students at end of first year.

In response to this concern, we have developed protocols for regular assessment of grad students (see below, Appendix 2: §G. “Assessment” and “Output”).

• **What are the emerging changes in the discipline? What is being done and can be done to move forward and seize emerging/future opportunities?**

The primary changes in the discipline to which our new curriculum responds are the following: the devastation of the market for traditional tenure-track teaching positions for humanities PhDs beginning with the financial crisis of 2008 and continuing through the economic crisis induced by the pandemic; a field-wide rethinking of the curriculum, including the ability of existing forms of preparation to prepare students for employment if there are fewer and fewer traditional tenure track positions for humanities PhDs; and finally, a critical turn within the discipline, questioning both the matter and the method of classical studies, especially in view of pressing issues pertaining to social justice, equity, diversity, and the extent to which existing approaches in the discipline do or do not address these issues.

With the curriculum reform of the last two years, outlined above, we are trying to address all the issues in one far-reaching overhaul: we are developing contacts with other programs across campus to help students use the existing breadth requirement of the PhD (“the doctoral minor”) to diversify their training by incorporating skills for other
forms of employment, such as museum studies, public humanities, digital humanities, and language pedagogy; we have instituted new courses on theory and methodology, as well as “critical issues” reading groups, to raise our students’ consciousness about problems in the field and what people are doing to address them, including more talks from a range of speakers more diverse in all respects (from place in career, career path, and degree of representativeness of minorities in the discipline); and we have revised our curriculum to allow more room for specialization in non-canonical subjects and methods, completely overhauling the fixed curriculum on which students were assessed in the past, to allow them to develop and be assessed on own curricula of their own design.

- **If relevant to the program, how do leaders within industry, business, government, or non-profit organizations become involved in offering advice and perspectives on the program and the curriculum?**

  See the previous point, re: “more talks from a range of speakers more diverse in all respects,” and add: we have increased the number of professional development workshops, including inviting alumni who have done “untraditional” things with humanities PhDs, experts in fellowship and grant applications, and greater mandatory use of campus resources provided by the grad school, such as the Versatile PhD.
D. Recruiting, Admissions, and Enrollment

Analyze current practices and trends to determine if enrollment levels are consistent with plans and program resources. Discuss relevant program data in the context of the following:

- Are admissions practices and enrollment levels consistent with plans, program resources, and career outcomes?

From its peak of 57 in 2010–2011, we’ve seen a slow decline in the number of applications to the mid-20s. Over the last three years, that number has held steady, with a slight uptick in the most recent year. To some degree, this uptick likely represents two factors (1) the fact that our department has continued to accept applicants, whereas some highly placed programs in the field have restricted applications in light of the COVID-19 crisis; and (2) more positively, the interest generated among applicants by our revised Mission Statement and the related documents, which deliberately seeks to develop students’ disciplinary breadth. Overall, however, this decline in applications reflects a larger trend found across the discipline of “Classics” and related fields. Various reasons underlie this decline, but the most impactful one is the decreasing number of traditional tenure-track jobs in the humanities since the 2008 recession (and potentially exacerbated by the financial fallout of COVID-19), which has the effect of deterring potential applicants across the board at all Ph.D.-granting institutions across the U.S. and the U.K.

During that time, we’ve continued to maintain our standards for admissions and generally sought to enroll somewhere between 2–5 new students each year, with a view to maintaining an overall program size of 12–15 students over the last three years. The precise number we admit is generally determined by the number of graduate students our program can support financially, as we have made it a practice over the last three years to admit students only with guaranteed funding: 5-year packages in the case of M.A./Ph.D. students and, more rarely, 2-year packages in the case of M.A.-only students. At the same time, we’ve steadily increased our efforts to respond to the decline in traditional tenure-track academic jobs by offering various professional and career training opportunities in non-traditional areas of potential employment (a.k.a. “alt-ac”) for our graduate students. Indeed, the recent revision of our graduate program in Classics offers students new options for pursuing the skills needed for some of these “alt-ac” opportunities as part of their formal Ph.D. credit and examination requirements at the same time as receiving the more traditional training required for tenure-track academic jobs. The result is a program that seeks to prepare students for both tenure-track academic jobs and pursuing employment in, e.g., publishing, educational administration, public humanities, and other non-academic professions.

- What effort has the department/academic unit or program made to enhance student diversity (traditionally underrepresented groups in field)? Have those diversity efforts been successful?
Over the last four years in particular, the department has increased its efforts to recruit students from historically underrepresented backgrounds. These efforts have mostly happened at the admissions level, with the Chair of the Admissions Committee and other faculty members engaging in personal outreach to potential applicants by using contact information gleaned from various resources, including the McNair Scholar Program and the National Name Exchange. At annual professional conferences, individual faculty members have made it a priority to attend and connect with minoritized scholars at the undergraduate and graduate levels. In AY 2020–2021, for example, the Chair of the Admissions Committee directly emailed ten such potential applicants, inviting them to apply, offering up a personalized information session, and providing them with department-purchased waivers for the application fee. Though this direct outreach did not result in any applications from these students, the Admissions Committee is planning to make this a regular component of recruitment, as the exchanges between the Admissions Chair and some of the applicants were quite positive and well-received.

In the case of historically underrepresented students who are admitted with the AOF fellowship, the department has sought to bolster their financial support by giving various forms of “top-up” funds with a view to increasing the financial support of these students. For example, in this most recent year, the AOF recipient is receiving a $3091 “top-up” scholarship in the two years in which the person holds fellowships and a $5500 scholarship in the three years in which the person holds TAships, bringing that person’s total stipend to $26000/year for five years. In addition, we are providing a $2500 research travel fund to be used some time after the student’s first year.

Finally, the Chair of CANES and a sub-committee of Faculty are currently in the exploratory stage of forming a “Bridge” program (having consulted recently with Dean Karpus regarding this possibility), which would target historically underrepresented students for enrollment and provide them with a funded program that would provide new resources for supporting them in their pursuit of graduate study in the field of Classics and other related fields. We intend to have an outline of our proposed plan by the end of the present AY (2020–2021), and to deliver it to the Dean of the Graduate School for further consideration sometime early in AY 2021–2022.

- If applicable, what do trends in application volume, admits, and enrolled students signal about program strength? For graduate programs, does the program directly admit students? If so, how does the program ensure student integration and success beyond the admitting advisor?

Though the volume of applicants is down from its historical peak in AY 2010–2011, the number has held steady over the last three years, with a slight uptick in this most recent year. As noted above, this uptick likely represents the fact that our department has continued to accept applicants, whereas some highly placed programs in the field have restricted applications in light of the COVID-19 crisis. Additionally, it is common for
applications to graduate programs to rise when the economy becomes sluggish (this seems to have to do with the insulating effect of graduate school).

In the cases of recruitment and enrollment, our biggest challenge has historically been the comparatively meager stipends we have been able to offer relative to competing institutions (this despite the lower cost of living in Madison compared to most of our peer institutions). In AY 2014–2015, the department implemented the use of various “top-up” funds to the stipends. The University’s 2019 increase in funding for TAships and fellowships in recent years has also helped substantially, and the department has continued to expand the use of “top-up” funding as well. In AY 2020–2021, the Faculty decided to allow for the potential use of summer revenues to further support the program’s recruitment and enrollment efforts.

The program admits students directly into an MA-degree program, with continuation into the PhD program contingent on the successful completion of the MA program (see Appendix 1, “Dossiers” for further details). In keeping with our department’s smaller size and more personalized advising system, the recipient is matched up with the Director of Graduate Studies (or another faculty member) for mentorship—in addition to being encouraged to participate in the University’s various graduate research communities.
E. Advising and Student Support

Discuss the process by which students get regular advising and accurate program information. Reflect upon the following:

Post-Baccalaureate:

• How are advisors assigned and matched to students? How many advisees does each faculty member have?

The DGS and Graduate Coordinator typically function as the leads for advising students. However, our department is small enough that students have regular, programmed interaction with nearly all of the department’s faculty over the course of their time in the program. As noted above, the Department Chair, in collaboration with the Curriculum Committee, makes curricular assignments, enabling the rotation of faculty through the programmed graduate offerings in Greek, Latin, and Classics methods courses and ensuring that students in the program have access to the majority of the faculty during the course of their study. Moreover, students and faculty are regularly encouraged to interact in the form of department lectures and brown-bags, including informal professionalization sessions (discussing paper abstracts, student papers, student CV’s, etc.).

• How often are program contacts and student handbooks updated and made available online? Is the handbook inclusive of program learning goals, program requirements as well as a program-level grievance procedure?

Program contacts are updated yearly, when personnel changes. (Because of the small size of the department, it is infrequent that the DGS of the Classics grad option would change, and our Graduate Coordinator remains constant). Information regarding the Overview of the program, Admissions, Funding, Requirements for completion, policies, professional development, learning outcomes, and people in the department is all available through the MA and PhD guides. The materials included below as Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 remain in development, but are distributed to students by the DGS as necessary.

• How are students transitioned between advisors when personnel changes?

Because of the small size of our program, the DGS is easily able to keep track of individual students. Further, because students normally work with multiple faculty members during the course of their studies, the decision with whom to work is most often left up to the students themselves. The ethos of the department is for all relevant faculty to be involved in the educational formation of students, so students have multiple points of contact for developing ideas, etc. The DGS and Graduate Coordinator comprise the primary points of contact for students regarding the technical aspects of degree completion.
• How often and in what manner is satisfactory progress monitored? Do students receive written annual feedback on their academic progress?

This was identified as one of the primary areas of growth in our 10-year program-wide self-study (completed in 2018). Since then, we have developed plans to implement a dossier-system, in which students regularly compile dossiers, including self-assessments based on a template form, including a “proposal for future course work and research, anonymized feedback from yearly Qualtrix student-survey of faculty, one term paper with relevant faculty feedback, and all other records”; the “MA Thesis (with faculty feedback and student response, if desired), application for MA degree and for continuation into PhD program”; “addition of first special topic exam (Greek or Latin), and all other records (e.g., modern language B exam, unofficial transcript of work toward PhD minor, possibly including work in modern language)”; and “plans for PhD (outline of topic, qualification, etc.)”. (See Appendix 1, section “Dossier” below).

• How is the impact of advising assessed?

