

Committee of Six Minutes of Thursday, July 27, 2006

A summer meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 10:30 A.M. on Thursday, July 27, 2006. Present were Professors S. George, O’Hara, Parker, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Hilborn participated by speakerphone. Professor Schneider, who was out of the country, was unable to attend.

President Marx began the meeting by thanking the members for convening during the summer, a period during which the Committee typically does not meet. The President requested the meeting to discuss issues surrounding the gift that was made by the Argosy Foundation to the College and announced on July 19. This donation will provide support for public service initiatives at Amherst, including expanded internships, which will be coordinated through the establishment of a new administrative Center for Community Engagement (CCE). Over the next seven years, partnerships will be built regionally and nationally with community organizations that are active in areas such as poverty, public education, human rights, the environment, and public health, depending on student and faculty interest.

The President informed the members that he felt that it was important at this time to provide some background to the new members of the Committee and to the Faculty as a whole (via these minutes) about how the donation unfolded, and to seek the Committee’s advice about decisions related to this initiative that should not wait until fall. He told the Committee that, during the last academic year—in discussions that were based upon the deliberations of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP), the Special Committee on the Amherst Education (SCAE) Working Group on Experiential Education, and the Faculty’s review of the Report of the CAP—he and Argosy Foundation founder John E. Abele ’59 explored ways of building on and expanding the foundation’s past support of public service initiatives at the College that were consistent with the then-emerging planning process.

President Marx noted that, through a partnership established with the Argosy Foundation in 2002, approximately thirty-five Amherst students a year now receive Abele Public Service Internships. These internships provide full support for Amherst students to work during the summer for nonprofit organizations that are dedicated to providing direct assistance to low-income and underserved populations. At present and in their entirety, Fellowships for Action enable roughly one hundred Amherst students each year to engage in public service internships, although the Abele internships are the only internships that guarantee full stipends and a travel allowance.

The President said that it was somewhat awkward to be having discussions with a donor while the Faculty was still considering the CAP’s recommendations, but, clearly, the Faculty was moving in the general direction of supporting increased opportunities for students to engage in experiential learning and public service in substantive and meaningful ways that also enriched, and were informed by, academic study.

To ensure as much consultation as possible and still respect the privacy of the prospective donor, the President discussed the possibility of the donation (and its implications) with the Committee of Six in the spring of 2005 and with the CAP last spring. Professor Parker said that he was surprised and troubled to learn that minutes that are not related to personnel matters are kept confidential. The President noted that, in public minutes last year and the year before, the need to keep some conversations confidential was discussed. For the most part, these are matters

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Thursday, July 27, 2006**

in which he seeks the Committee's guidance and opinions before making a decision. The President said that he was open to having a full discussion of this issue at a future meeting of the Committee this year and asked Assistant Dean Tobin to share with the members the minutes (September 5, 2005 and October 4, 2004, appended) of previous conversations about what is being kept confidential in Committee of Six minutes. Professor Woglom commented that, while he was concerned initially about keeping some non-personnel-related discussions confidential, over the past year, he came to recognize the necessity of doing so in rare cases and to respect the administration's desire to consult with the Committee on matters of a sensitive or unresolved nature.

Returning to the discussion of the Argosy gift, the President said that, last spring, both the Committee of Six and the CAP favored moving ahead with discussions with Mr. Abele. The President noted that the CAP Report includes the following language, which the committee drafted with knowledge of a potential Argosy Foundation gift and for the purpose of being as transparent as possible about the fact that conversations about funding in this area were under way: "We commend the College's current efforts to secure significant additional funding for the expansion and coordination of such efforts and hope that these partnerships can inspire peer institutions to do more of the same." (CAP Report, page 21)

The President noted that, for some time, he did not know just when Mr. Abele would make his final decision about a gift. When the donation was made this summer, President Marx was delighted with the generosity of the Argosy Foundation. At the same time, he realized that receiving the gift in July would make communication with the College community, and moving forward with the CCE, more difficult than during the academic year. He noted that the expectations of students, faculty members, and potential community partners have now been raised and that he has been receiving inquiries about the center. The President said that he feels that it would be advantageous to take the first steps toward finding a director for the CCE as soon as possible; delays in having someone in place to lead this effort would affect the College's ability to offer internships to students next summer, he pointed out.

President Marx suggested that a search committee be formed and that an ad for the position of director be placed as soon as possible. (The Dean then distributed to the Committee a draft of an ad that had been prepared.) In this way, a pool of applicants could be emerging when the search committee begins its work in the fall. Taking these steps should not preclude conversations about the CCE with the Committee of Six and the Faculty as a whole this fall, the President noted. Professor O'Hara said that she supports forming a search committee for the center director as soon as possible. Professors Woglom and Hilborn also said that they supported the immediate formation of the committee. Given that all members of the Committee of Six will not be present until late this summer, Professors Parker and George at first favored waiting until fall to establish the search committee, but, after some conversation, agreed with the other members that a search committee should be formed now.

After the President concluded his remarks, Professor Parker offered his congratulations, commenting on what a wonderful gift that the College has received and on how difficult the process of coordinating this donation with the CAP process must have been. He also expressed concern that the Faculty has not had the opportunity to express its collective thanks because of the timing of the gift, and said that, in his view, many colleagues had not anticipated the scale

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Thursday, July 27, 2006**

and speed of developments. He noted that the CAP Report made no mention of a new Center for Civic Engagement but only urged “that more staff and financial support be provided to support both public-service efforts and faculty interested in pursuing community-based learning and that consideration be given to bringing all such support under a single administrative structure.” The Faculty has yet to discuss, let alone endorse, what the proposed center would look like, how it would be staffed, to whom it report, etc., Professor Parker said. President Marx said that he had worked to ensure that all of the funding possibilities discussed with Mr. Abele were consistent with the CAP Report and with faculty conversations about experiential learning and public service initiatives—expanding on existing models and programs on a larger scale. Professor Parker replied that the Faculty had endorsed ideas and principles, noting that there is a difference between theorizing and being able to accomplish something. He added that, during the Faculty’s CAP discussions, there was little sense that experiential learning was a top priority among the recommendations under consideration.

President Marx acknowledged that the gift following so quickly on the heels of broad discussions by the Faculty about a large number of issues might seem to imply a single priority, but instead it simply reflected the coincidence of the College’s and a donor’s interests. The President noted that the Faculty was consulted on the principles that will guide this or other initiatives, and that moving forward now is consistent with the concept of the CAP Report as a blueprint that would be implemented. Just how these initiatives will be implemented is now in the hands of the Faculty, administration, and Trustees, in various combinations, he said, and will depend on the resources that can be made available.

Professor George commented that, while it is true that the initiatives that will be supported by the Argosy gift are consistent with recommendations discussed and supported by the Faculty, the scale of the proposed plans seems larger than what were presented. He noted that he had reviewed online the three flagship programs cited as models in the report of the Experiential Learning Working Group, and that all had fewer staff positions, in relation to the number of students served, than the six professional staff plus three clerical staff planned at the center envisioned by Amherst. President Marx said that Mr. Abele wanted to create the best program possible, in accordance with the Faculty’s stated interest in establishing substantive opportunities for experiential learning and service. The President said that the most substantial driver of the program’s budget is the funding needed to support the greatest number of Amherst students seeking summer internships, which could be as high as three hundred a year (including the one hundred students who have previously been funded through the Gerety/Abele fellowships).

Center for Community Engagement staffing, both on- and off-campus, will be another significant expense, as it is anticipated that staff will be needed both at the CCE and to work at some partnering organizations to help these entities develop and coordinate programs that engage Amherst students effectively. He noted that at least two existing positions at the College will be incorporated into the center. It is anticipated that a staff member will also be hired to assist interested faculty members with integrating experiential learning into their classes. The President said that he is particularly intrigued by plans for establishing an incentive program through which Amherst students will engage in regular service in the local community and in turn receive paid January or summer public service internships.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Thursday, July 27, 2006**

Professor Woglom noted that support for this initiative will be provided for only seven years, and he wondered what would happen at the conclusion of this period. President Marx replied that the new director and his or her staff, supported by an advisory committee of faculty members, students, staff, and community partners, will design the best program possible. The College will test the program for the next seven years, carefully monitoring and assessing it during this time. Depending on whether the program is successful, the administration, Faculty, and Trustees will decide whether finding the resources to continue this initiative should be a priority. He noted that many of the CAP recommendations carry large price tags, commenting that conversations among the administration, the Faculty, and the Board during the upcoming academic year and beyond will focus on setting priorities in terms of making commitments to providing the necessary resources.

Returning to the topic of the reaction of the Faculty to the announcement of the establishment of the CCE, Professor O'Hara said that she does not believe that the Faculty will be surprised, as discussions about experiential learning (and faculty interest in this area) have been ongoing over the past ten to fifteen years. Professor George reiterated that it was the scale of the initiative that might be a bit shocking. Professor O'Hara responded that she had visited centers for experiential learning at other institutions, and that the Experiential Working Group, of which she had been a member for some time, had proposed in its report to the Faculty that the Outreach Office be enhanced and expanded. She contends that, if a center was never discussed specifically by the Faculty on that committee, it was only because it was thought to be unimaginable. She said that having the resources to establish the CCE is "like a dream come true."

Professor O'Hara noted that it is not necessary or desirable for a faculty committee to vet every aspect of such a center. Of course, the Faculty should be involved in those aspects of the initiative that involve links to the curriculum and other matters within the Faculty's purview, she said. Professor Woglom agreed, commenting that the implementation of many CAP initiatives will be delayed if the Faculty is involved in every decision, rather than limiting its input to those issues that are within its domain. He said that the Faculty should trust the administration to implement and administer the public service initiative, with the understanding that the Faculty would be consulted when appropriate. The President asked Assistant Dean Tobin to provide the Committee with the minutes (February 20, 2006, appended) of the discussion by last year's Committee of Six of which bodies might be charged with considering each CAP recommendation. He believes that reviewing this preliminary assessment might be helpful, and said that the Committee could return to a discussion of this issue.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Parker said that he has long been a supporter of experiential learning and that his concern is only that the Faculty did not consider the establishment of a single administrative structure, and that colleagues were not provided with details about a potential center or asked to collaborate in its design. Professor Woglom responded that the Faculty did approve experiential learning as a priority. Professor George said that, during every step of the CAP process, the Faculty was told that, the priorities of the CAP report were just that—priorities and goals; if the priorities were approved, it would be with the understanding that specifics would be discussed later by the appropriate faculty committees. While acknowledging that the gift is magnificent, he said that he was concerned that moving

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Thursday, July 27, 2006**

forward with the CCE so quickly and without discussion—the first public action since the CAP Report was approved—might be perceived by the Faculty as a violation of promises made by the administration during the CAP process.