The Graduate Coordinator is evaluated on a yearly basis by a supervisor (the Departmental Administrator) and the Chair. Student progress is discussed regularly throughout the year by the faculty in Closed Department meetings, with the DGS reporting on a biennial basis (beginning and end of year).
F. Program Community and Climate

Where applicable, evaluate exit survey and climate survey data. Describe the efforts taken to foster overall program diversity, a climate of respect and inclusion, and a sense of community by considering the following:

- Discuss efforts to welcome, orient, and retain new students. What is offered to connect students within the program, as well as with the greater campus community?

At the beginning of the fall semester, we typically run a graduate student orientation designed to integrate matriculating students with their continuing peers. Matriculating classes ideally consist of at least two students (occasionally with 5 or more matriculating) in order to provide incoming students with a peer. Moreover, we regularly participate at the beginning of the academic year in an informal Meet & Greet mingling students with faculty, in an attempt to both humanize the program and create an atmosphere of inclusion for incoming and returning students. At the level of the graduate program, we require that new TA’s attend the Graduate School’s semesterly new TA orientation, and our Latin Program supervisor (we have recently made arrangements to make her position permanent) regularly runs TA trainings and instructional support sessions. Departmental staff typically take the lead on walking students—physically—around Van Hise, including working with the students to set up their offices (Graduate Coordinator) and—metaphorically—through the paperwork required for HR registration.

Plentiful engagement opportunities on a more regular basis (departmental lectures, brown-bags, reading groups, etc.) facilitate more casual/informal interaction between faculty and students. Over the AY 2020–2021, the department and affiliated faculty have planned well over a dozen lectures by outside lecturers, as well as several reading-groups, informal feedback sessions, etc. Further, the small nature of our program—including the relatively small size of our graduate seminars—and the hands-on approach to scheduling language-and-literature seminars (described above) allows us to make a good-faith effort at introducing students to all faculty members over the course of study and providing a close-knit community within which to work. We hope thereby to provide all students an opportunity to meet and interact with the department faculty in both formal and informal settings, providing an inclusive and humane context for graduate education.

- What efforts are there to enhance faculty/staff representation of traditionally underrepresented groups in the field? How does the unit rate its ability to attract and retain a diverse faculty/staff?

In addition to the activities listed under the preceding question, we have recently had the chance to hire a new assistant professor, Chontel Syfox, through the Target of Opportunity (TOP) program, and we continue to work to diversify our faculty and staff
representation. We would happily accept further University resources that would allow us to increase the number of lines in our department and thus to accommodate more faculty of color and/or diversity of gender-identity and sexual orientation. Further, we maintain a Committee for Excellence in Diversity, which is staffed by the Graduate Coordinator, DGS, one grad representative, and an undergraduate representative. This committee’s action has led to several measures being taken to make our inclusivity more robust (including hanging signs on the 9th floor restrooms inviting students and staff to use the restroom corresponding to their identified gender).
G. Degree Completion and Time to Degree

Referencing relevant data and campus goals, describe efforts to help students make timely progress to degree. Include the following in your discussion:

- Use institutional data sources to examine and evaluate progress to degree metrics and comparison to peers.

The Time-to-Degree and retention figures at https://dataviz.wisc.edu/ for the CANES graduate program at least into 2018 represent the conflation of two different sets of information: the HB grad option that was migrated from the former Hebrew and Semitic Studies Department and the Classics grad option migrated from the former Classics Department. The two are separable in https://tableau.wisconsin.edu/, but we have discovered that the information there does not account for at least one recent HB PhD (Currier, 2020) and one recent MA (Harvey, 2020). Without reliable, labeled data to analyze, it is difficult to be confident in any of the datasets accessible in the portal. Nonetheless, if we limit ourselves to the data presented by the portal, we can make a few salient observations that demonstrate the results of our continue efforts to retain students and to shorten time-to-degree.

First, the department has made decreasing time-to-degree for our Ph.D. students a priority since AY 2015–2016. These efforts have been borne out in the reduction of our average time-to-degree in AY 2016–2017 (11.8 years) to just over half of that (6.5 years) in a mere three years (2017–2020). (This of course raises the issue of the accuracy of the former figure). Further actions taken toward this goal include the revision of the program’s plan for student assessment, which includes the reapportionment of exams and seminar requirements to make these assessments more integral to existing coursework (see Appendix 2).

Second, the retention rates over the last ten years suggest that our retention rate is more favorable than that of our competitors. Out of 32 total matriculants, only 10 (31%) have discontinued their programs whereas 9 have completed (28%) and 13 remain enrolled (40%). In comparison, over the same time period, AAUP Peer Programs have enrolled 225 total students, with 62 (28%) discontinuing their programs, 58 (26%) completing them, and 105 (47%) still enrolled. In other words, our completion rate is slightly better than that of our peers, and we have managed this while having no one enrolled past year six. In contrast, our peers still have 4% of students enrolled in year 10, 9% in year 9, almost 16% in year 8, and nearly 21% in year 7. If we are reading these data correctly, this puts our program well ahead of the curve in time-to-degree, with very little difference in retention rates (69% as opposed to our competitors’ 72%).

- What efforts have been made to improve progress to degree performance and completion rates?
Until the revision of the graduate program in AY 2019–2020, these efforts to reduce time-to-degree were accomplished primarily through the efforts of the Director of Graduate Study, who worked to advise students in a way that maximized the returns on their efforts. The newly revised Ph.D. program takes on this issue by deliberately, and thoughtfully, aligning historical “sticking-points” for our program (e.g., exams) with the coursework that a student must also complete. For example, instead of being asked to prepare for a “special topics” exam as an overload, a graduate student will now pursue their “special topics” exam by means of regular meetings and an individualized reading list with a faculty member at the same time as they take a credited course with that faculty member. The result is a program that allows for a greater degree of individualization; provides more and better guidance on the part of faculty; empowers students to finish their exams at the same time as they complete the requisite four years of coursework; and thus allows them to commence work on their dissertation at the start of their fifth year.

- **Do students from educationally underrepresented groups (racial/ethnic minority, low-income, first generation in college) succeed in the program at rates comparable to other students? How are equity gaps addressed?**

The overall low numbers of both graduate students in general and historically underrepresented students in particular in our program render statistical evaluation of the performance of the latter vis-à-vis other students difficult. With that said, as one index of our commitment to enrolling students from underrepresented and international groups, applicants from such groups have made up only 17% (8% and 9%, respectively) of applicants from 2016–2020, but 40% of matriculants (30% and 10%, respectively). The department currently has several international, minoritized, and AOF students who are making good progress in the program and/or completing their degrees.
H. Career Services and Post-Graduation Outcomes

Evaluate student career outcomes, exit survey, and alumni survey data, and reflect upon how these outcomes are consistent with program goals.

- What do students do after graduation? How does the program prepare them for careers or further academic training?

Because of our extremely small sample size, it is difficult to use the prescribed University resources to develop the response here. Instead, our data have been compiled largely by keeping track of our graduate alumni on an individual basis. Career outcomes are discussed under the question below, and we correlate career track with training received in the program there.

- What career resources are available to students?

The current Graduate Coordinator (Landis) is a certified career coach; we regularly make time for her to attend professional development sessions and workshops/trainings that enhance her ability to deliver high-quality career advice to both undergraduate and graduate students whose career goals lie outside of academia. In the academic realm frequently associated with graduate studies, the department has focused especially on trying to create more intentional alumni connections (by, e.g., bringing in alumni, such as Dr. Adrienne Hagen, who has recently given a lecture about her research).

In addition, the Grad School and SuccessWorks offer regular seminars for career placement; these events are included in the weekly departmental newsletter. The Center for the Humanities has also put together a series that is featured in the newsletters. Landis will be offering a career course for undergrads in the fall.

- What is the range of student career outcomes, and are these outcomes consistent with program goals? Does the program track the career progression of its graduates?

Alumni of the department’s MA and PhD graduate programs have typically moved into three significant career paths after graduation:

(1) The career path that most graduate students aspire to is academia (teaching and research). Our MA graduates frequently continue into the PhD grad option in Classics, although some have moved into other fields, where they are able to combine their passions for Classics with other fields (e.g., History [Johnson]; Computer Science [Harvey]). Our PhD graduates—from both the HB and Classics options—have found academic positions in several nationally- and internationally-recognized settings (e.g., Bonesho [UCLA], Geiger [Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary], Greene [Aberdeen U.], Hagen [Monmouth College], Hart [Nebraska–Lincoln], Hawley [Harding School of Theology], Kumon [researcher, The Organization for the New Japanese Bible Translation], Moorman [University of Toronto–Mississauga, and now
Providence College], Mattison [U. of Bochum], Smith [Johns Hopkins U.]). The bulk of our current training regimen is oriented towards the practical applications underlying teaching and performing and communicating research, meaning that our graduates are all well-trained for this career path. Students regularly serve as Teaching Assistants during their time in the CANES graduate program, and frequently earn the role of designing and delivering their own courses in consultation with the Latin Program Director (e.g., Introductory Latin). In addition, students are encouraged to present their research at professional conferences, and sometimes are invited to co-publish with faculty.

(2) Because of the prime placed on training our students to teach effectively, one of the most frequent alternative career paths to which our graduates gravitate is Secondary Education—in both teaching (Gregory, Vieron, Wylie) and management roles (Atwood).

(3) Because of their acquired familiarity with the University setting, including administrative procedures, networking, and working with students and academics, the third major career path that our alumni encounter is Student and Academic Support Services (Brannon, Harris, Currier, Morrow).

We track our alumni through continued communication with them post-graduation, both personally (faculty) and professionally (Graduate Coordinator).
I. **Overall Analysis of the Self-Study and the State of the Program**: outline key findings from the self-study, including primary program strengths and challenges, and priorities the program has identified for improvement.

As noted above, our Classics graduate options continue to adapt to a changing field. The market for traditional tenure-track teaching positions has been hit hard by the COVID-19 pandemic, and we have taken proactive steps to pivot towards a methods- and competencies-based mode of graduate education, instead of the corpus-based model that has historically infused Classical Studies. That said, we are excited about the new directions that our graduate program is taking.