President Marx reiterated that some awkwardness has resulted as a result of the timing of the Argosy gift, but said that he has been mindful—throughout the process of negotiating the gift—of a double-bind that has emerged. There is both a need to get things moving and a need to have full consultation from the Amherst community to build the best program possible. He trusts that placing an ad for a director and establishing a search committee now will not preclude consultation with the Faculty or other constituencies and will move this initiative forward. The Committee reviewed the ad for the director of the CCE and, after making some editorial changes, agreed that it should be circulated as soon as possible.

The Dean next informed the members that, in accordance with the recommendation of the CAP, he is adding a half-time Associate Dean, beginning in January, for a two-and-a-half-year term. The Committee wondered whether another full-time Associate Dean was needed. The Dean said that his plan was to try the part-time structure as an experiment and continue to assess the staffing needs of his office. Professors George and Woglom expressed concern that faculty members who become members of the administration remain included in the FTE count and that departments and students may suffer as a result. The Dean acknowledged their concern and noted that teaching replacements are discussed with the departments of colleagues who join the administration. The Dean and the President agreed to review this situation.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Thursday, August 31, 2006**

The second meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by President Marx *en plein air* outside Converse Hall at 3:00 P.M. on Thursday, August 31, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with announcements from Dean Call. He proposed that the Committee’s regular meeting time be from 3:30 P.M. TO 6 P.M. on Mondays, and the members agreed. The Dean said that it may become necessary to schedule additional meetings, and the members agreed to discuss at their next meeting potential times for additional meetings. He next informed the Committee that Assistant Dean Janet Tobin will continue to serve as the recorder of Committee of Six minutes and that Robyn Piggott will once again serve as the recorder of the faculty meeting minutes.

The Committee then considered three course proposals. Professor Woglom asked the Dean if the Department of Political Science had approved Colloquium 15, as there was no indication on the course approval form to this effect. The Dean reminded his colleagues that colloquia are interdisciplinary courses not affiliated with a department, so that a departmental signature is not required. He noted that the Department of Political Science had chosen to list Colloquium 15 as a related course and to accept it as credit toward the major. The Committee then voted to forward all three course proposals to the Faculty for approval.

Continuing his announcements, the Dean informed the members that community teas will continue this year on Thursdays at Frost Library, at 3:30 P.M., and that coffee, tea, and confections will again be provided at Lewis-Sebring from 8:00 A.M to 11:00 A.M, Monday through Friday. President Marx asked whether these ongoing events have been successful. The Dean replied that there is a loyal following of faculty members and staff who frequent the morning gatherings at Lewis-Sebring. He said that the library teas were very popular among students, but that attendance by Faculty and staff was modest. Dean Call feels that both events are valuable ways of bringing members of the College community together. He then reminded the Committee that, during the first week of classes, Monday classes are held on Wednesday.

The Committee turned briefly to committee assignments.

The Dean next informed the members that Jill Meredith, Director and Chief Curator of the Mead Art Museum, has resigned her position, effective October 31, 2006. He noted that she then plans to conduct research and would be available to assist with the Mead’s reaccreditation process, which is now under way. Dean Call said that it is his hope to appoint an interim director, probably on a part-time basis, to provide administrative support at the Mead. He informed the Committee that he would soon bring suggestions for search committee members to the Committee of Six, with the goal of beginning a national search as soon as possible and having a new museum director in place by the beginning of the 2007-2008 academic year. President Marx said that this time of transition at the Mead provides a further opportunity to explore ways of engaging the museum more fully in the life of the College.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Woglom reiterated his desire that consideration be given to the issue of including faculty members who become members of the administration in the FTE count. He said that, while he understands that teaching support is needed when a regular Amherst faculty member takes on an administrative role at the College, he feels that visiting faculty members should not be viewed as substitutes for FTEs. He wondered

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Thursday, August 31, 2006**

whether the Committee on Priorities and Resources, the Committee on Educational Policy, or the Committee of Six might be the appropriate body to explore this issue. The Dean said that he would consider which committee should take up this subject.

Professor Parker next asked if there would be an opportunity for the Committee to discuss the final report of the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) for the 2005-2006 academic year, which was recently distributed to the Faculty. He said that he was unfamiliar with issues surrounding C-Band “athletic admits” and that he felt that having an understanding of these issues would be necessary in order to evaluate the FCAFA’s recommendations. Professor George noted that the FCAFA report is a report to the whole Faculty, not to the Committee of Six. He said that the role of the Committee of Six is to organize the business of the Faculty, not to do that business by itself.

Dean Call responded that, in his view, part of the Committee’s job is to engage with the work of various faculty committees and to put the members’ conversations about such content before the Faculty. This function can be understood as part of the Committee’s role of setting the agenda for faculty meetings, the Dean said. By discussing matters such as the report of the FCAFA and recording these conversations in the minutes, the Committee can get a sense from the Faculty’s response as to whether colleagues would like to take up a particular issue. Returning to Professor Parker’s specific question, the Dean noted that, in the past, there was a faculty meeting devoted to a discussion of admission practices and the composition of recent entering classes. Changes in the way the admission profile of classes can be summarized, and dwindling attendance at open meetings for the Faculty on admission-focused issues led to the discontinuation of this practice, the Dean said. He wondered whether reinstating such a meeting might be useful.

The President pointed out the need to be sensitive about admission discussions that can be misunderstood as denigrating. President Marx said that it is important that every student at Amherst feel valued and included here.

Professor Schneider asked for further clarification of the charge of the Committee of Six, as he feels that the charge, as written, does not express the breadth of the Committee’s duties. Dean Call first read the charge and then offered further explanation. He noted that the Committee is the executive committee of the Faculty. As such, it sets the agenda for the faculty meetings; drafts charges for faculty committees; moves forward conversations about reports and campus issues; evaluates cases for reappointment, tenure, and promotion; and evaluates faculty grant and fellowship proposals. President Marx also relies on the Committee, as the elected committee of the Faculty, to provide a faculty perspective and advice on important matters that are under consideration. Professor George said that he objects to putting the Committee in such a role, as he believes that the members are not elected because they have any particular expertise, with the exception, possibly, of experience or good judgment regarding personnel matters. Professors Hilborn and Woglom disagreed, noting that they feel that colleagues elect individuals to the Committee of Six because of the judgment and experience of these individuals. They said that they are comfortable expressing views—as individuals and members of the Committee—because there are often important faculty interests at stake.

Continuing the conversation, Dean Call said that it is part of the Committee’s work, through the minutes of its conversations, to put arguments about significant issues before the

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Thursday, August 31, 2006**

Faculty. Professor George then questioned the practice of keeping some Committee of Six conversations confidential, and expressed his discomfort with this system. He wondered, too, about the extent of this practice. President Marx said that having weekly meetings with the elected representatives of the Faculty is a uniquely valuable resource for the Dean and himself. The President pointed out that he has erred on the side of seeking guidance from the Committee, but that very few conversations (with the exception of personnel matters and committee nominations that are under consideration) have been kept out of the public minutes of the Committee. Minutes of discussions of certain sensitive or unresolved matters and plans in their formative stages, about which the President and/or the Dean are seeking the advice of the Committee of Six, are sometimes kept confidential, he said. Often, discussions of these issues are made public once the matter is in a less tentative state, President Marx added.

The President expressed concern that, if he is unable to keep any sensitive conversations with the Committee confidential, he might not be able to get the guidance of faculty colleagues. This approach would be counterproductive to faculty interests, he added. Professors Woglom and Hilborn agreed. Professor George responded that, on the other hand, insistence on confidentiality might make him uncomfortable with expressing his views and offering confidential advice, as an individual with no expertise about a particular matter. Professor Parker agreed and noted that, under such circumstances, it would be impossible for a Committee of Six member to seek the opinions of the colleagues who had elected him or her. Dean Call noted that the Committee does review each case of potential confidentiality in the minutes, and that the question of whether a matter should be kept confidential is open to debate. The Committee might also consider referring certain questions to another faculty committee that the members view as having particular expertise in the matter under discussion. The President, the Dean, and the members agreed to strive for transparency in the minutes.

Continuing the discussion of the Committee's minutes, the Dean noted that the public minutes should be used as a guide in questions of whether matters can be shared with others. The members agreed that the minutes should be as concise as possible, but should communicate fully, and that, for reasons of transparency, there should be direct quotation in the minutes. Dean Call informed the members of the longstanding policy of appending letters to the minutes when the matters contained within them have been discussed by the Committee. Colleagues are informed by the Dean's office as to when their letters will be appended. If a colleague states at the outset that he or she does not want the contents of a letter discussed in the public minutes, the Committee will decide whether it wishes to take up the matter in question.

The Committee then discussed the circumstances under which it would communicate via email. It was agreed that email communications would not be used to communicate about personnel or other confidential matters and that, in general, the use of email would be kept to a minimum. Professor Woglom noted that email is particularly useful when the Committee is drafting, collectively, motions or other formal language and when decisions have to be made under deadline pressure. The members agreed that email can be a valuable tool in such instances. Dean Call then reviewed rules governing participation in the Committee's tenure discussions when members belong to the department of a tenure candidate.

The Committee next discussed issues surrounding Professor Hilborn's departure from the College this January. As Professor Hilborn informed the members over the summer, he has

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Thursday, August 31, 2006**

accepted an appointment at the University of Nebraska, where his wife has taught for a number of years. He also informed the Committee over the summer that he is willing to serve in the fall of 2006, if this is the Committee's pleasure. The members congratulated Professor Hilborn, while expressing regret over the College's loss of such a fine colleague, and then considered when it would be best to elect a replacement. They discussed the advantages and disadvantages of having a new colleague begin serving this fall, this spring, or at the beginning of the 2007-2008 academic year.

The Dean informed the members that the technology is now in place to conduct the election electronically, and that last year's Committee of Six had agreed that online elections are permitted under *Faculty Handbook* guidelines, providing, of course, that colleagues not using the Web were provided with appropriate means to participate. He noted that it would be advantageous to hold an election after November 1, because the Faculty is not required to inform him of leave plans until then. He told the members that, in addition, an election must also be held at that time for the Advisory Committee to the Trustees' Committees on Honorary Degrees and Trusteeship.

Professor George informed the members that, with the assistance of the Dean's office, he had explored whether there was a precedent for mid-year Committee of Six elections. He found that there have been two mid-year turnovers during the past several decades. He noted that one difference between these cases and the one now before the Committee is that the colleagues who joined the Committee of Six in mid-year served only for the remainder of that year, which in both cases was the second year of the term of the person they replaced. In November 1975, Professor Fink resigned from the Committee for personal reasons, having been elected in spring of 1974 to serve for two years. An election was held, and Professor Yost was elected to serve only the remainder of that year, i.e., the remainder of Professor Fink's term. In the other case, President Julian Gibbs died in February 1983. Professor Craig, who was then on the Committee in the second year of his term, was named Acting President. Professor Beals was then elected to serve for the remainder of the spring semester that year.

Continuing the conversation about the current situation, the Dean recommended that Professor Hilborn continue to serve this fall and that a new member be elected for this spring and the 2007-2008 academic year. Professors George and Parker, who initially favored electing a new member beginning this fall, raised concerns about having a lack of continuity in terms of those who would be making personnel decisions. They felt that the same individuals should be evaluating cases of tenure, which are typically decided by the end of the fall semester, and reappointment and promotion, which are decided in the spring. They asked what would happen in the unlikely event that tenure evaluation is not completed by the end of the semester. The Dean replied that Professor Hilborn had agreed to return to Amherst to participate in deliberations until the cases were completed.

Professor Schneider said that it seemed more problematic that a new member elected after November 1 for the fall term would join the Committee in the midst of tenure deliberations and without the benefit of having the summer to review the scholarly work of the candidates. The Dean said that an election would take approximately three weeks to complete, if an online election was conducted, and that the election would have to take place immediately—before leave plans were known—if the new member were to serve this fall. It would not be possible to

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Thursday, August 31, 2006**

have a new member join the Committee for the fall once the tenure process got under way in October. Professor O'Hara said that she felt that having a colleague learn in the fall that he or she would be serving on the Committee immediately would be a hardship, as the colleague would not have the notice necessary to design a schedule that would accommodate the commitment of work and time that is expected of Committee members. Professor George expressed concern that, beyond personnel matters, a new member elected in the second semester would not have the benefit of participating in discussions in the fall. Other members noted that, with Professor Woglom being the only other returning member from the Committee of Six of last year, having Professor Hilborn continue in the fall would provide greater continuity from last year. At the conclusion of this discussion, the members voted five to zero (Professor Hilborn abstained) in favor of having Professor Hilborn remain on the Committee for the fall.

Turning to the question of whether a new member should be elected to the Committee for the spring, Professor Woglom said that he preferred continuing with five members during the spring term, as the new member would not have had the benefit of participating in committee discussions and decisions in the fall and would require time to get up to speed. The Dean noted that, often because of leave plans or the requirement that at least three members be elected to the Committee each spring, at least half the Committee is in this position each fall. Professor Parker said that he was in favor of having as many voices as possible on the Committee and therefore advocated having a new member elected for the spring. The members then voted four in favor of electing a new member to the Committee in November for the spring. Professor Hilborn and one other member abstained. It was agreed that the new member's term would be for a year and a half, beginning in January 2007.

The Dean asked the Committee to consider the issue, which was discussed at the end of the spring semester by last year's Committee of Six, of how to develop a mechanism to allow the Committee—when it has concerns or questions about an honors thesis—to have a dialogue with a department or set of departments recommending a candidate for the distinction of *summa*. Some members of last year's Committee felt that it was important to communicate any misgivings before a decision is made in order to offer feedback to the department(s) and to uphold standards. The Committee agreed that, because of the timing of when the members receive the theses to read—which is typically just a week before a final decision is needed—it is difficult to initiate any process by which concerns can be addressed. The members decided that the best way to solve the problem is to move the due date for turning theses in to the Registrar from Friday to Thursday of the week in which they are typically received. In this way, the Committee of Six could receive them on Friday and have the weekend before its Monday meeting to read them. If questions should come up, there would be time to contact members of the department or interdepartmental committees. It was agreed that, if one member of the Committee should raise questions about a thesis, a second member of the committee would read the thesis in question and render an opinion. The Dean said that he would check with the Registrar to determine if it would be workable to change the date on which theses are due.

In the brief time remaining, President Marx informed the Committee that another issue from last year that he would like to carry over for discussion this year is “class bunching” during a limited number of time slots within the schedule, a situation that he views as a barrier for students' ability to take full advantage of the curriculum. He said that he would ask the

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Thursday, August 31, 2006**

Committee's advice about how to spread courses more evenly across the time slots available, especially if efforts undertaken thus far have had little impact. A high proportion of student enrollments occur between 10:00 A.M. and 3:30 P.M on Tuesdays and Thursdays. The President noted that last year's Committee of Six had discussed whether the College should require departments to use every time slot for teaching courses before any slot is used a second time. Colleagues last year had pointed out that Williams follows this system. The members agreed to consider whether this structure might be workable and desirable at Amherst. Professor George pointed out that such a system would have a negative impact on the scheduling agreement that the science departments have developed to ensure that introductory science courses do not conflict. Professor Parker noted that his department already employs a system much like the one at Williams. President Marx acknowledged that the issue is complex, applauded the cooperation of the science departments, and agreed that their interests must be considered in further deliberations.

Finally, Dean Call noted that, after eliminating dates for which there were scheduling conflicts, the possible dates for Faculty Meetings this semester, based on the Faculty's longstanding practice of reserving the first and third Tuesdays of each month of the term for possible meetings, are September 19, October 17, November 7, and December 5. The members reviewed and approved the agenda for the Faculty Meeting of September 4 and adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Committee of Six Minutes of Monday, September 11, 2006

The third meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, September 11, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Corrections to the minutes of August 31 were given to the Dean, and announcements from the President followed.

President Marx informed the members that he was in the final stages of drafting a letter to the College’s alumni body to explain the set of priorities and goals that were endorsed by the Faculty last year, after deliberations on the Report of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP), which will guide initiatives in curricular and co-curricular areas. It is the President’s hope to engage the alumni in the ongoing conversations about Amherst’s future, as the Trustees deliberate and the College prepares to raise funds to support the goals that emerged through the CAP process. He said that he looks forward to receiving feedback from the recipients of the letter. Professor Parker asked if the letter would be shared with the Faculty; the President said yes, it would.

Dean Call next made a series of announcements. He reported that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has put on its agenda the issue of how to spread courses more evenly across the time slots available. Professor Schneider said that it was his impression that there are more early-morning classes being held now than in previous years. Dean Call said that, at the request of the CEP, his office is gathering information on the range of time slots being used this semester, and that he will report back to the CEP and the Committee of Six once he has this information.

Continuing his announcements and reporting back about some matters raised at previous meetings, the Dean informed the members that, with the addition of two members, the search committee for the position of Director of the Center for Civic Engagement is now in place. Its members are Professors Aries, Cobham-Sander, and L. McGeoch; Donna Abelli, Administrative Business Manager of the Mead Art Museum; Suzanne Coffey, Director of Athletics; Ben Lieber, Dean of Students; and Robyn Piggott, Special Assistant to the President for Principal Gifts. Dean Call next reported that the Registrar, Mr. Mager, saw no problems with moving the due date for turning in theses and departmental recommendations for *summa* to the Registrar’s Office from Friday to Thursday of the week in which they are typically received, as the Committee had proposed at its last meeting. Bringing up a related topic, the Dean noted that last year’s Committee of Six expressed the view that the recommendation for *summa* for interdisciplinary theses should be unanimous. The members had suggested that, if a member of a thesis committee disagrees with the committee’s recommendation for *summa* that is being put forward, he or she should write a separate letter to the Committee of Six expressing his or her dissenting views. This year’s Committee agreed that this procedure should be used beginning this year. The Dean noted that last year’s Committee also expressed concerns about the number of typographic and grammatical errors in senior theses, generally. He said that he would ask Mr. Mager, in his annual letter to the Faculty about honors theses, to include information about the new due date and the procedure to follow if an interdisciplinary thesis committee’s recommendation for *summa* is not unanimous, as well as a reminder about the need for careful proofreading.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 11, 2006**

Dean Call also informed the members that Professors Mehta and Tranbarger have agreed to serve on the Committee on Student Fellowships, Professor Kallick has agreed to serve on the Mead Acquisitions Committee, and that Professor Frank will serve on the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Parking. The Dean said that he was pleased to announce that Betsy Siersma, who retired two years ago as Director of the University Gallery at UMass, Amherst, has agreed to serve as Interim Director of the Mead Art Museum on a half-time basis for at least eight months, beginning November 1.

Dean Call next asked for permission to invite Professor Viggo Kann, a Swedish computer scientist who is in residence at the College this semester on a STINT Fellowship, to attend meetings of the Faculty as a guest without vote for this semester. Dean Call informed the members that Professor Kann is here to observe how Amherst, as an American liberal arts college, organizes its curriculum and to learn about faculty governance. The members agreed that Professor Kann could attend faculty meetings this semester. The Dean then reported briefly on his meetings at the end of the spring semester with newly reappointed faculty members and the chairs of their departments. He said that he felt that these conversations had gone well and that all involved had been appreciative of the feedback shared with them, based on the Committee of Six's conversations.

Discussion turned next to tenure procedures for creative and performing artists. The Dean summarized the history of the Committee of Six's consideration of this issue over the past two years. In 2004-2005, at the Dean's request, the Committee discussed procedures for early selection of outside reviewers for candidates for tenure who are creative or performing artists. Under consideration was whether the need for reviewers to attend, to the degree possible, productions and exhibitions over a number of years necessitates making available the option for outside reviewers to be selected earlier than current procedure dictates. Ideally, such selection would take place soon after reappointment. The Dean noted that the procedures that were discussed were modified versions of standard procedures. Some outside reviewers, it was thought, would fulfill their role over a more extended time period than is typical, but they would be selected in the usual manner and by standard criteria. Ultimately the Committee drafted a motion to modify the language in the *Faculty Handbook* to allow for the early selection of reviewers and sent it to the Departments of Music, Fine Arts, and Theater and Dance for their response.

Time did not permit any further action in 2004-2005 on this issue, but in 2005-2006, the Committee revised the motion and resubmitted it to the departments. The responses of the departments to the proposed procedures, which would be voluntary, varied considerably. The divergent nature of the departmental views led the Dean to believe that it might be best to adopt an ad hoc approach, rather than having the Faculty vote on a change to the *Faculty Handbook*. Some members of the Committee felt that different disciplines seem to have different needs in presenting creative work for review and assessment. Recording performances or concerts, rather than having reviewers attend them, sometimes appears to be preferable. Dean Call said that the aim is to provide the fairest and most thorough evaluation possible for each candidate. Last year, the members asked the Dean to review the tenure procedures outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* to see if adopting the proposed procedures, on a voluntary ad hoc basis, would be permissible. This is where matters stand now, Dean Call said.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 11, 2006**

The Dean said that he had reviewed the current relevant *Faculty Handbook* language and had consulted the College attorney. He feels confident that the current language, as written, provides the flexibility to adopt the proposed procedures on a voluntary ad hoc basis. He said that he favored deciding on a case-by-case basis whether to select reviewers early, based on discussions with candidates and their departments about which procedures would provide the fullest information. If candidates and their departments request support to facilitate professional recordings of musical and theatrical events and exhibitions—in addition to having reviewers present, or in place of having them present—the Dean said that he would provide this funding. These recordings could then become part of the tenure file, should the candidate and his or her department so wish.