We believe that our program strengths lie within the close-knit, inclusionary context that our program has been working on instituting over recent years. Our small size as a department allows us to provide a “boutique” experience, in which students are able to determine the contours of their graduate program and develop their methodological and theoretical interests in novel and unique ways. Our identified areas of improvement have been described throughout this self-study, and are elaborated in the Appendices. We hope to increase the number of graduate students from historically marginalized communities, and to provide additional avenues for success that would permit students from underrepresented minorities and from under-supported educational systems to lay claim to a supportive and rigorous graduate school experience.
Additional Considerations for Graduate Students

J. Funding

Discuss the program’s student funding data and mechanisms, along with any goals for providing funding guarantees. Include a discussion of funding issues, such as:

- How is the program ensuring PhD students have adequate funding and taking steps to provide a multi-year funding guarantee upon admission? Are there opportunities for graduate students to secure individual extramural support? What efforts are made to ensure PhD students have funding?

In recent years, the program has only admitted students for whom we can provide guaranteed funding packages: five-year packages in the case of M.A./Ph.D. students and two-year packages in the case of M.A. students. Since 2015–2016, the program began to offer “top-up” funds in the form of yearly scholarships in varying amounts. Over time, we have sought to increase the amounts of these funds in order to be more competitive against peer institutions. For example, in 2018–2019, we offered one candidate a five-year package, which consisted of one year of fellowship ($20,864) and four years of 33% TAships w/ $4000 yearly top-up scholarships (i.e. $14,819 per year). With the department’s shift to 50% TAships and the University’s increase in graduate stipends, that amount increased correspondingly, while the department has consciously sought to maintain and, when prudent, increase, the “top-up” funds, with a view towards increasing the program’s financial competitiveness vis-à-vis other peer graduate programs. In this most recent year, for example, we offered all admitted students five years of guaranteed funding by a mixture of fellowships and TAships, with yearly adjusted top-funds that brought the funding package to $26,000 per year in the case of every student. In addition, we have started to include a $2,500 research travel fund, which the student can use after their first year.

All of these packages are dependent on the student maintaining “good progress,” which is evaluated by the Faculty at the conclusion of the M.A. and involves the submission of the thesis, a dossier, and a statement of purpose. In addition, the Director of Graduate Studies makes an annual report to the Faculty about the graduate students’ progress and holds individual meetings with students each semester to map out their plans for that semester, the next year, and their overall graduate career.

Students are informed of, and encouraged to pursue, extramural funding opportunities, such as those that exist as part of accredited institutions like the American School at Athens.

- To what extent is the program making use of funding for diversity efforts?
As noted above, the program aggressively seeks to promote the diversity of its applicant pool and enrolled students by pursuing historically underrepresented prospective students—particularly through the AOF program but also through targeted efforts at outreach to students and various forms of participation in the main professional societies.

While the funding packages are guaranteed for five years, it is the normal practice to extend another year of TAships to dissertating students who are making good progress. In cases where circumstances warrant it, the department is pleased to extend that financial support for another semester or two.
K. Professional Development and Breadth

Discuss the professional development opportunities of graduates and consider the following:

- How does the program encourage students to participate in professional development opportunities that will enhance their skills and support their career goals?
- What resources and guidance are available for exploring academic and/or non-academic careers?
- How is the program using Individual Development Plans, which are recommended for all graduate students and required for those with NIH funding?

We are not currently requiring students to use IDPs, which are a model of advising that is primarily oriented around the sciences. Instead, we work with students through multiple advising channels every semester, through the DGS, GPC, and other faculty appointed to help students develop their own assessment plans, in addition to making provision to provide all students with regular written feedback in a variety of channels from course work to Qualtrics surveys of faculty for each student. At various points in the students’ graduate career, especially in the course of completion of the MA thesis and the drafting and assessment of the proposal for the doctoral thesis, students draft proposals for their future academic and intellectual trajectory with feedback from a committee of three to four members of the faculty, including a member from outside the department, who provide detailed feedback. At the MA-level, on receiving the MA, the faculty as a whole discusses the student’s progress and overall trajectory and communicates that information to the student in a meeting with the MA-thesis adviser; they then submit a dossier applying to continue into the PhD program, which comprises a self-assessment and list of goals for the next two years (the usu. time taken to move from the MA to the PhD)—a process repeated at both the outset and the completion of the dissertation.

- What opportunities and funding are available to attend and present at professional meetings?

As noted above (§J: Funding) we have started to include a $2500 research travel fund, which the student can use after their first year. This fund can be used for research or conference travel. In addition to the University-level resources, the department has several funds that graduate students may access for research and conference travel. We normally use a UW Trust account (Adams #2) to fund graduate student conference/research travel up to $750/year/student. We also offer the Kramer summer fellowship for research/conference travel using a UW Foundation account. We have four other “Adams” accounts that are also eligible for this kind of support. The department discretionary fund from the UW Foundation can also be used for this purpose.
• **To what degree does the program offer teaching experience and teaching-related professional development to graduate students?**

One of the distinct advantages of Classics PhDs trained at the university of Wisconsin are the extensive and diverse teaching opportunities that pursue throughout their time here, ranging from writing-intensive large lecture class, small language classes, and a rotation through teaching assistance in a number of middle level “culture” classes such as “Women and Gender in Greece and Rome”, “Sex and Power in Greece and Rome”, “Classical Mythology”, “The Romans” (=Roman Civilization), and “The Greeks” (=Greek Civilization). Students attend the orientation for pedagogy when they first arrive, and the department continually holds workshops on pedagogy including topics such as universal design for curricular delivery and enhanced accessibility for people with disabilities.

• **How does the typical graduate’s program ensure exposure to breadth training? Does the program require a doctoral minor for doctoral students or evaluate other breadth requirements?**

The program requires a doctoral minor. In the past, this was fulfilled by students who specialize in Latin also doing work in Ancient Greek, and vice versa. Now, as detailed in the point beginning “The primary changes in the discipline to which our new curriculum responds” in §C above, we are developing a network of connections with more practical programs, including library and information sciences, museum studies, and the emerging World Language Education program, which students may fulfill through the PhD minor. At the very least, students are required to learn additional modern languages through course work, and this replaces a past requirement to test out of language work through intra-departmental proficiency exams, replacing proficiency with fluency, and equipping students to participate in scholarly activity internationally.
Appendix 1: NGC proposal and outline

1. The problem

The current graduate curriculum in the Classics Program in the department of Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies dates back to time immemorial and has received modest, ad hoc revisions over the years, but has never been considered as a whole in terms of systematic learning outcomes, or the existing structure and resources of graduate education at the University of Wisconsin – Madison, the changing nature of the field, or the regular and widespread advising requirements of students facing increasingly complex markets, including assuring basic regular communication between students and faculty. The aim of these changes is to effect a variety of small changes to the distribution and arrangement of credits and other requirements to increase the flexibility with which students can meet the existing requirements, diversify the options for doing so, and incorporate more regular one-on-one and small-group advising that addresses each students’ particular need based on where they are in the program. At the same time, the new plan will replace some requirements with other, comparable requirements, which can be fulfilled through coursework in the department, or in other departments, and not, as before in the case of these requirements, by students working independently or by faculty directing them as overloads.

The defects of this curriculum are well known to the faculty of the department and include the following:

- **Divergent course of classes and examinations**: currently students take a wide range of examinations, informally (and inconsistently) grouped into two categories, preliminary and special examinations; while the course of study of the examinations is consistent and a little systematic, it works at cross purposes with course offerings, providing students few opportunities to take qualifying examinations that actually relate to course work (several examinations, e.g., the history prelim and the modern language exams, have no place in the course curriculum at all), while faculty are required to take constant overloads, advising, producing, and reviewing these exams

- **Uneven distribution of advising responsibilities and mentoring opportunities**: currently students choose their course of study exclusively with the director of graduate studies (DGS) who alone is responsible for their course choices, time to degree, and professional development in general; this deprives students of additional mentoring opportunities, disproportionately burdens one member of the faculty, and generally prevents diversification in student training and insufficient attention, especially to the qualitative aspects of the student’s experience (in the form of diverse, regular sources of written feedback, for instance)

- **Insufficient opportunities for professional development both in and beyond “traditional academic employment,”** in for instance “alt-ac” employment, or even in a more diverse range of academic training (over-specialization inconsistent even with the current “traditional academic” job market); students currently take class after class in Greek and Latin and only acquire other professional skills, to the extent that they do, from their teaching assignments (which are also not a formally integrated part of the curriculum), meetings with the DGS, and informal and irregular departmental events (“brown bags”)

- **Overly specific and unnecessarily inflexible requirements** for training in particular fields, rather than in general methods (e.g., “3 credits Classical Archeology or Classical Art History), with no direct correlation with existing course of examinations, presenting constant logistical problems to students and DGS, in addition to preventing innovative self-directed curricular design on the part of students and increasing workload for DGS and graduate program coordinator (GPC)

- **Organization in terms of outdated and ineffective MA and PhD options**: the current curriculum is structured around the two degrees, with the bulk of requirements distributed for the
latter (PhD, two years+dissertation, two more) even as other departments are phasing out the
former (MA, two years) and as experience with current students in our department suggests that
they require a better foundation (which would be provided in the years currently assigned for the
MA) and earlier mentoring and individual guidance

For schematic representation of these requirements with specific comments, see 3A below.

2. The solution

A) We propose to overhaul the existing curriculum, with a “new graduate curriculum” (hereafter
NGC), maintaining the essence of the current curriculum in the key areas of professional
development (primarily training in ancient languages and relevant scholarship) but also
improving the curriculum in view of current and recent developments in the field and in our
institution, while allowing future in the following ways:

- **Streamline time to degree** by integrating extensive course of examinations into existing course
  offerings, while proposing a modest addition of course work to the department to better balance
  graduate advising responsibilities and expose students to a wider range of mentoring (this
  includes, almost exclusively, the “pro-seminars” intended for general professional development
  indicated throughout the outline below)

- **Make better use of on campus resources**, from professional development opportunities
  provided by the Graduate School to other departments’ expertise (e.g., encourage students to
  pursue formal study of a modern language in lieu of self-directed study and department-produced
  examination)

- **Diversify student training**, incorporating opportunities for self-directed professionalization
  inside and outside of “traditional academic employment” (that is, in so called “alt-ac positions”),
  primarily by bulking up the Ph.D. minor and pursuing contacts with other programs on campus
  (e.g., education and computer science)

B) The learning outcomes for the redistribution of requirements guided by these principles are the
following:

- Critical thinking (ability to assess diversity of evidence and support original claims
  pertaining thereto)
- Advanced proficiency in ancient languages
- Mastery of particular branches of modern scholarship devoted to ancient languages and
  methods supporting their study, and familiarity with the same in general
- Diverse teaching and professional experience, including the ability to produce a flexible,
  dynamic dossier documenting experience and demonstrating a wide range of professional
  skills

For schematic representation of these requirements with explanation of terms and rationale, see 3B below.
3. Comparison of current and new (proposed) curricula

A) Current graduate curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>QUALIFICATIONS FOR MA (Years 1-2)</th>
<th>QUALIFICATIONS FOR PHD (Years 3-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MINIMUM COURSEWORK | • 9 credits Greek above the 300-level  
• 9 credits Latin above the 300-level  
• 6 additional credits in Greek and/or Latin above the 300-level  
• 9 additional credits in Greek, Latin, or other courses  
• 3 credits seminar | • 3 credits Classical Archeology or Classical Art History  
• 3 credits Greek Prose Composition  
• 3 credits Latin Prose Composition  
• 12 additional credits in Greek, Latin, and/or non-language courses in related fields must be approved by Director of Graduate Studies  
• 12 credits from 4 seminars  
  - Ancient History offered by History Department  
  - Greek  
  - Latin (3 credits)  
  - Greek and/or Latin and/or an approved seminar outside the department (students who did not complete a seminar for the M.A. (e.g. from another institution) must complete a fifth seminar  
• 3 credits CANES Advanced Seminar |
| GOALPOSTS | • One ancient language exam  
• One modern language exam | • One ancient language exam  
• One modern language exam  
• Ancient history exam  
• Greek literature prelim  
• Latin literature prelim  
• Greek special author  
• Latin special author |
| OUTPUT | • MA thesis  
• Application to continue to PhD program | • Documentation of work on exams outlined in above field of grid (e.g., argument and scholarship driven prose of 10-20 pp. re: ancient Greek author) |

Comments
- no obvious correlation between exams and course work
- no formal mentoring opportunities or opportunities for diversification of mentoring and training (all training and assessment falls to classics faculty)
- arbitrary specification of content (e.g., ancient history examination, course in Classical Art History or Archaeology – why not, e.g., philosophy or public humanities, etc.?)
- note also sheer quantity of differently defined credits accomplishing more or less the same thing: e.g., what is the practical difference between 9 credits Greek above the 300-level and 6 additional credits in Greek and/or Latin above the 300-level and 9 additional credits in Greek, Latin, or other courses?
B) NGC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>A-PRELIMS &amp; MASTER’S THESIS</th>
<th>B-PRELIMS &amp; PHD QUALIFICATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINIMUM COURSEWORK</td>
<td>24 credits in Greek and Latin 500-level courses or seminars, including 6 credits in courses with research papers</td>
<td>18 credits in Greek and Latin 500-level courses or seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 credits in PhD minor</td>
<td>6 credits in working research and professional development seminars**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 credits in working research and professional development seminars**</td>
<td>6 credits in (i.e. completion of) Ph.D minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOALPOSTS</td>
<td>Greek language/literature exam*†</td>
<td>Greek special topic exam*†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latin language/literature exam*†</td>
<td>Latin special topic exam*†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern language A exam or equivalent</td>
<td>Modern language B exam or equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUT</td>
<td>MA thesis (first draft for a publishable article)</td>
<td>One dossier assembled per year for faculty review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One dossier assembled per year for faculty review</td>
<td>- B1: progress report B, cp. A1 in MA field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A2: “Master’s dossier”=like A1, plus additional exams, application for MA degree, application for PhD program (optional), and Dossier A1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible PhD. minors: modern language (German, French, Italian), history, art history and archaeology, digital/media studies, pedagogy and instruction, philosophy

*All ancient language exams will be based on a combination of course work and supplementary reading, as described under Exams in D below
**For explanation of this most innovative addition to the curriculum, see D below
† In contrast with current system, students may only take one exam marked thus per semester

C) Rationale for NGC
- Credits distributed more evenly over all four years, with greater emphasis on specific language work in first two years and more free time for independent work in second two years
- Exam material and topics correlated with course offerings (see D below)
- De-specification of content of credits and exams throughout, with more opportunities for self-directed diversification of training, esp. through the PhD minor
- Elimination of redundancy: e.g., “credits taken for Greek” vs. “credits taken for Greek and/or Latin and/or other” (?)
- Double-streamlining of existing requirements: e.g., not proficiency THEN literature exam, with no correlation to course work, but proficiency AS literature exam, BASED ON course work (one exam in place of two)
- Likewise, not proficiency exam, THEN literature exam, THEN special author exam, but literature/language exam THEN special author/topic (two in place of three), also based on course work

D) Explanatory addenda to NGC
- Exams: combine sight- and prepared-translation including course reading (from “source classes”) and related selections from the reading list (“supplementary reading”), BASED ON COURSE WORK, with the following requirements:
  o Preparation: student is independently responsible for preparation of “supplementary materials”; students determine material, based on course work in “source classes” (regularly offered 500-level language classes) and a combination of “supplementary materials” (derived in consultation with the instructor of record for “source class,” and based on but not limited to the departmental reading lists, primary and secondary)
  o Preparation, cont’d: in contrast with the exams taken for A-Prelims (Language/Literature: Years 1-2), the “supplementary materials” for exams taken for B-Prelims (Greek and Latin Special Topics: Years 3-4) will also entail interpretation and discussion of scholarship
  o Execution: exams taken for A-Prelims (Language/Literature: Years 1-2) will comprise translation and commentary of prepared and sight-read in a three-hour, closed book written examination; exams taken for B-Prelims (Greek and Latin Special Topics) will comprise one weekend-long written examination, requiring translation, commentary, and scholarly discussion of Greek or Latin author or group of cognate authors (e.g., lyric poets, historical authors, Augustan poetry), and scholarship pertaining thereto;
  o Execution, cont’d: exams are offered during exam week in lieu of an examination for the source class; faculty member setting the exam will be instructor of record for source class in semester that the exam is being offered, in consultation with one member of the faculty with relevant specialization (“second reader”);
  o Recommendations: students should take no more than one exam per semester, starting with exams for which they are best prepared from undergraduate and recent graduate training (e.g., modern language taken prior to graduate school, or stronger ancient language)
  o Assessment: two readers will assess the exam, the instructor of record for the “source class” who sets the exam and the “second reader” (a member of the faculty with complementary specialization);
  o Assessment, cont’d: for all exams, the two members of the faculty will provide students with written feedback (form-based, qualitative, and/or corrections) and “exit interviews” (directions for further development), included in student file as part of next dossier, with any student responses
- Ph.D minor: may include Art History, French, German, Hebrew Bible, History, Italian, Philosophy, or other professional training, and can fulfil requirement for modern language exams A or B; this requirement may be fulfilled by self-constructed PhD minors (e.g., pedagogy, public humanities/scholarship, etc.)
- Thesis: first draft for a publishable article, advancing a new thesis and featuring a broad range of representative modern scholarship, including works in modern language A, based on
a term paper or an original paper with permission from student-selected MA adviser, DGS, and provisional MA thesis committee

- **Dossiers**
  - A1, progress report A: student-self assessment based on form, including proposal for future course work and research, anonymized feedback from yearly Qualtrex student-survey of faculty, one term paper with relevant faculty feedback, and all other records, e.g., modern language A exam and/or unofficial transcript detailing work in modern language, faculty feedback to any included examinations, student response to faculty feedback (optional)
  - A2, “Master’s Dossier”: like A1, with addition of Dossier A, MA Thesis (with faculty feedback and student response, if desired), application for MA degree and for continuation into PhD program (modelled on current counterpart)
  - B1, progress report B: like A1, with addition of first special topic exam (Greek or Latin), and all other records (e.g., modern language B exam, unofficial transcript of work toward PhD minor, possibly including work in modern language).
  - B2, “Doctoral Dossier”: like B1, with addition of plans for PhD (outline of topic, qualification, etc.)

*Once assembled, the dossiers will be submitted to the faculty for review at a year-end meeting, minutes from discussion of dossier will be recorded and included in the dossier, which will be returned to the student, placed on record in the department, and discussed in minimum 30 minute individual meeting between student and DGS, GPC, and Chair; topics including student progress, future research, possible Ph.D. minors, or other professional and/or funding possibilities (if student decides to withdraw on receiving MA or is denied permission to continue into Ph.D. program in case of A2: Master’s Dossier)*
Appendix 2: Classics Exams and Assessment Handbook

A. STARTING GRAD SCHOOL IN CLASSICS AND PLANNING A RATIONAL AND PRACTICAL COURSE OF STUDY

In terms of what you need to know about the program and how to prepare, a barebones outline of that information is published online, on the department website. The description of requirements and timelines offered in this document is far more extensive, detailing all relevant procedures for preparation, execution, timing of exams, and other output for both graduate students, faculty, and staff. For simpler reference, including requirements for credits, examinations, and timing, you should consult the brief outline of exams and the tabular representation of all requirements in Sections B and G, respectively.

The aim of our curriculum is to balance students’ development of individual initiative and creativity, in research and (optionally) other non-scholarly (professional) development; the requirements are organized in two year chunks, which coincide with the time taken by most students to obtain the master’s degree at the end of the second year of the program, and the rest of the prelims for dissertating by the end of the fourth year of the program, assuming a minimum course load of nine credits (usu.=three classes) per semester.