Professor Schneider expressed concern that having to make a choice about selecting reviewers early would place a tremendous burden on the candidate and add new levels of complexity to the tenure process. He pointed out that the department and the candidate might not be in agreement about whether to select reviewers early or whether creative work should be viewed live or in a recorded form. He also said that he found it troubling that some reviewers—those selected early—would be judging a case based on different information than what would be available to reviewers selected later and to the Committee of Six. He wondered, as well, whether it would be possible to get experts in a field to agree to attend multiple live performances or exhibitions over an extended period. President Marx said that there is also a danger that, by trying to ensure equity, the result might be ensuring that only the minimum amount of information could be gathered when the maximum is needed. He wondered whether the need to have all outside reviewers and the Committee of Six consider uniform information outweighs the benefits of having some reviewers see work in real time. Professor Schneider said that the creative arts occupy an awkward fit within traditional systems of academia, and that he believes that educating the Committee of Six about the fields of tenure candidates in arts would be most valuable. Professor Parker wondered how confidentiality could be ensured if a reviewer was present at multiple performances or exhibitions.

Professor Schneider said that he feels that the creative and performing arts departments each had internal dialogues about the question of selecting reviewers early. As a result, he believes that there were insufficient cross-disciplinary conversations and dialogue with the administration about changing the tenure procedures for working artists. Professor Woglom suggested that the Dean have a meeting with the three departments together to discuss this issue, and Dean Call agreed to do so.

The Dean next informed the members that, as recommended by the CAP, the CEP plans to ask members of the Faculty to determine where each of their courses fits within the six broad areas (outlined on page 61 of the College Catalog), each of which students are encouraged to sample broadly. This information can then be used by students and their advisors to reveal the patterns of a student's course selections for purposes of advising and self-assessment, and to encourage breadth in course selection. In addition, this information in the aggregate can offer information about how students are taking advantage, or not taking advantage, of the education Amherst offers. The President feels that the areas designated in the Catalog are sufficiently broad and flexible to be workable for this experiment. He suggested, however, that the wording of one category, "knowledge of culture and a language other than one's own and of human

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 11, 2006**

experience in a period before one's lifetime" contains too many parts to track accurately students' course selections within this multi-faceted area. He suggested that this category could therefore be subdivided graphically for purposes of clarity. Professor Woglom noted that, after experimenting with using this new system, the Faculty may want to re-consider these categories. The members noted that the consideration of any changes to the categories would be within the purview of the CEP and would require the vote of the full Faculty.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Woglom expressed concerns about whether there have been negative effects on the academic profile of the incoming class that appear to be the result of recent efforts to diversify the student body. He said that he fears that the College might be moving toward changing its standards for admission. Professor O'Hara raised her uneasiness with the recent characterizations of the incoming class as having a greater range of diversity while maintaining and even raising the average SAT. It is her impression that the range of academic preparedness in students electing to begin work in science is getting wider and wider. This increasing spread is masked when incoming classes are characterized by an average SAT. While she supports the goal of diversification, Professor O'Hara feels that it is important to be honest about the effects of taking steps in this direction and the needs that are created. Implying that students at Amherst today are as capable or even more capable of succeeding in their academic goals undermines the institutional challenges of providing academic support for all students. Professor O'Hara suggested that making use of additional statistical measures that offer a fuller picture of the distribution of SAT scores should be employed when characterizing the class. Professor Woglom said that he shared Professor O'Hara's concerns.

While noting that admission decisions are based on many factors, performance on standardized test scores being only one among them, President Marx said that it is important that the College be clear about its admissions goals and policies, and their results, and also be honest about the needs of our students. He explained that the publicity surrounding the College's desire to broaden the economic profile of its student body, and the success of recruitment efforts undertaken by the Office of Admission in this regard, had an effect on the College's applicant pool this year; a greater number than expected of qualified students from lower socioeconomic groups applied to the College and, meeting established standards, were accepted—with a higher yield. This unanticipated change in the pool and the yield contributed to a reduction in average SATs, as did the national decline in SAT scores this year. The President noted that Amherst remains the most selective college, with the highest SAT averages; he expressed great confidence in the judgment of the admission office and pride in our students. President Marx said that the Office of Admission is preparing a range of data for him; that the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) will also be assessing this year's admission results in relation to goals and standards; faculty will receive a more in-depth report and that the Board of Trustees will also explore this issue as it relates to CAP goals and funding.

Professor George asked the President to identify which committee of the Board examines questions of admissions. President Marx said that the Instruction Committee's mission touches on admissions and that the Budget and Finance Committee is concerned with the financial aid budget. He suggested that the Committee should return to this matter once complete information about this year's class is available, including comparisons with previous classes. He noted that

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 11, 2006**

conversations on this topic are sensitive and that they should be transparent, but that it is important for current students not to be made to feel denigrated or devalued in any way.

Continuing the conversation, the President noted that a proposal from the Quest Foundation has come forward to assist underprepared students who aspire to be physicians, allowing them to ease into the pre-medical science and math courses more gradually than often happens now. Typically, students who are interested in attending medical school take a challenging sequence of courses beginning in their first semester. When underprepared students struggle and receive low grades in these courses, they sometimes give up their career aspirations very early on. As a result, their entire college career can be colored by a sense of failure. The proposal is to identify, during the application process, students who may need to start more slowly. These students would be offered admission to Amherst with the understanding that they may take an extra semester or perhaps an extra year at the College, with demonstrated financial need continuing to be met, in order to complete their pre-medical requirements. President Marx said that there are many uncertainties and issues at this preliminary stage of discussion, including questions of how to determine eligibility for such a program. He said that the FCAFA could take up these questions. Professor Schneider asked why such a program was only being considered for students who are interested in medicine. He said that the same early barriers to success for underprepared students exist in many fields. Professor Parker agreed, offering the example of lack of language fluency holding back students who wish to explore the literature and culture of a country in its native language or study abroad. The President said that these are important questions, and that it is his hope that the College will soon be able to provide students with the resources to increase their language skills over the summer by providing opportunities for language study in this country and abroad. He noted that questions of whether to have an extended pre-med option remain and should be discussed in this broader context.

Professor George next raised the issue, in the context of faculty meetings, of what constitutes the distinction between questions about the minutes of the Committee of Six and questions to the administration. He said that the business of the meeting is obstructed when the President answers at length, at the beginning of a faculty meeting, a question that does not revolve around factual issues relating to the minutes. Professor George suggested that, when a question is asked that arises from the minutes but is actually related to administration actions rather than Committee of Six business, the President should say that he would be happy to answer questions to the administration at the time designated for doing so. If the President should be uncomfortable with making this decision, perhaps a Committee of Six member could call a point of order, he said. Professor George suggested that a guide to determining whether questions are actually about the minutes of the Committee is whether any member of the Committee of Six can answer them. The members agreed, and Professor George noted that the impression that is being given currently is that the administration is answering for the Committee of Six. Professor Woglom's understanding of the practice that evolved last year is that questions about Committee of Six minutes were meant to be questions of facts and that substantive questions about issues raised by those minutes should come after the Faculty has dealt with the scheduled business for that meeting. He said that he would also like to encourage colleagues who are concerned about substantive issues raised by the Committee's minutes to write to the Committee of Six. The Committee can then make sure that their concerns are heard by all and,

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 11, 2006**

in that way, better prepare faculty colleagues to discuss these important issues at faculty meetings.

Continuing “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Parker asked if a committee might be formed to examine the troubled state of Film Studies at the College. He noted that Amherst does not participate in the Five-College major; Film Studies courses are currently offered in an uncoordinated manner among a number of departments; ways to house and offer courses in the production of moving images on a permanent and systematic basis need to be developed; and the College lags far behind its peers in this rapidly changing field. Dean Call replied that he recognizes these concerns; he noted that he has been considering forming just such a committee and that he has been in conversation with Professor Cameron, who is also in favor of establishing this committee. President Marx asked whether such a committee would examine how to improve this situation by using available resources and/or improving organization, weighed with the possibility of additional resources. Professor Parker said that he believes that a committee would conduct a thorough review and that, in any case, all of its recommendations would not have to be implemented. The Dean, the President, and the Committee agreed to put a discussion of Film Studies on the Committee’s agenda for next week.

The Dean next confirmed with the members that they wished to conduct the election electronically this fall for Professor Hilborn’s replacement on the Committee of Six and for the Advisory Committee to the Trustees’ Committees on Honorary Degrees and Trusteeship. After some discussion, the members agreed that the prospect of increased efficiency and fuller participation (it was noted that colleagues could vote online while on leave, even if they were out of the country) suggest that online elections are a worthy experiment. The members reiterated that it is essential that colleagues not using the Web must be provided with appropriate means to participate. The Dean also reviewed with the members potential dates for future meetings of the Committee.

The Committee turned to a consideration of whether there was sufficient business to warrant having a faculty meeting on September 19. In this context, Professor Woglom raised the question of whether the Faculty should vote on adopting the FTE allocation system outlined in the Report of the CAP. The Dean said that, in effect, by voting to amend the charge of the CEP as written in the *Faculty Handbook*, the Faculty would vote on the method of allocation, which takes into account institutional priorities outlined in the report. The Dean said that last year’s Committee of Six had begun to revise the charge; the members agreed to review this draft and to put forward a motion to adopt the revised charge at the next faculty meeting.

The Dean noted that the CEP has also recently discussed the question, which has been brought up at the final faculty meeting over the past two years, of whether the Registrar should announce publicly the grade point average cutoff point for the top 25 percent of the class, if asked at a faculty meeting. The CEP confirmed that the Registrar was following the Faculty’s will when he declined to provide this information at the meeting. The Registrar told the Faculty that he would provide the information on request to any individual member of the Faculty. The President said that, since the question has come up repeatedly, the Faculty could debate it and then vote. The members agreed. After some discussion about the pros and cons of having a meeting on September 19, the members agreed that the next faculty meeting should be on October 17.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 11, 2006**

The Dean next informed the Committee that the members of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Student Evaluation of Teaching have requested that their charge, and possibly their name, be broadened to include the goal of improving teaching. He noted that this committee is charged with recommending ways to implement the following resolution voted by the Faculty on May 25, 2006:

The Faculty endorses the larger CAP Report goal to improve teaching throughout the College. In order to help achieve this goal, student teaching evaluations of all Faculty should be required. The evaluations solicited for senior faculty will be made available only to the faculty member in question.

Professor O'Hara said that she would like time to review this situation and suggested that the Committee return to this issue at its next meeting. The Committee agreed.