Although there are no concrete milestones in the first year of the program, there are nevertheless several requirements for the M.A. and the Ph.D. that can take a long time to do and that you can and should start working on, or at least start thinking about, as early as your first day in the program. These include:

1) The Modern Languages – German and French or Italian (or other approved substitutes): students are required to achieve scholarly reading proficiency in two modern languages by the time they finish their prelims and begin their dissertation. German and French or Italian are the traditional standards of classical scholarship, but ability to engage in scholarship and especially reception of Greco-Roman antiquity in another modern language is increasingly desirable. Students may substitute such a language with approval from the DGS for one of the two out of three traditionally studied languages, which they are required to learn. Whatever languages you choose to apply to your scholarship, if you have experience with a modern language that is relevant in some way to the study of Greco-Roman antiquity, you can take a proficiency exam when you arrive and “test out” of the requirement for that language. If you do not have experience with one of those languages or feel like you should do more work in them, then you should search in the course guide for “for graduate reading knowledge” courses or their equivalent and begin course work to develop those proficiencies; if such courses are not available, or you desire a more holistic familiarity with the language, you may meet the requirement by doing course work through the 300 level. If all things are equal, you should probably start with German, since it really is harder for most Anglo-American Classicists than the Romance languages, but if you already have experience in one of those, it might make sense to start taking classes in them first and get to German later. It is expected that students who lack proficiency in one of the three modern foreign languages will do course work in at least one, if not two, in the course of graduate study.
How much time in your graduate training you devote to the modern languages depends on what you want to use them for. Do you want to be able to proficiently check references, to engage critically with scholarship and even theory, or to do scholarship in those languages – that is, at least be able to attend conferences where people will present work in those languages, which you want to understand, or perhaps even give papers in a language other than English? As the complexity of your aims increases, you will need to do more coursework in the modern languages or look for equivalent immersion experiences, usu. scheduled over summer, on your own. If you find these, the department can usu. help with funding for them.

Classics requires reading proficiency for the purposes of using scholarship in at least two languages, and it is probably easiest to develop this proficiency in classes offered by the relevant departments (French and Italian=FRIT, or German, Nordic, and Scandinavian Studies=GNS), but if you choose to focus on one language intensively, for the value of working in that language in its own right and/or to satisfy the requirement for the doctoral minor (more below), you may want to take multiple courses in the modern language that is most important to you and independently pursue study in one of the others in order “test out” of the more time-consuming requirements for course work.

2) Two pairs of examinations in two ancient languages (four exams in total), based on course offerings, the graduate reading lists (primary and secondary), and individual research interests (for all information concerning the content, preparation, and execution of these exams, incl. timing and advising, see B-D below).

3) The Doctoral Minor: you are not REQUIRED to begin work on a doctoral minor, which you can find defined and briefly explained here, before you earn your M.A., but you SHOULD START thinking about it now, because course work required by the doctoral minor sometimes requires additional preparatory work1; you may also want to explore course offerings in different programs which can contribute to the self-designed “distributed” minor (“Option B” defined in the previous link).

There are two ways to think about the doctoral minor:

(a) an additional scholarly specialization that will contribute directly to your profile as a scholar, such Art History, Biblical Hebrew, Gender and Women’s Studies, History, Philosophy, Sanskrit, or one of the modern languages (even outside Classicists’ canonical three: French, German, Italian)

(b) an opportunity to diversify your training in fields that are SUBSTANTIvely DIFFERENT from the curriculum of CANES but that can support employment OUTSIDE traditional teaching in higher education, in related fields, incl. a certificate in Digital Studies, Education, Non-Profit Management, Public Humanities, Community Engaged Scholarship, the Latin – BSE (for teaching secondary schools), Museum Studies, Second Language Acquisition, etc.2

---

1 If, for instance, you want to complete a doctoral minor in one of the modern languages, because you have decided to make work in that language an integral part of your scholarship (see A1 above), you may need to do several semesters of intro- and intermediate-level coursework to be qualified/permitted to take the upper-level language classes that alone count toward the minor and if you wait till after receiving your M.A., you may not have enough time to do this.

2 Although it is called a “minor,” the same requirement can be fulfilled by a wider range of more diverse training in graduate program certificates by way of the “distributed” doctoral minor option described in the link above. The
4) **The Greek and Latin Literature Examination Preliminary to the Ph.D.** or “Lit. prelim.,” an oral examination taken after all other examinations, usually in the fourth year of the program, designed to redress any deficiencies and gaps in preparation that remain in the student’s education as determined by comparison of the student’s coursework and record of examinations with the graduate reading lists and each student’s intended research profile, in consultation with the DGS and other advising resources in the department (for all information concerning the content, preparation, and execution of these exams, incl. timing and advising, for the Lit. Prelim., see Section E below).

5) Various milestones for assessment, including a Master’s Thesis (if continuing into the Ph.D.), dissertation, and various dossiers documenting progress and collecting faculty feedback (for all of which, see Sections F and G, esp. “output” in G, below; forms for the dossiers and sample dossiers will be kept on record by the Graduate Program Coordinator).

**B. LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE EXAMINATIONS: A BROAD OUTLINE WITH KEY POINTS**

1. The following items (a-g) are intended as a broad overview of the requirements for examinations in ancient languages and literatures for the M.A. and Ph.D. options in Classical Studies. Between items a-g here and the table in Section G below, you should get a working sense of what you need to do and when, but when making specific plans for taking an exam and/or planning a course of exams in a given year, you should consult C-F below to ensure that you pursue the required channels of advising, exam content, and submission of records of progress at the right time.
   a. Students take **two pairs of exams in ancient languages**, corresponding to two ancient languages and comprising two “General Language/Literature” exams and two “Special Literature/Scholarship” exams, **based on a combination of course work and independently prepared supplementary materials** determined each semester in which the student is preparing for an exam in consultation with the Director of Graduate Study (DGS) and Instructor of Record (IOR) of a given class (as described in C1a-b and C3b, below).
   b. The first set of (closed book) exams, the **General Language/Literature Exams**, or “**Greek and Latin Generals**,” comprising translation and commentary (as detailed in D3 below), should be scheduled for completion in the examination

---

primary difference between a doctoral minor and a graduate certificate that satisfies the breadth requirement of the doctoral degree is that most doctoral minors require 9-12 credits of course work where graduate certificates range from 9 to as high as 42! Obviously, you can’t do 42 credits of course work in an unrelated program while pursuing an advanced degree in Classics, but you can draw on courses from those certificate programs to assemble the distributed (or self-designed) doctoral minor, defined and briefly explained here; there is also a broader group range of undergraduate certificate programs, with less demanding requirements, and you may want to consider these for ideas, provided you consult the DGS, GPC, and other advising resources, especially from the certificate granting program, before you undertake a doctoral minor based on undergraduate certificates.
period as soon as the student will complete nine credits (usu. = three courses) with a graduate attribute in the relevant language.  

c. The second set of (open book) exams, Special Literature/Scholarship Exams, or “Greek and Latin Specials,” comprising essays and commentary (as detailed in D4 below), should be scheduled for completion in the examination period of the semester in which the student has completed or is scheduled to complete nine credits (usu. = three courses) with a graduate attribute since taking the General exam in the same language.  

d. Two members of the faculty, appointed on the basis of their expertise in consultation with the student by the DGS, will set and evaluate each exam, to be administered in the exam period at the end of Fall and Spring Semesters by the Graduate Program Coordinator (GPC), either in person (for the Generals) or by email (for the Specials; see C2-4 below).  

e. Students must begin preparing for exams as soon as they enter the program; they do this by taking Greek and Latin classes with a graduate attribute and by reading additional material related to those classes (the “supplementary material” described in C1-2 below), based on departmental reading lists or approved substitutions, and determined in consultation with the Instructor of Record (IOR) for a given class, and the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) within the first three weeks of the semester in which they are taking a class that will furnish material for a future exam (see C2-4 below).  

f. Every semester in which they are enrolled and preparing for an exam, students must submit a record of all the material that they have read for a class, both the material assigned in the class and the supplementary material read for the class (as detailed in the italicized portion of C2 below).  

g. Once they have completed General and Special exams in both languages (four exams), students wishing to proceed to the dissertation phase of the Ph.D. must complete one final exam: the Greek and Latin Literature Examination Preliminary to the Ph.D. or “Lit. Prelim.” They must do this by their eighth semester (or fourth year) in the program.  


---

3 Usually at the end of the third semester, or the Fall semester of the second year, in the program; in other words, students should schedule the first General in Greek or Latin as soon as they will have taken enough graduate-level credits (9 or more) in the language, including additional material studied independently, although they may choose to delay one exam until after the other has been taken (see Appendix to this section, below).

4 If, in other words, you take your Greek General in the examination period of your third semester in the program (say, the Fall Semester of your second year), you should aim to take your Greek Special in your sixth semester in the program (say, in the Spring Semester of your third year) – that is, again, three semesters after taking the previous exam in the same language. You can and probably should take exams as soon as possible. In other words, exams that require three courses’ worth of work should be scheduled for completion by the end of the semester in which you are taking the third course that will count towards that exam.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>first year</th>
<th>second year</th>
<th>third year</th>
<th>fourth year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One 500-level course in both Greek and Latin&lt;sup&gt;º&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>One 500-level course in both Greek and Latin&lt;sup&gt;º&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>One 500-level course in both Greek and Latin&lt;sup&gt;º&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>One 500-level course in both Greek and Latin&lt;sup&gt;º&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exams</th>
<th>for Lat. Gen.</th>
<th>for Lat. Gen., &amp; Greek Gen.†</th>
<th>for Greek Gen. &amp; Latin Spec.</th>
<th>for Latin Spec. &amp; Greek Spec.</th>
<th>for Greek Spec., &amp; Lit. Prelim. (see E1b below)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of source &amp; supp. materials due to IOR, etc.</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; year dossier*</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; year dossier, incl. MA thesis if requesting to continue to Ph.D.*</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; year dossier*</th>
<th>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; year dossier, incl. outline for diss. topic and proposal of advisers*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<sup>º</sup> With a few exceptions (see D2 below), all General and Special examinations in the ancient languages require course work in the ancient languages, but not all courses in the ancient languages require taking General or Special examinations. Realistically, students should prepare to take at least one upper-level course in both Greek and Latin in ALL semesters in which they are enrolled: this will usually be satisfied by 500-level classes, but can also be satisfied by the less frequently offered 900-level classes, or graduate seminars. At any rate, taking two 500-level classes (or above) every semester is not technically required but is highly recommended. Given the close correlation of exams with courses, and the requirement to complete exams in a timely fashion, it will be very difficult to make timely progress if students choose not to take Greek and Latin in a given semester.

<sup>†</sup> This sample table of student progress assumes that the sample student received more training in Latin before joining the program and is thus better prepared for graduate-level work in Latin. As a result, the student may choose to delay preparation for the Greek examinations. On the other hand, students who seek to ensure timely progress may choose instead to begin preparation for the Greek General as soon as they enter the program, intending to take both Greek and Latin Generals in the same semester – that is (here), in the Fall Semester of the second year.

<sup>*</sup> For more information on the dossiers, see “output” in G, below.
C. PREPARATION OF ANCIENT LANGUAGE EXAMS: CONTENT

1. General criteria: ancient language exams taken to qualify for the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees will be based on the following:
   a. reading and research conducted in primary and secondary material in Greek and Latin classes including a graduate-level attribute, called “source classes” featuring “source material” throughout this document;
   b. related selections from the reading lists, relevant to course work in some way (by genre, period, author, topic, e.g.) as well as additional scholarship, to be determined by the student in consultation with the DGS and IOR for the courses that will furnish material for the exam, called “supplementary material” for “source classes” throughout this document;
   c. the student’s ability to provide credible evidence of preparation for at least nine credits (usu.=three courses) of course work, including supplementary work, in a given language, generally comprising a record of preparation, submitted each semester, or an acceptable substitute, outlined in C4 and D2 below).

2. Source material will be determined by the IOR in a given semester, based on curricular offerings and course learning outcomes. Students will determine the supplementary materials for each source class in consultation with the IOR and the DGS, along with a schedule of reading for the semester, on the basis of the following considerations:
   a. departmental reading lists or approved substitutes (see C4 below),
   b. personal academic interest,
   c. gaps in knowledge and preparation,
   d. current proficiency in ancient languages (for Generals), and/or
   e. current familiarity with scholarship (for Specials), and
   f. IOR expertise or willingness to advise/examine now and in the future.

   Documentation and accountability: For every semester in which a student is preparing for an exam, including the semester in which they intend to take the exam, they will email a list of the source and supplementary materials that they plan to read that semester to the IOR of the “source class”, cc’ing the DGS and GPC, no later than third week of classes. Over the course of the semester, students may modify their plans for supplementary readings to a limited extent; if they do this, they should email the IOR of the source class a revised version of the original list, including an explanation for the revisions, as a supplement of the original in their file, cc’ing the DGS and GPC, at least two weeks before the end of the semester.

   For each semester in which students are preparing for the Specials, in addition to writing an email detailing any changes to the IOR, DGS, and GPC, they must also email a list of questions or based on the semester’s reading, research, and discussion with the IOR or other adviser. These “question banks” will be used by the faculty designing the Special in the relevant semester.

3. Advising for the language exams is a key factor in both preparing for and taking the exams.
   a. For the Generals, beyond the measures of communication and accountability outlined in the italicized portion of C2 above, additional instruction or advising about the supplementary
materials by the IOR during the semester in which the student is preparing the material in conjunction with taking a source class is at the discretion of the IOR. Students intending to take a General in a given semester should contact the IOR, DGS, and GPC to confirm their intention two weeks before the time in which they intend to take the exam (the exam period of the semester in question) in order to give the IOR time to design the exam in consultation with other faculty (see D5 below) or raise concerns about the insufficiency of material resulting from any modifications in the supplementary reading (see the final sentence of the italicized portion of C2 above).

b. For the Specials, the student should contact the IOR or other adviser for the source class every semester in which they are preparing for the Special, including the semester in which they intend to take the Special, and schedule at least 3 meetings with the IOR for that semester, determining a curriculum of supplementary readings, including scholarship, and keeping a running record of their research with the DGS and GPC, as indicated in the italicized portion of C2 above. In most cases, the student and IOR or other adviser will meet for a minimum of 30 minutes per meeting to discuss the following (listed by topic from the earlier to the later meetings):

i. past work relevant to the next exam,
ii. expectations of work for the semester,
iii. progress over the course of the semester,
iv. relevant literature and scholarship in general,
v. a bank of questions to be used in the Special for which the student is preparing, and
vi. in the semester in which the student intends to take the exam, the format and content for the Special, including topics for essay questions, based on work undertaken in this semester and the previous semesters (see (e) above).

Exceptions to these policies, including the schedule of meetings and the requirement that the advisor for the Special be the IOR of a closely related source class in the same semester can be granted by the DGS, in consultation with the relevant faculty, on a limited case-by-case basis.5

5 If, for example, the student is taking the seminar in theory and methodology (Classics 900) in the semester in which they intend to take the exam, or another course in a related discipline (e.g., Art History, History, Philosophy) or if the bulk of their Special will focus on work from a class taken in a previous semester, it might make sense for the student to work with the IOR of one of those classes, rather than the IOR for the source class in the semester in which the student is taking the exam. At any rate, one of the two members of the faculty who will be responsible for writing and evaluating the exam should be a member of CANES familiar with the exam protocol. Other reasons for exception to the advising requirements may relate to staffing and personnel: if, for example, a student intends their Special to focus on work from a source class taken in a previous semester and/or if the IOR is unable to take on additional advising responsibilities that semester, is on leave, etc.
4. **Exception to requirements for source and supplementary material:** Students can work with the DGS to remove one class’ worth of source and/or supplementary materials from inclusion in each exam, provided the exam still draws on nine credits (usu. = three classes) of relevant course work, or its equivalent, including the semester in which the exam is taken. Students may also substitute items from the department reading list of primary sources which usually furnishes supplementary material with other material, provided they find a member of the faculty with sufficient expertise in the desired area who is willing and able to consult with them about the supplementary material proposed for substitution. Reasons for appeal to remove material from examination and/or substitute other material include new directions in scholarly focus or particular challenges in the semester furnishing the material in question; such requests will be evaluated by the DGS and other faculty involved in preparing the exam on a case by case basis.

D. **EXECUTION OF EXAMS: FORMAT AND TIMELINE**

1. **The source and supplementary materials** outlined above will be used as the basis for most examinations in both the M.A. and Ph.D. programs. In all cases, except for follow-up attempts after failure to pass an exam (see D6 below), all exams must draw on at least 9 credits of new coursework (usu.=three classes) in courses with a graduate attribute since the student has entered the program or taken the last exam in the same language, including the semester in which the student is taking the exam. After consultation with the DGS, students must submit a request for approval to take the exam to the DGS and the IOR of the relevant source class no later than the third week of the semester in which they intend to take the exam, and the DGS must respond in writing within one week, cc’ing any member of the faculty who may be involved in writing or evaluating the exam, so that they may, together with the student, begin preparation for the exam (see esp. C3b above).

2. **Exception to requirements for timeline:** In cases of exceptional preparation prior to enrollment in the program or multiple enrollments in relevant language courses with a graduate attribute in a single semester, students may request to take one of the “Generals” or Specials either in their second semester in the program (usu. at the end of their first year in the program) or within only two semesters of taking the last corresponding exam in the same language; in cases in which the source and supplementary material for the General will come from work completed prior to enrollment in the program (as an undergraduate or in a different M.A. program, for example), the student must submit a list of the equivalent of a semester’s worth of material in one language – that is, the equivalent of source and supplementary materials for one three-credit class) on which to be examined. Request for early examination will be evaluated by the DGS and the two members of the faculty who will be involved in writing and evaluating the examination in

---

6 If a student takes one class of three credits in Greek or Latin courses with a graduate attribute every semester, then they will usu. not take their first exam in a given language, the General Language/Literature Exam, until their third semester (usu. Fall Semester of their second year); if they continue to take one three-credit course in the same language each semester, then they will not usu. take the Special Literature/Scholarship Exam in the same language until their sixth semester, or the Spring Semester of their third year.
question, and two of the three members of the faculty must agree to the student’s request. Students must submit the request in the third week of the semester by email to the GPC, DGS, and the two members of the faculty who will be involved in writing and evaluating the examination. Faculty must respond within one week of the request.

3. **General Greek and Latin Language/Literature Exams:** Usu. in the first and second years of the program, starting in their second or third semester, as determined by the student in consultation with the DGS and GPC, students may begin taking the **General Greek or Latin Language/Literature Exams.** The purpose of these exams is to assess student competency in **READING PROFICIENCY** and **LITERARY HISTORY,** using source and supplementary materials as the primary basis for assessment in a three-hour closed book examination, conducted in the department, administered by the GPC, comprising the following:
   a. 30% translation of source and supplementary materials studied by the student since beginning preparation for the exam and supplementary prepared in conjunction with source classes,
   b. 30% linguistic and stylistic commentary on the same material,
   c. 20% short answers relating to the literary historical dimensions of the source and supplementary materials, and
   d. 20% sight translation of otherwise relevant material (for criteria for relevance, see n. Error! Bookmark not defined. above).

   **Criteria for passing:** students who complete 70% of the exam to the satisfaction of the examiners pass the exam; students who complete 90% of the exam to the satisfaction of the examiners pass with distinction; instances of tying will be referred to the DGS; if the DGS is one of the examiners, the DGS will seek an additional qualified reader.

4. **Special Greek and Latin Literature/Scholarship Exams:** In contrast with the exams taken for “General” Greek and Latin Language/Literature exams, the **Special Greek and Latin Language/Scholarship** exams will usu. be taken in years 3-4 of the program, after qualifying for and receiving the M.A. degree. Each exam will comprise an open-book 72-hour (three day) exam, comprising the following:
   a. 40% commentary on select passages of source and supplementary material, and
   b. 60% essays (2-3 in number) on issues in interpretation in the same material.

   The Special Greek and Latin Language/Scholarship exams will be written and evaluated in the same way as the General Greek and Latin Language/Literature exams, with copies sent to the DGS and GPC and included in the student’s dossiers (see “output” in G below), as will any instances of failure in which the exam must be re-taken in a subsequent semester.

   **Criteria for passing:** students who complete 70% of the exam to the satisfaction of the examiners pass the exam; students who complete 90% of the exam to the satisfaction of the examiners pass with distinction; instances of tying will be referred to the DGS.

5. **Writing and administering of the exams by Faculty and Staff:** In the exam period of any semester, independent of any examinations or assignments required in that semester, the GPC will administer the exams in person (for the General Exams) or by email (for the Special Exams). In consultation with the DGS, on the basis of the student’s record of
preparation of source and supplementary materials kept on file by the GPC, a faculty member whose expertise includes the material on the examination (the primary examiner, usu. the IOR of the most recent source class) will write the exam, and a faculty member with related expertise (the secondary examiner, usu. the IOR for a previous course furnishing material for the upcoming exam) will, along with the faculty member who writes the examination, evaluate the exam and award it a grade of Pass/Fail, based on the criteria for passing explained in the italicized text of C3 above. A copy of the exam with a record of the grade that it has received will then be sent to the DGS and GPC and included in the student’s dossiers (see below).