The members turned to issues raised in a letter (appended) sent to them by Professor Guttman. The Committee agreed that faculty members should not accept papers written after the end of the exam period, unless an extension is granted in writing by both the instructor and the Class Dean. This policy, they noted, is stated clearly on page 56 of the College Catalog. Professor George noted that a final paper due during exam week is an exam by definition. The Committee asked the Dean to remind the Faculty of the rules governing the submission of work after the end of exam period and requested that the Dean of Students be asked to remind students of these same regulations. The Dean agreed.

Dean Call noted that he had one final matter to discuss with the members. He shared with the Committee the following draft charge for a proposed committee, the Amherst College Wildlife Sanctuary Stewardship Committee:

The Amherst College Wildlife Sanctuary Stewardship Committee is composed of two members of the Faculty, the Director of Facilities Planning and Management, the Grounds Supervisor, two other staff members (either Trustee appointees or staff appointees), and two students. The Faculty members of the committee are appointed by the Committee of Six and serve for three-year terms. The Advisory Committee on Personnel Policies appoints the staff members, who serve three-year terms. The two student members of the committee are elected by the Association of Amherst Students each year. The committee, which is charged with the long-term oversight and management of the sanctuary, recommends priorities and policies; oversees academic, research, and other uses of the sanctuary; and acts as a steward for the sanctuary's wildlife and habitats. The committee may be advised by the conservation director (current or former) of the town of Amherst and other consultants.

The Dean noted that, in March 2005, Conservation Works, LLC, was engaged to work with the Sanctuary Advisory Committee to facilitate a preliminary study of the College's wildlife sanctuary. The committee was charged with making general recommendations regarding the long-term oversight of the sanctuary, including the management of red pine stands, and the

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 11, 2006**

sanctuary's use by the College (Amherst's proposed environmental studies program was mentioned in particular) for academic and recreational purposes. Conservation Works submitted a report to the committee in August 2005. It proposes boundaries for the sanctuary and recommends that the sanctuary be managed as an important bird and wildlife habitat. Conservation Works concluded that the sanctuary should be more actively used as a resource for long-term academic projects, and that the College should provide limited trail access to parts of the property for those outside the Amherst College community. Committee oversight of the use and stewardship of the sanctuary was recommended by the advisory committee and is a return to the structure that was established in the 1930s and 1940s, when the sanctuary was used extensively as an outdoor laboratory. With discussions about establishing an Environmental Studies program under way, renewed focus on the sanctuary is indicated. Finally, the report recommends that Amherst should compare notes with colleges such as Harvard, Trinity, Swarthmore, Mount Holyoke, Skidmore, and Williams regarding the management of their sanctuaries and arboreta. In particular, because of its close parallels to Amherst's sanctuary, the Hopkins Memorial Forest in Williamstown was cited as a useful example of a private college property that is used for academic and recreational purposes.

After some discussion about the dangers of adding to the already large number of faculty committees, the members agreed to create the committee as an ad hoc advisory committee to the President and the Dean and to accept the charge as proposed. As an advisory committee, this committee would not be added to the list of faculty committees in the *Faculty Handbook*.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amherst College
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002-5000

Tel.: (413) 542-2134 (office)
Tel.: (413) 548-9601 (home)

FAX (413) 542-2141
aquttmann@amherst.edu

13 August 2006

Dean Gregory Call
Secretary, Committee of Six

Dear Greg,

I am seriously concerned about a problem that seems to have grown much worse in the last few years. Several years ago, a student demanded the right to submit papers written after the end of the exam period. Last semester, two students actually submitted work done after the end of the exam period, one without asking for permission to do so, the other after I refused permission. All three of these students claimed that other instructors do accept postsemester submissions. In the earlier case, the student's father berated me by telephone for my rigidity. In the two recent cases, I received (and replied to) a total of eleven letters of explanation, complaint, and accusation. In one of these letters, the student threatened to continue the discussion in September when I'll be back in my office (where, according to the student, I should have been in late May).

I don't know if it's true that some members of the faculty, without consulting with the Dean of Students, allow students to submit work done after the end of the semester. Whether or not it's true, I appeal to you and to the Committee of Six to do one of two things: (a) remind the faculty of the faculty's rules about postsemester submissions or (b) ask the faculty to change its rules so that students who feel they need more time may receive a temporary grade of "incomplete" (to be replaced by a permanent grade after they finish the semester's work). I'd prefer (a).

Affably,

Allen Guttman

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 18, 2006**

The fourth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, September 18, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Corrections to the minutes of September 11 were given to the Dean, and the minutes of August 31 were approved.

In response to concerns that were raised at previous meetings by Professors George and Parker regarding the practice of keeping some Committee of Six conversations confidential and at the President’s request, Assistant Dean Tobin passed out a report in which she had categorized for the Committee the information that was kept confidential in 2005-2006. She described the category of “matters that were kept confidential when they were in formative stages and that were later made public” as being the most prominent. Those matters were the following: information regarding the possibility of hosting with Williams the Xavier University pre-medical cohort and Xavier faculty in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, during the time that Presidents Schapiro and Marx were in negotiations with Xavier; the members’ views on whether a particular faculty meeting should be held if the President could not be present; information about the possibility of establishing a program to bring pairs of lecturers or visiting faculty with divergent views on a particular issue to Amherst; and the proposed substance of a revised version of the Schupf Scholars Program, before the proposal for the revamped program was made to Mr. Schupf. Continuing her remarks, Assistant Dean Tobin said that the names of specific individuals who might be brought to Amherst as visiting lecturers or as speakers—during the period when such individuals might be under consideration or inquiries were being made—were sometimes kept confidential. In addition, statements made by individual Committee of Six members were kept confidential when members requested that their remarks not be made public. The identity of the individual (Congressman John Olver) who approached the College about establishing a Five-College center based at Amherst for the study of international affairs was kept confidential, as were some discussions of how to structure faculty meetings and discussions to consider the report of the Committee on Academic Priorities. Finally, Assistant Dean Tobin said that conversations in which the Committee discussed strategies about how best to present to the Faculty the proposal for revisions to the tenure procedures for the creative and performing arts were kept confidential. The members acknowledged that it is the practice of the Committee to keep confidential conversations surrounding personnel matters, committee assignments, leave and grant proposal review, nominations for named professorships, and departmental issues and reviews.

At the conclusion of the summary, Professor Woglom asked President Marx if there were plans to implement the proposal to bring pairs of lecturers or visiting faculty with divergent views to the College. President Marx responded that three sets of such speakers will participate in January 2007 in a new colloquium program, which will bring pairs of prominent individuals to campus for three or four days to discuss pressing societal concerns. Faculty, students, and alumni will be invited to join in the program, although the number of participants in each colloquium will be limited to encourage in-depth conversation. The President noted that, in July, an email about the program was sent to the entire Amherst community, requesting suggestions of topics and pairs of speakers. The program for this first year will be announced soon.

The Committee expressed interest in the College’s response to the proposal for a

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 18, 2006**

Five-College center for the study of international affairs. President Marx explained that Congressman Olver is currently pursuing this idea through the Five Colleges. At present, the President does not foresee the College, on its own, establishing any such thematic centers, though the revised Copeland Fellowship does allow for a thematic focus each year.

After reviewing the funding guidelines of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Summer Stipend Program and the criteria by which the College has selected nominees for this program in the past, the Committee reviewed NEH proposals and approved the nomination of two professors. The members discussed the decision by the NEH to change its regulations. In a departure from previous years, there is no longer a restriction on the career stages of nominees for the fellowship. The Committee agreed that putting forward the proposals of junior colleagues who apply, if their proposals are worthy, is particularly desirable.

Discussion turned to the request by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Student Evaluation of Teaching (Professors A. George, Jagannathan, Parham, and Sanderson) to broaden their charge, and possibly their name, to include the goal of improving teaching. The Dean reminded the members that the ad hoc committee has been charged with recommending ways to implement the following resolution voted by the Faculty on May 25, 2006:

The Faculty endorses the larger CAP Report goal to improve teaching throughout the College. In order to help achieve this goal, student teaching evaluations of all Faculty should be required. The evaluations solicited for senior faculty will be made available only to the faculty member in question.

Professor Woglom said that he is perplexed by the committee's request. It appears to him that the charge, as written, is broad and implies that the committee should be exploring and recommending ways to improve teaching, including a system of evaluating the teaching of senior faculty. Professor Parker noted that, in a letter sent to the Committee of Six in May 2006 (appended to the Committee of Six minutes of May 8, 2006), Professor C. McGeoch emphasized that student feedback is a limited tool for improving teaching. Professor Parker said that Professor McGeoch offered a list of other ways to improve teaching, such as attending workshops, exchanging course syllabi and exams with colleagues, co-teaching, participating in reading groups to discuss papers on pedagogy, and visiting other Amherst courses, and expressed his hope that the ad hoc committee would consider such mechanisms as part of its deliberations.

Professor Woglom agreed, while expressing his view that the current charge of the committee encompasses and encourages the consideration of these sorts of efforts as part of the Faculty mandate to recommend ways to improve teaching throughout the College. Professor George commented that the committee is being asked to implement a decision, in the case of requiring student teaching evaluations for senior faculty, that is unpopular with many colleagues. He said that he would be uncomfortable with broadening the charge to place even greater emphasis on exploring ways to improve teaching, noting that there is a danger that doing so could result in a lack of focus and that conversations might go on indefinitely.

Continuing the discussion, President Marx noted that the Report of the Committee on Academic Priorities includes recommendations beyond evaluations to improve teaching, and he suggested that the committee might also consider these ideas. The Committee of Six agreed that

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 18, 2006**

the ad hoc committee should focus on implementing the resolution regarding teaching, as voted by the Faculty on May 25. The members decided that the name of the committee should be changed to the Ad Hoc Committee on the Evaluation and Improvement of Teaching to reflect its broad charge. It was agreed that developing a proposal for evaluating the teaching for all Faculty is clearly an important and pressing part of committee's work.

The Committee returned to its discussion of whether the Registrar should announce the grade point average cutoff point for the top 25 percent of the class, if asked at a faculty meeting. Dean Call provided the members with some additional background. He noted that members of the Committee on Educational Policy and other colleagues recall that the Faculty considered this issue as part of its discussion in 2002 surrounding a new honors policy. The Dean explained that the faculty meeting minutes of May 23, 2002, include a reference to the Registrar reporting the cutoff to the Faculty at a faculty meeting, but that there are no indications in subsequent minutes that such a report was given. Although there are no minuted conversations about changing the practice of reporting this information, the Dean feels confident, because of the timing of the change in practice and the recollections of colleagues, that, during the course of the 2002 discussion, the Faculty requested that the cutoff figure not be disseminated widely.

Professor George said that he does not understand why a distinction is now made between announcing the information at the faculty meeting and sharing it with faculty members on an individual basis, which is permitted. Professor Woglom said that he supports not having this information dispersed widely. Professor O'Hara noted that, if reported in the minutes, information about the cutoff figure might reach students—with the effect that they might lobby faculty members to raise grades to meet the cutoff, particularly if their GPAs are within close reach. Professor Hilborn pointed out that having the cutoff number widely available would offer opportunities for comparison and information about grade inflation over time. The President noted that the issue does seem to touch on the subject of grade inflation more generally, a topic about which he has heard that colleagues are concerned. Professor Woglom then agreed to draft a motion regarding the reporting of the cutoff for the agenda of the October 17 meeting of the Faculty.

The Committee next considered revisions to the charge to the CEP, which would have the effect of having the Faculty vote on adopting the FTE allocation system that is outlined in the Report of the CAP. This system, which was supported by the Faculty as part of its general endorsement of CAP priorities and goals at the end of the last academic year, takes into account institutional priorities outlined in the report. Dean Call noted that, in its letter of February 17, 2006, to the Committee of Six (appended to the Committee of Six minutes of February 20, 2006), the CEP requested guidance and affirmation of its role in implementing and evaluating the success of the new system of priorities. Professor George expressed his support for having the Faculty vote on the allocation system individually through the charge. He pointed out that this step would be consistent with the Faculty's understanding that it would endorse a set of general principles and then address specifics during the implementation of each of the recommendations that fall within its purview. The Committee agreed.

The Dean shared a draft of the revised charge to the CEP begun by last year's Committee of Six. It reads as follows (changes are in bold caps):

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 18, 2006**

I. *The Committee on Educational Policy.* The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) is composed of five faculty members, each serving a three-year term; the Dean of the Faculty, *ex officio*, without vote; and three student members, each serving a two-year term. The Humanities, the Social Sciences and the Natural Sciences must be represented on the committee, by both faculty members and student members. Each year the committee chooses its own chair and secretary from among its five faculty members. The chair sets the committee's agenda. Nominations of the faculty members for the Committee on Educational Policy are made by the Committee of Six and reported to the Faculty in advance of the Faculty meeting at which they are to be elected.

Additional nominations may be made from the floor at the meeting. Candidates must receive the approval of a majority of the eligible voting members of the Faculty present at the meeting in order to be elected. Ideally, two members of the Committee on Educational Policy should be elected in two out of three years, and one member elected in the third. In this way, overlapping terms will create a continuity of membership. The student members of the committee are elected for two-year terms, two members being elected in one year, and a third in the other, alternately.

All members of the Faculty are eligible to serve on the Committee on Educational Policy, with the same exceptions as govern eligibility for the Committee of Six.

The Committee on Educational policy is expected to study the general educational policy of the college, to consider suggestions from departments or from individual Faculty members or students relating to changes in educational policy including proposals for new courses, new programs, and altered major programs or honors requirements, and to make recommendations to the Committee of Six and the Faculty. ~~In addition,~~ The Committee on Educational Policy advises the President and the Dean of the Faculty about the allocation of faculty positions to departments. **IN MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FTE ALLOCATIONS, THE COMMITTEE CONSIDERS BOTH THE CURRICULAR NEEDS OF INDIVIDUAL DEPARTMENTS AND THE COMMITMENT OF DEPARTMENTS TO OFFER COURSES THAT MEET IDENTIFIED COLLEGE-WIDE PRIORITIES AND CURRICULAR NEEDS.**

Professor Parker asked how the specifics of the new allocation system would be communicated to the Faculty, as he felt that the revised language of the charge is peculiarly moralistic. He expressed his discomfort with the use of the word *commitment* in the final paragraph, as its meaning in this context is unclear to him. He wondered how a sense of commitment could be measured, as he views *commitment* partially as a psychological state of mind. Professor Woglom said that the wording is clear if colleagues understand the legislative

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 18, 2006**

history behind the language. Professor Hilborn said that he views the language as being sufficiently directive, as it conveys that the CEP, when recommending FTE allocations to the administration, will take into account College-wide priorities. Professor Schneider said that he does not find the language to be ambiguous.

Noting that a certain amount of trust would be involved in the allocation process, Dean Call explained that, in the revised charge, *commitment* refers to the promise that a department would make to teach courses every year to meet one or more College-wide priorities, should that department be awarded the envisioned FTE. The Dean said that the department would describe the priority or set of priorities that it would meet in its FTE proposal to the CEP. Professor Parker asked how long a “commitment” of this sort would last. President Marx responded that the duration will depend on whether the Faculty as a whole decides to revisit the priorities it has set. Professor O’Hara said that she supports the use of the word *commitment* because it is not overly prescriptive and allows for future possibilities. Professor Hilborn said that he is in favor of the proposed wording because it is a firm statement that will offer the guidance that the CEP has requested for implementing the allocation plan.

Professor George expressed concern that the last sentence of the revised charge implies that all FTE proposals must take College-wide priorities into account. Professor Woglom said that it is his understanding that a consideration of College-wide priorities could play a part in departments’ proposals for both new and replacement FTEs. Dean Call said that every request does not need to address College-wide priorities to be successful. However, he explained, proposals that include commitments to these priorities would be compared with those that don’t, and that colleagues should be aware of this aspect of the allocation process. The Committee agreed that the word *both* in the last sentence should be stricken from the draft charge to communicate that, in recommending FTE allocations, the CEP would consider proposals that focused only on curricular needs of departments and that a commitment to offer courses that meet identified College-wide priorities is not a requirement for departments making FTE requests.

The Dean suggested that the Committee next consider as part of its review of the revised charge language about the Dean’s membership on the committee. Dean Call reminded the members that he is now completing his third year as a member of the CEP ex officio this fall. At the time he joined the committee, it was agreed that the Faculty would review this experiment at the end of three years and would then decide whether the Dean of the Faculty should continue serving on the CEP. At the request of last year’s Committee of Six, the Dean consulted with the CEP about whether to include the Dean of the Faculty as a member ex officio of the CEP in the enhanced charge to the committee that the Committee of Six would formulate and that would be voted on by the full Faculty. It was the CEP’s view that the Dean’s term as a member ex officio of the committee should be extended for another three years, at which time the arrangement could be reviewed again.

The Committee agreed that the Faculty should vote on whether the Dean of the Faculty should continue to be a member ex officio of the CEP and asked the Dean to convey its view to the CEP and to remove himself (as he has done previously) during the committee’s discussion of this issue.

Conversation turned to possible changes in how members of the CEP are selected. The

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 18, 2006**

Dean noted that some members of last year's Committee of Six had suggested a mixed model in which some members of the CEP would be elected and some appointed, but that the CEP did not favor such an approach. Professor Parker said that he sees compelling reasons for continuing to have the members of the CEP nominated by the Committee of Six and approved by the Faculty. Professor Woglom noted that the CEP has an enormously important function and has the opportunity to influence the FTE process. He said that he supports having the members elected to ensure that the Faculty has the fullest confidence in the committee.

Professor Parker responded that much of the CEP's power, in terms of the FTE process, depends on having members who represent the different academic areas of the College. Professor Woglom said that colleagues consider such representation when they elect the Committee of Six and that they would exercise the same judgment when electing the CEP. Professor Schneider said that he would be concerned about limiting the pool if both the Committee of Six and the CEP were elected, and he noted that he doesn't see anything wrong with the current system of nominations. He expressed the view that the committee's potency derives from whether it is able to influence the administration's allocation of FTEs, in other words, whether it has clout. He also worried about possible unintended consequences of the election of the members of the CEP.

Professor Woglom responded that he believes that it would be more difficult for the administration to make decisions that would be contrary to CEP recommendations if the members of the CEP were elected, as the committee would have more authority. Responding to Professor Schneider's concern about limiting the pool for Committee of Six and CEP elections, Professor Hilborn said that such elections could be held sequentially, with the Committee of Six election happening first. Dean Call agreed that such a structure would be possible, but that the Committee of Six election would have to occur earlier than it does presently. Professor Hilborn suggested that, if the Faculty as a whole is interested in the question of electing the CEP, the Committee of Six could discuss the matter further and bring the issue to the Faculty for a vote. The members agreed.

The Committee then asked the Dean to share the following proposal for a revised charge with the CEP and to request their response:

I. *The Committee on Educational Policy.* The Committee on Educational Policy (**CEP**) is composed of five faculty members, each serving a three-year term; **THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY, EX OFFICIO, WITHOUT VOTE**; and three student members, each serving a two-year term. The Humanities, the Social Sciences and the Natural Sciences must be represented on the committee, by both faculty members and student members. Each year the committee chooses its own chair and secretary from among its five faculty members. The chair sets the committee's agenda. Nominations of the faculty members for the Committee on Educational Policy are made by the Committee of Six and reported to the Faculty in advance of the Faculty meeting at which they are to be elected.

The Committee on Educational Policy is expected to study the general educational policy of the college, to consider suggestions from departments or from individual

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 18, 2006**

Faculty members or students relating to changes in educational policy including proposals for new courses, new programs, and altered major programs or honors requirements, and to make recommendations to the Committee of Six and the Faculty. ~~In addition,~~ The Committee on Educational Policy advises the President and the Dean of the Faculty about the allocation of **TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK** faculty positions to departments. **IN MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FTE SUCH ALLOCATIONS, THE COMMITTEE CONSIDERS THE CURRICULAR NEEDS OF INDIVIDUAL DEPARTMENTS AND THE COMMITMENT OF DEPARTMENTS TO OFFER COURSES THAT MEET IDENTIFIED COLLEGE-WIDE PRIORITIES AND CURRICULAR NEEDS.**

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 25, 2006**

The fifth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, September 25, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Corrections to the minutes of September 18 were given to the Dean, and he distributed to the members the final draft minutes of September 11.

The Committee returned to its discussion of admissions policy and of issues surrounding the academic profile of the incoming class. President Marx said that, anytime admissions goals and policies, and their results, are discussed in public, it would be important that individual students not become a focus. He reiterated that all current Amherst students must feel valued here. President Marx explained that it is clear that the applicant pool for this year’s first-year class shifted in ways that were welcome and unexpected and that the yield was higher than anticipated for some students who met certain admissions goals, all reflecting the hard work of our fine admission staff. He said that it is important that the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) assess admissions results in relation to Amherst’s current admissions policies, goals, and standards, and that the committee report its findings and make recommendations to the Faculty. The President emphasized that it is not workable to shape admissions policy on the floor of a faculty meeting, and that the faculty committee structure is the best mechanism for evaluating such policy, in consultation with the Offices of Admission and of Institutional Research.

Professor O’Hara agreed, pointing out that the Committee of Six has limited information with which to assess the current admissions situation and to make predictions about the probable results of applying current policies to future applicant pools. The Committee agreed and asked the Dean to draft a request to the FCAFA to explore these issues. Dean Call agreed to draft such a charge.