6. In cases of failure: In the event that the students fails (see the italicized text of D3 and 4 above), they can re-take each exam, General and Special, two times for a total of three times, and each subsequent offering of the exam will feature a combination of source and supplementary material from the previous exam(s), but also any source and supplementary material studied subsequently, proportionate to the amount of course work that the student has completed since failing the previous exam. These subsequent attempts will be written and evaluated by the primary examiner of the previous exam, or their nearest equivalent (usu. the secondary examiner) in terms of expertise. For all material on which a student is being re-examined, the presentation of the material – for instance, the selection of passages for translation or formulation of questions for expository response – should be no more than 50% the same as the presentation in previous (failed) exam. If a student does not pass an exam after three attempts, their case will be referred to the whole faculty for discussion and recommendations for next steps, ranging from recommendations for remediation to possible termination of funding on the grounds of unsatisfactory progress, in the earliest faculty meeting following the third and final attempt. The results of this meeting will be communicated to the student in writing within three days of the faculty meeting and in person (or the equivalent) in a meeting with the DGS and the Chair of the Department within one week of the faculty meeting. The student may choose not to meet with these representatives of the faculty, or to postpone the meeting, but the faculty must make every reasonable effort to meet with students who request to do so within this time frame.

E. THE GREEK AND LATIN LITERATURE PRELIMINARY EXAM, OR “LIT. PRELIM.”: PREPARATION AND EXECUTION

1. Preparation:
   a. The purpose of the Greek and Latin Literature Exam Preliminary to the Ph.D., or “Lit. Prelim.,” is to fill gaps in the student’s knowledge of Greek and Latin literature and scholarship relevant to that literature before the student begins the final specialization constituted by the doctoral dissertation, after they have successfully completed the Generals and Specials in Greek and Latin Language, Literature, and Scholarship. The student can determine “gaps in knowledge” in three ways: (a) with reference to the departmental reading lists, (b) on the basis of their own scholarly interests and developing expertise, and (c) in terms of questions of theory and methodology.
b. In consultation with the DGS, the student will choose two members of the faculty of the University who represent diverse research backgrounds (e.g., Greek and Latin, poetry and prose, literature and history, etc.) and meet with these members of the faculty no later than two weeks before the end of the semester preceding the semester in which they intend to take the Lit. Prelim. The point of these meetings is to use the student’s cumulative records of previous study and examination to assess gaps in their knowledge and devise a reading list of primary and secondary material which will furnish material on which the student will be examined in the examination period of the following semester. On establishing the aforementioned lists, the student will email them to the two examiners, cc’ing the DGS, and the GPC, and the lists will be added to the student’s file.

2. Execution:
   a. Over the course of the semester in which the student intends to take the Lit. Prelim., they will meet with the examiners at least three times, in meetings of at least 30 minutes, to discuss the following: (i) expectations of work for the semester, (ii) progress over the course of the semester, incl. academic discussion of relevant literature and scholarship, and (iii) a bank of questions to be used as the basis of the Lit. Prelim.
   
   b. Assuming the student makes satisfactory progress in preparation over the course of the semester in which they intend to take the Lit. Prelim., they will inform the DGS and GPC of their intention to take the Lit. Prelim. in an email cc’d to the two the examiners at least two weeks before the examination period in which they intend to take the Lit. Prelim. in order to give the members of the faculty time to design the exam and/or raise questions about the insufficiency of material resulting from any modifications in preparation.
   
   c. Once a time for the exam has been scheduled by the GPC in consultation with all participants, the student will participate in an oral examination of 1 hour, administered by the two examiners on the basis of the question bank discussed over the course of the semester, in the presence of the DGS. The student will receive a grade of pass/fail (see 3 below), incl. qualitative written feedback from the two examiners which will be emailed to the student and cc’d to the DGS and GPC within one week of taking the exam, to be included in the student’s file and all subsequent dossiers (see G below).

3. In cases of failure: The student will pass the exam if they can answer 70% of the questions of both examiners to the examiners’ satisfaction as discussed by the examiners and DGS at the end of the exam, without the presence of the student, where any instances of “tying” will be referred to the DGS for resolution. In the event that the student fails, they can re-take the exam any time in the following semester on the basis of the same question bank, administered by the original examiners, in the presence of the DGS and one additional member of the faculty, all of whom will together determine whether the student has passed or failed in consultation at the end of the exam. Whether the student passes or fails, they will receive qualitative written feedback from the three members of the faculty in an email cc’d to the DGS and GPC, within one week of taking the exam. In the event that they pass, the record of passing and written feedback will be included in
the student’s file. In the event that they fail, the record will be included in their file and their case will be referred to the whole faculty for discussion and recommendations for next steps, ranging from recommendations for remediation to possible termination of funding on the grounds of unsatisfactory progress, in the earliest faculty meeting following the second attempt.

F. SCHOLARLY WORK FOR THE M.A. AND PH.D.: THESES AND DISSERTATIONS

1. The Master’s Thesis is a requirement for students seeking to continue into the Ph.D. program and an option for students seeking a terminal M.A. The process for completing the master’s thesis is the following:
   a. students should form a provisional thesis committee, comprising a thesis advisor (committee chair) and two other faculty members from CANES or affiliates no later than the first week of the semester in the year in which they intend to defend their thesis;
   b. students should **meet with the committee** by the end of the first month in the semester in which they plan to graduate after submitting a prospectus of 1-2 pages for discussion by the committee, in a meeting scheduled by the thesis advisor and the GPC.
   c. to qualify for the M.A. and proceed to the Ph.D., students will submit the **first draft of a publishable article paper of 20-30 double-spaced pages**, written under the supervision following the stylistic guidelines specified by the thesis adviser, in the semester in which they plan on submitting their application to continue into the Ph.D. program (which is usu. the fourth semester in the program);
   d. after completing the M.A. thesis, students will participate in an **oral examination and defense of the thesis**, set by the thesis advisor and scheduled the GPC. The completed thesis should be delivered to all three committee members at least two weeks in advance of this oral defense.

2. The Doctoral Dissertation: Candidates for the doctorate program should form a provisional dissertation committee the semester before they intend to complete their last preliminary exam and reach dissertator status. This committee should consist of a Dissertation Advisor and at least two additional faculty advisors. The procedure for the preparation and completion of the doctoral dissertation is the following:
   a. During the first semester of dissertator status, candidates will schedule a dissertation proposal defense to discuss the proposal’s viability. Under the guidance of their Dissertation Advisor, candidates will provide all committee members with a detailed abstract of the proposed dissertation, including a synopsis of each chapter and a timeline for scheduled completion. After the provisional committee has approved the proposal, the candidate may begin writing in consultation with their committee.
   b. The final composition of the dissertation committee requires four members in total (one of whom should be from outside the department).
Once the dissertation has been completed and approved by the Dissertation Advisor, the candidate will distribute the final document to all committee members at least two weeks before the anticipated defense date. If the committee supports the dissertation, the Advisor will set a date for the oral defense in conjunction with the department administrator.

c. Additional guidelines set by the Graduate School for dissertation completion can be found at their website.

G. TABLE OF CREDITS, EXAMS, AND OTHER OUTPUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>REQUIREMENTS FOR M.A. (Years 1-2)</th>
<th>REQUIREMENTS FOR PH.D. (Years 3-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MINIMUM COURSEWORK | 33 credits (usu. 11 classes) must be completed in a combination of coursework including the following  
• 27 credits (usu. 9 classes) in classes including graduate-level coursework attribute (searchable here)  
• 6 credits (usu. 2 classes) in graduate seminars, including 3 credits (usu. 1 class) in pro-seminar (Classics 900 or equivalent)  
• 9 credits (usu. 3 courses) in courses with research papers (these credits usu. overlap with the 27 credits in Greek and Latin classes and/or 6 credits in graduate seminars indicated above)  
• Recommended: 6 credits in Ph.D. minor (e.g., Art History, German, French, or Italian, Digital Studies, Second Language Acquisition, Museum studies, etc.) | In addition to the credits required for the MA, 36 credits must be completed in a combination of coursework including the following:  
• 21 credits (usu. 7 classes) in classes including graduate-level coursework attribute (searchable here)  
• 3 credits (usu. 1 class) in pro-seminar (Classics 900 or equivalent)  
• 9 credits (usu. 3 classes) in courses with research papers (these credits usu. overlap with the 21 credits in Greek and Latin classes, incl. graduate seminars, indicated above)  
• Completion of Ph.D. minor: see previous |
| ASSESSMENT | • 1 “general” Greek Language/Literature Exam*  
• 1 “general” Latin Language/Literature Exam*  
• 1 modern language exam or equivalent course work in German, French, or Italian | • 1 “special” Ancient Greek Literature/Scholarship Exam**  
• 1 “special” Latin Language/Scholarship Exam**  
• 1 Greek and Latin Literature Prelim Exam†  
• 1 modern language exam or equivalent coursework in German, French, or Italian (excluding language assessed for M.A.) |
H. Faculty guidance for writing General and Special Exams in Greek and Latin

1. Purpose/design – Generals
The purpose of these exams is to assess student competency in READING PROFICIENCY and LITERARY HISTORY, using source and supplementary materials as the primary basis for assessment. Before preparing exam, the examiner should contact the DGS and GPC for a record of the student’s source and supplementary materials and send it to the student for any necessary emendation or clarification. The two examiners may individually or jointly prepare the exam for a three-hour closed book format, conducted in the department, administered by the GPC, comprising the following:

   a. 30% translation of source and supplementary materials studied by the student since beginning preparation for the exam and supplementary prepared in conjunction with source classes=two out of four passages of approx. 50-75 words

   b. 30% linguistic and stylistic commentary on previous and new material=two of the passages from Part A above and one out of two passages provided for this section

   c. 20% short answers relating to the literary historical dimensions of the source and supplementary materials=three out of five questions answered in 2-3 sentences

   d. 20% sight translation of otherwise unseen material, drawn from the department reading lists and related to the material on the exam primarily by identity of author, but also including genre and period=one of two passages of approx. 50-60 words

Criteria for passing: students who complete 70% of the exam to the satisfaction of the examiners pass the exam; students who complete 90% of the exam to the satisfaction of the examiners pass with distinction; instances of tying will be referred to the DGS; if the DGS is one of the examiners, the DGS will seek an additional qualified reader
2. **Purpose/design – Specials**
The purpose of these exams is to assess the student’s grasp of primary and secondary scholarship relevant to a selection of authors from the department reading list, including approved substitutes, as outlined in C2-3 above, where the requirements for the selection of sources and advising by faculty are also stated. Before preparing the exam, one examiner should contact the DGS and GPC to obtain a record of students’ reading in literature and scholarship for the three semesters or equivalent in which the student was preparing the exam, as well as “question banks” prepared in each of the semesters in which the student received faculty advising for the process, which may include a question bank prepared during the semester in which the student will be taking the exam. The student will be provided with the exam no later than the final week of classes in a given semester and will be permitted three days (or 72 hours) to complete it. The two examiners may individually or jointly prepare the exam for a three-hour closed book format, conducted in the department, administered by the GPC, comprising:

a. 40% commentary on select passages of source and supplementary material=three out of five passages between 200-300 words each, and
b. 60% essays (2-3 in number) on issues in interpretation in the same material=two essays of XXXX words or three essays of XXXX words.