President Marx emphasized that, apart from making determinations about admissions policy and its ramifications, it is the College’s responsibility to be responsive to the needs of all students who have been admitted and to be mindful of differences in their level of preparation. He said that the College will make available additional resources to provide support for students as needed, noting that such assistance should not wait until the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) initiatives surrounding writing and quantitative skills are funded.

Professor O’Hara agreed that such help would be welcomed, but raised the concern that, if this year’s trend continues, there will be a greater number of students at Amherst who may benefit from such resources. She suggested that plans must be made now to meet their needs. Professor O’Hara offered the example of students who are underprepared in math. At present, these students are often advised to begin their studies with Math 5. Once they are enrolled in Math 5, they are disappointed to discover that they cannot simultaneously enroll in Chemistry 11, the only pre-medical science course open to first-semester students, because both courses are offered at the same time. This scheduling is done intentionally, because the faculty members in Chemistry believe that it is in the best interests of these students to wait a semester before taking Chemistry 11, and, more importantly, to have completed Math 6 before enrolling in Chemistry

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 25, 2006**

12, the second of the chemistry courses taken by most students interested in preparing for the study of medicine. Chemistry 12 lists Math 11 (or Math 5 and 6) as a prerequisite. Students who are put in this situation, especially those who are considering majors in the sciences or who wish to be pre-med, have expressed intense frustration. They fear that they will fall behind and be unable to meet pre-medical or major requirements. Many also feel that they have been misled during the application process in not being told that they would have to delay their plans because they were underprepared. Professors O'Hara and George emphasized that the College should be providing additional gateway science offerings for students in this situation. At present, staffing levels do not permit such courses to be taught, they said.

While acknowledging that these issues surrounding the needs of students in the sciences are significant and should be addressed, the President pointed out that they should not be conflated with the effects of the shift in the applicant pool this year. Professor Hilborn agreed that the College has been facing issues surrounding underpreparedness in quantitative skills and the sciences for some time and said that it is his hope that initiatives to provide additional support will move forward.

Dean Call said that he will examine possible means of providing further support in January and in the summer for students who are less prepared in math and science. He explained that he has already begun discussions with Professor O'Hara and other faculty members in the sciences about enhancing the Phoenix Program and the summer science program. The Dean noted, however, that an expanded summer program would benefit members of the Class of 2011, rather than of the Class of 2010. He said that, as rising sophomores, members of the current first-year class would be eligible to apply for summer research fellowships, while noting that he is interested in engaging in more conversations about developing ways to support this cohort.

In addition to ways of helping on the math and sciences front, Dean Call said that he is considering other vehicles for providing support to the incoming class. He noted that demand for the services of the Writing Center was up last year and that there is a similar trend this year. Dean Call said that he will be in touch with Ben Lieber, Dean of Students; Susan Snively, Director of the Writing Center; and Jennifer Innes, Director of the Moss Quantitative Center, to explore the possibility of adding support to both centers. He also plans to speak with Senior Associate Dean of Students Charri Boykin-East, who coordinates academic support services at the College.

Returning to the discussion of admissions policy, Professor Woglom expressed the view that the College is being irresponsible by not further gathering and analyzing data on how students perform academically during their years at Amherst and how they navigate the College curriculum. He noted that the Special Committee on the Place of Athletics at Amherst (of which Professor Woglom was a member) recommended in 2002, in its report titled *The Place of Athletics at Amherst College: A Question of Balance*, that the College provide ongoing monitoring of identified areas of concern, among them the academic performance of athletes. Professor Woglom said that the special committee recommended that the Office of Institutional Research gather data about this and other issues of concern and produce a report on an annual

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 25, 2006**

basis. He expressed dismay that this recommendation has not been implemented, while suggesting that the College should also take particular care in tracking the performance and curricular choices of less well-prepared students. Professor Woglom said that he suspects that current programs that are designed to offer support for these students are not coordinated or sustained and are insufficient for meeting the needs of students who arrive at Amherst without the background needed to succeed in quantitative courses here.

Professor O'Hara agreed that more information about student learning outcomes should be gathered and analyzed. Professor George noted that, when students receive information from the admission office, they may get the impression that they will be prepared for the rigor of Amherst's curriculum, when, in fact, this is not always the case. He said that it is understandable that the admission office emphasizes positive messages when reaching out to prospective students, but he feels that such an approach may raise some less well-prepared students' expectations to a degree that is unrealistic for them. Professor Schneider agreed that such "advertising" does not always serve the College and students well. He also raised concerns that grade inflation at the College may mask the degree to which less well-prepared students are integrated into the intellectual community at Amherst. President Marx suggested that conversations about grade inflation should occur in the context of these issues and as part of a larger discussion about the intellectual engagement of all Amherst students. He worries that some number of students may not be making the most of their academic experience at the College. He also agrees that it is important that the College evaluate the effects of its admissions policy. He said that he is pleased that the appointment of Marian Matheson as a full-time Director of Institutional Research has reinvigorated the Office of Institutional Research at the College and noted that staffing in her office will soon be increased to accommodate the increasing demand for institutional research at Amherst.

Noting that the College aspires to have a diverse student body and high academic standards, President Marx said that achieving this aim requires making choices in admissions policies. He said that it is his hope that the Faculty's consideration of admissions issues would result in a number of policy outcomes. While the College remains the most selective liberal arts college in the country, we must continue to strive to raise our standards even further, across the board. He noted that the CAP has recommended adding twenty additional spaces to incoming classes, and that this would enable the College to offer admission to all of our applicants with the top academic reader rating.

Dean Call requested that the members consider how to put these issues before the Faculty and the schedule for doing so. The Committee agreed that the FCAFA should be asked, as a part of its standing charge, to undertake its review as soon as possible and should report to the Committee and the Faculty by the end of the fall semester.

The Dean next asked the members to consider colleagues for a Memorial Minute Committee for Benjamin McCabe, Parmly Billings Professor of Physical Education, Emeritus, who died on September 13. He said that he would report back to the Committee of Six once the membership of the Memorial Minute Committee was finalized.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 25, 2006**

The Committee returned to its discussion of whether the Registrar should announce the grade point average cutoff point for the top 25 percent of the class, if asked at a faculty meeting.

Professor Woglom said that he would vote against having the figure announced. He reiterated that, while he feels that every faculty member has the right to know the cutoff figure, he believes that disseminating it widely will lead to grade-grubbing. Professor Parker commented that the Faculty had voted for grade-grubbing when it approved the honors policy. The Dean pointed out that, if this motion were to be approved, the Registrar would announce the cutoff figure at the final faculty meeting of the year, when it is too late for appeals to change grades. Professor Hilborn reiterated his view that having the cutoff figure announced would provide feedback to the Faculty about grade inflation, depending on the top 25 percent cutoff number. Professor O'Hara said that, after thinking about this issue, she believes that the Faculty has a responsibility to know how the grades that they give translate into the top 25 percent of the class. After review of a motion drafted by Professor Woglom, the Committee voted on the following motion:

The Faculty authorizes the Registrar at the Commencement Meeting of the Faculty to report the minimum grade point average, to two decimal places, for students earning a degree with Distinction.

The Members voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the motion to the Faculty and four in favor and two opposed (Professors Woglom and Schneider dissented) on the substance of the motion.

Continuing the conversation, President Marx asked the members if they thought that announcing the cutoff would lead to further grade inflation. Professor Schneider said that he believes that most faculty members are unaware of how their grade distributions compares with those of their colleagues. President Marx asked the members if they wished to discuss the issue of grade inflation, it having been raised in earlier conversation. Professor Schneider suggested that the conversation be held for another time, as grade inflation was not on the Committee's agenda.

At the request of the President and the Dean, the members next reviewed the following preliminary assessment, prepared by last year's Committee of Six, of which bodies should be charged with considering each CAP recommendation. President Marx noted that adjustments might be required now that some CAP recommendations are beginning to be forwarded to various groups for further discussion. The members made a number of suggestions for additions to the list of bodies, which are indicated in bold uppercase letters in the following summary:

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 25, 2006**

1. We recommend that talented students from less affluent backgrounds be more vigorously recruited and that the Trustees seek funds to meet the additional aid burden.

FCAFA works out the details and reports back to the Faculty periodically on how the initiative is progressing.

Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) may discuss financial implications.

Trustees.

2. We recommend that the Trustees consider significant reductions in the loan burden of all our students, as has been done for our highest-need students, in particular to avoid the limit that loans may impose on future career aspirations.

FCAFA works out the details and reports back to the Faculty periodically on how the initiative is progressing.

CPR may discuss financial implications.

Trustees.

3. We recommend that the proportion of non-US students admitted be increased from about 6 to about 8 percent.

FCAFA works out the details and reports back to the Faculty periodically on how the initiative is progressing.

CPR may discuss financial implications.

Trustees.

4. We recommend that admission for non-US students be made need-blind.

FCAFA works out the details and reports back to the Faculty periodically on how the initiative is progressing.

CPR may discuss financial implications.

Trustees.

5. We recommend that entering classes be increased by between 15 and 25 students.

FCAFA works out the details and reports back to the Faculty periodically on how the initiative is progressing.

CPR may discuss financial implications.

Trustees.

6. We recommend that 5 new FTEs be devoted to new interdisciplinary ventures and the support of other forms of cross-departmental collaboration.

Academic departments initiate FTE requests.

CEP, with vote by the Faculty on any new programs or majors proposed.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 25, 2006**

7. We recommend that 2.5 new FTEs be devoted to global comprehension, their distribution to be made by the CEP among departments that are willing to commit themselves to teaching courses with this focus.

Academic departments initiate FTE requests.

CEP, in consultation with the Special Committee on the Amherst Education (SCAE) Working Group on Global Comprehension.

8. We recommend that 4 new FTEs be reserved to meet existing departmental needs.

Academic departments initiate FTE requests.

CEP, in consultation with the Working Committee on the Arts.

AD HOC ARTS GROUP.

9. We recommend that 2 FTEs be reserved to allow accelerated hiring to take advantage of targeted “opportunity” hires that invigorate or enrich the racial, cultural, gender, and/or intellectual diversity of the faculty.

Academic departments initiate FTE requests.

CEP.

10. We recommend that all assistant professors be assured of a year of sabbatical leave at full salary after reappointment.

CPR.

Administration.

Trustees.

11. We recommend that the existing program of Senior Sabbatical Fellowships be expanded to cover as much as two semesters of leave after six years and that the College make every effort to secure sufficient funds to support all qualified applicants.

CPR.

Administration.

Trustees.

12. We recommend that the College create a staff position to assist faculty in applying for grants to support their research and creative work.

CPR.

Administration.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 25, 2006**

13. We recommend that funding for the Amherst Academic Interns program and the Dean of the Faculty's resources to support student research across the disciplines be enhanced.

CPR.

Administration.

Trustees.

Discuss possible partnerships with relevant departments.

14. We recommend significantly expanding opportunities for community service and for summer and January internships.

Administration.