**Criteria for passing:** students who complete 70% of the exam to the satisfaction of the examiners pass the exam; students who complete 90% of the exam to the satisfaction of the examiners pass with distinction; instances of tying will be referred to the DGS.

3. **Faculty guidance for executing General Greek and Latin Language/Literature Exams**
See D5 above.
Appendix 3: Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies M.A., Annual Assessment
### Section 1

1. **Please provide your name.**
   - Alex Dressler

2. **Please provide your administrative unit.**
   - CANES

3. **Please provide your contact information (email address).**
   - adressler@wisc.edu

4. **If you are not an Academic Unit Chair (or Director of Graduate Studies) – that is, you have been designated by the Chair or DGS – please provide which Academic Unit Chair or DGS has designated you.**

5. **Please pick an academic year.**
   - [AY 2017-2018](#)

6. **MA 190L&S 11**
   - Recognizes and applied principles of ethical and professional conduct.

### Section 2

1. **What type of assessment was conducted?**
   - Direct Assessment

2. **How many students were assessed? Please enter a whole number.**
   - 4

3. **Please provide a brief description of how the assessment was conducted. Include: who was involved in the administration of the assessment activity, who was assessed (description of the students), and what was assessed (student work or survey analysis).**
   - Assessment of this learning goal is conducted by DGS, instructors in language courses and seminars, area advisers for language exams, instructor of record or supervising instructor for TAs. Students comprised 4/4 students working towards MA. Students are assessed on the basis of course work, esp. presentations, regular articulation of personal professional profile (with DGS and in year-end dossier submitted to whole faculty with application to continue from MA to PhD, regular class room observation with report submitted to department and student, evaluating ability to integrate research into teaching and present to students and peers.

4. **Optional: Include any instruments/rubrics/scoring guides.**
   - Drop file or click to add attachment

5. **What percentage of students assessed met the criteria for this outcome? Please enter a number expressed as percent.**
   - 100

6. **Briefly, describe the results of this assessment project. Include: how the results were compiled and analyzed (faculty/staff involved in the process), how the results were disseminated to faculty/other stakeholders, what discussions occurred, what was seen in the data.**
   - See above (3) where add regular evaluation of student progress, recorded and presented by DGS to whole faculty, in Spring of each academic year.

7. **Based on the results, are there any recommendations to improve students' achievement of the learning outcomes? If so, include an expected timeline for action.**
   - Most were successful in this exercise; in the instance where they were not (one student), it was resolved to proceed with greater supervision of MA dossiers and earlier advising with more mentors and written feedback: dept. is currently discussing means of implementing this through Qualtrex surveys of whole faculty, earlier advising on dossier preparation with GPC, and formal written feedback to students at end of first year.

8. **If you would like to upload additional documentation, you may do so here. This is not required. Typical upload documents include assessment reports the program provides to their discipline-specific accrediting agency or professional organization.**
   - Drop file or click to add attachment
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What type of assessment was conducted?
Direct Assessment

Indirect Assessment

How many students were assessed? Please enter a whole number.

4

Please provide a brief description of how the assessment was conducted. Include: who was involved in the administration of the assessment activity, who was assessed (description of the students), and what was assessed (student work or survey analysis).

Assessment of this learning goal is conducted by DGS, instructors in language courses and seminars, area advisers for language exams, instructor of record or supervising instructor for TAs. Students comprised 4/4 students working towards MA. Students are assessed on the basis of course work, esp. presentations, regular articulation of personal professional profile (with DGS and in year-end dossier submitted to whole faculty with application to continue from MA to PhD, regular class room observation with report submitted to department and student, evaluating ability to integrate research into teaching and present to students and peers.

Optional: Include any instruments/rubrics/scoring guides.
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What percentage of students assessed met the criteria for this outcome? Please enter a number expressed as percent.

100

Briefly, describe the results of this assessment project. Include: how the results were compiled and analyzed (faculty/staff involved in the process), how the results were disseminated to faculty/other stakeholders, what discussions occurred, what was seen in the data.

See above (3) where add regular evaluation of student progress, recorded and presented by DGS to whole faculty, in Spring of each academic year.

Based on the results, are there any recommendations to improve students’ achievement of the learning outcomes? If so, include an expected timeline for action.

Most were successful in this exercise; in the instance where they were not (one student), it was resolved to proceed with greater supervision of MA dossiers and earlier advising with more mentors and written feedback: dept. is currently discussing means of implementing this through Qualtrex surveys of whole faculty, earlier advising on dossier preparation with GPC, and formal written feedback to students at end of first year.

If you would like to upload additional documentation, you may do so here. This is not required. Typical upload documents include assessment reports the program provides to their discipline-specific accrediting agency or professional organization.
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Please provide your name.
Alex Dressler

Please provide your administrative unit.
CANES

Please provide your contact information (email address).
adressler@wisc.edu

Section 2
What type of assessment was conducted?
Direct Assessment
Indirect Assessment

How many students were assessed? Please enter a whole number.
4

Please provide a brief description of how the assessment was conducted. Include: who was involved in the administration of the assessment activity, who was assessed (description of the students), and what was assessed (student work or survey analysis).
Assessment of this learning goal is conducted by DGS, instructors in language courses and seminars, area advisers for language exams, instructor of record or supervising instructor for TAs. Students comprised 4/4 students working towards MA. Students are assessed on the basis of course work, especially presentations, regular articulation of personal professional profile (with DGS and in year-end dossier submitted to whole faculty with application to continue from MA to PhD, regular classroom observation with report submitted to department and student, evaluating ability to integrate research into teaching and present to students and peers.

Optional: Include any instruments/rubrics/scoring guides.

What percentage of students assessed met the criteria for this outcome? Please enter a number expressed as percent.
100

Briefly, describe the results of this assessment project. Include: how the results were compiled and analyzed (faculty/staff involved in the process), how the results were disseminated to faculty/other stakeholders, what discussions occurred, what was seen in the data.
See above (3) where add regular evaluation of student progress, recorded and presented by DGS to whole faculty, in Spring of each academic year.

Based on the results, are there any recommendations to improve students' achievement of the learning outcomes? If so, include an expected timeline for action.
Most were successful in this exercise; in the instance where they were not (one student), it was resolved to proceed with greater supervision of MA dossiers and earlier advising with more mentors and written feedback: dept. is currently discussing means of implementing this through Qualtrex surveys of whole faculty, earlier advising on dossier preparation with GPC, and formal written feedback to students at end of first year.

If you would like to upload additional documentation, you may do so here. This is not required. Typical upload documents include assessment reports the program provides to their discipline-specific accrediting agency or professional organization.
Appendix 4: GFEC Program Review 2018
24 September 2018

William Aylward, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Department of Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies
College of Letters & Science
University of Wisconsin–Madison
Sent Electronically

Dear Professor Aylward,

When the College of Letters & Science assembled a review committee to conduct the ten-year program review of the MA/PhD in Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies with Named Options “Classics” and “Hebrew Bible” and Doctoral Minors Classics, Greek, Hebrew Bible and Latin, Associate Professor Christa Olson was asked to serve as the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) representative. Professor Olson led a discussion of the review at the GFEC meeting on September 14, 2018. In this letter, I summarize the committee’s discussion.

The GFEC learned of the strengths of this program, which include faculty commitment to plans for integration and coordination in the new department and its graduate programs along with robust scholarly training for students in their respective fields.

In addition to these strengths, the GFEC discussed some of the challenges facing the program:

- Advising: The review committee noted a need for more consistent early mentorship and clearer information about program requirements when students first arrive in the program. The GFEC recommends the department assess its advising strategy to ensure students feel confident asking questions of the right people.

- Professional Development: As the job market, particularly in Classics, continues to contract, the department will need to take concrete steps to support students across a range of career goals. The GFEC recommends the department engage in efforts to make information about alternative career options outside of academia available to students.

- Degree Completion: The data indicate that 35% of enrolled Ph.D. students do not complete the degree. Additionally, for those that do finish the Ph.D. the time to degree is prolonged beyond that of our AAU peers. While this may be a phenomenon of the past,
the department should outline its continuing strategy to mitigate both of these weaknesses.

The GFEC commends the program on its strengths and thanks you for your commitment to graduate education. We look forward to the program’s response by December 10, 2018.

Sincerely,

William J. Karpus
Dean of the Graduate School
Professor of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine

Cc: Karl Scholz, College of Letters & Science
    Susan Zaeske, College of Letters & Science
    Elaine Klein, College of Letters & Science
    Alex Dressler, Department of Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies
    Jeremy Hutton, Department of Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies
    Toni Landis, Department of Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies
    Jocelyn Milner, Office of the Provost
    Sarah Kuba, Office of the Provost
    Parmesh Ramanathan, Graduate School
    Joshua Morrill, Graduate School
    Emily Reynolds, Graduate School