College Council.

Trustees.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE CENTER FOR COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT.

15. We recommend that a visiting appointment be made to allow a faculty member to serve half-time as coordinator of community-based learning.

Administration.

CEP.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE CENTER FOR COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT.

16. We recommend that the College provide need-based support to encourage students to enroll in intensive summer language programs in the USA and abroad.

CPR.

Administration.

17. We recommend that 2 new FTEs be reserved to support the development and teaching of "intensive writing" courses, their distribution to be made by the CEP among departments willing to commit themselves to teaching additional courses for this purpose.

Academic departments initiate FTE requests.

CEP.

18. We recommend that all students be required to take at least one course designated as Writing Attentive, with pedagogical support to be provided for faculty engaged in such writing instruction.

Fleshed out by CEP, in consultation with the SCAE Working Group on Writing.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON WRITING.

Faculty vote.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 25, 2006**

19. We recommend that 2.5 new FTEs be reserved for improving students' quantitative literacy, their distribution to be made by the CEP among departments that are willing to commit themselves to teaching "intensive" sections or new courses for these purposes.

Academic departments initiate FTE requests.

CEP, in consultation with the SCAE Quantitative Working Group.

20. We recommend that the Faculty adopt a policy that requires the soliciting of teaching evaluations from all students in all classes.

Fleshed out by Committee of Six.

**AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE EVALUATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF
TEACHING.**

Faculty vote.

21. We recommend that the administration devote more resources and staff time to supporting programs in pedagogy, including programs to help teachers at all ranks.

Committee of Six.

Administration.

Discussion by the Faculty.

TEACHING AND LEARNING PROJECT COMMITTEE.

22. We recommend that a faculty innovation fund be created to support pedagogical projects of faculty at all ranks and that eligibility for Senior Sabbatical Fellowships be expanded to include proposals for contributions to pedagogy in the broadest sense.

Administration.

Trustees.

Professor Schneider asked if recommendation 16 was intended to be restricted to language study or whether it might apply to summer study in other disciplines. The members agreed that the members of the CAP had language study in mind specifically when they made this recommendation. Professor Parker asked the Dean if the Committee on Educational Policy and Committee on Priorities and Resources have been made aware of the issues that they are to consider. The Dean said the two committees were informed. In regard to recommendation 14, Professor Parker asked if the Center for Community Engagement, and its advisory committee, would be responsible for considering issues surrounding community-based learning. He wondered about the status of the CAP recommendation that a faculty member serve half-time as coordinator of community-based learning. President Marx noted that, for the short term, Professor Basu, who will start her term as Associate Dean of the Faculty in January, will play this role. He informed Professor Parker that there would be resources available through the Center for Community Engagement to assist faculty members with community-based learning courses

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 25, 2006**

and assistance for faculty members to make connections between curricular content and experiential opportunities.

Professors Hilborn and O'Hara suggested that the President and the Dean report back to the Faculty in the spring about where things stand with the CAP process. Professor Schneider agreed and asked if the order of implementation for these recommendations depends on securing funding and issues of timing and phasing. President Marx said that the Board hasn't met since the beginning of June and that the Trustees are now reviewing the priorities and goals of the CAP report and evaluating how to secure funding. The Trustees are also considering the timing of implementation in relation to financial and other factors. The President said that the Faculty will have input into these deliberations, since Trustee committees are planning to meet with faculty committees. Professor Woglom said that he fears that each committee would lobby for its own priorities and said that it will be important for the Trustees to receive a larger faculty view. Professor George said that in the past, to his dismay, he has found that the Board tends to equate the views of the Committee of Six with those of the full Faculty. Professor Woglom suggested that the Committee consider ways to convey a more comprehensive expression of faculty opinion to the Trustees. The Committee agreed.

The Committee next returned to a discussion of Film Studies at Amherst. Professor Parker provided some background for the members. He noted that, while the study of the history and analysis of film at the College began in the English department more than three decades ago, interest in film and newer technologies of the moving image has lately spread across the curriculum. At present, all the film courses offered at the College are listed in a section of the Catalog, but students can find no instruction there as to ways of pursuing a coherent course of study. Professor Parker noted that, whether viewed as an art form in its own right or as an instrument or tool for research, film requires courses in production that the College has offered only sporadically (and mainly through Five-College faculty). He informed the Committee that the three other Colleges in the Five-College Consortium have now approved a Five-College major in Film Studies and that the university is expected to do so soon. What, he asked, should be Amherst's response to these developments? He suggested that an ad hoc committee be formed to explore the future of Film Studies at the College, noting that there has been thus far inconsistent communication among faculty interested in film and new media.

Responding to Professor Parker's comments, Professor Schneider questioned whether the Committee of Six should be involved in this issue. While acknowledging that the case for Film Studies appears to be a compelling one, Professor O'Hara suggested that the appropriate path in cases such as this one is for like-minded colleagues to come together for the purpose of discussion and, if they agree, to make a proposal to the CEP for a new program or major. Ultimately, such a proposal would be brought before the full Faculty. Professor Parker reiterated that communication has broken down and that things are at a standstill. He feels that, unless there is a directive from the Committee of Six and the administration, a proposal will not move forward. Professor Hilborn offered the example of the recent proposal for an environmental studies program, noting that proposals should arise out of faculty self-assembly, self-assessment,

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 25, 2006**

and interest, rather than being imposed from above. Professor Woglom agreed, commenting that it is not within the Committee's purview to make educational policy. The members agreed that, if he wished, the Dean could form an ad hoc advisory committee to examine the future of Film Studies at the College, but that the Committee of Six should not play a role in the formation of such a committee.

The members next discussed proposals for Five College certificates in: Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies; Asian/Pacific/American Studies; and Native American Studies, all of which have been endorsed by the CEP. Last year's Committee of Six voted to endorse these proposals and to forward them to the Faculty, and the Dean asked this year's members for their views. Professor Schneider said that he views all of the proposals as laudable, but that he is opposed to them in principle. He views such certificates as running contrary to the spirit of the liberal arts and has found that they cut into the liberal arts curriculum in a profound way. His experience with students has demonstrated that such certificates are also impractical, because it is difficult for students to fit the required courses into their schedules. Professor Woglom also expressed concern, as he did last year, over the proliferation of such certificates and agreed that an emphasis on such credentialing is at odds with the philosophy of a liberal arts education. He has found that students in pursuit of Five College certificates often end up taking courses for the sole purpose of meeting the requirements of the certificate. Professor George said that he agreed with the sentiments expressed by Professors Woglom and Schneider, noting that he and others at Amherst had declined to support a Five-College certificate program in an area related to his own field. However, for better or worse, Amherst does allow participation in these certificate programs, and Professor George said he doesn't see a basis for opposing proposals that are coherent and that have strong faculty support. Professor Parker expressed the view that the certificates are being brought forward for different reasons, in response to different pressures, and as different educational and intellectual exercises and should be considered separately. The members then voted six to zero in favor of forwarding the certificates to the Faculty and agreed to continue their discussion before voting on the substance of the motions to approve them.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Committee of Six Minutes of Monday, October 2, 2006

The sixth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, October 2, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Corrections to the minutes of September 25 were given to the Dean, and the minutes of September 11 and September 18 were approved.

Dean Call introduced Attorney James Wallace, who participated in the meeting by speaker phone. Each fall, Mr. Wallace is invited to speak with the Committee prior to personnel discussions to provide general legal advice related to the tenure and reappointment processes. At the conclusion of the discussion with Mr. Wallace, the Dean, the President, and the Committee expressed their thanks.

Dean Call next reported to the members that he had shared the proposed enhanced charge to the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) (included in the minutes of September 18) with the members of that committee. The CEP was generally pleased with the new content, but would like to refine it further, Dean Call said. He will share the revised version of the charge with the Committee once it is completed.

The Dean then offered suggestions of colleagues to serve on the search committee for the Director of the Mead Art Museum. Dean Call said he would report back to the members once the search committee was finalized. In another committee matter, he reported that the Ad Hoc Committee on Writing has been formed. Its members are Professors Barale, Bosman, Brandes, Greenstein, and López. The Writing Committee is charged with recommending ways of implementing recommendation 18 from the CAP Report: “We recommend that all students be required to take at least one course designed as Writing Attentive, with pedagogical support to be provided for faculty engaged in such writing instruction.”

Discussion turned to a proposal (new language appears in bold capital letters) by Professor George that the section of the College Catalog on Examinations and Extensions (page 56) be clarified as follows:

Examinations are held at the end of each semester and at intervals in the year in many courses. At the end of each semester, final grades are reported and the record for the semester is closed. In conformity with the practice established by the Faculty, no extension of time is allowed for ~~intraterm~~ papers, examinations and ~~incomplete~~ laboratory or any other course work beyond the date of the last scheduled class period of the semester unless an extension is granted in writing by both the instructor and Class Dean. **LIKewise NO EXTENSION BEYOND THE LAST DAY OF FINAL EXAMINATIONS IS ALLOWED FOR SCHEDULED, SELF-SCHEDULED OR TAKE-HOME EXAMINATIONS TO BE TAKEN DURING THE FINAL EXAMINATION PERIOD, INCLUDING FINAL PAPERS DUE DURING THE EXAMINATION PERIOD, UNLESS AN EXTENSION IS GRANTED IN WRITING BY BOTH THE INSTRUCTOR AND CLASS DEAN.** Only for medical reasons or those of grave personal emergency will extensions be granted beyond the second day after the examination period.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, October 2, 2006**

The members agreed that Professor George's revisions convey their understanding of current practice and suggested that the Dean propose to the CEP that these changes be incorporated into the Catalog. The Dean agreed, noting that a vote of the full Faculty is not required to revise this language since it is meant only to communicate current policy.

Under "Questions to the Administration," Professor George asked the Dean for a brief report about the Chairs meeting that was held on September 29. Dean Call said that the meeting had been very productive and had included a discussion about a proposal to change the Five-College academic calendar, which has been brought forward by UMass. The university wishes to start the spring semester two weeks earlier than it begins at present, moving the start date to just after Martin Luther King Day. The Dean said that the Chairs expressed little support for the proposal.

President Marx asked the members whether they thought that it might be worthwhile to start the spring semester earlier at Amherst so that the time in the summer during which students can pursue internships or research could be extended, allowing such experiences to become even more substantive and enriching for Amherst students. Such a change in the calendar would also lengthen the period in the summer available to the Faculty to pursue research and prepare their courses. Professor George said that he would not be in favor of such a plan, since shortening Interterm, an effect of the proposed change in the calendar, would reduce the time that science students would have to do honors work in January. Professor Woglom pointed out that the Faculty accomplishes a good deal of administrative work during Interterm. Professor O'Hara noted that Interterm is also a time during which academic support programs, such as the Phoenix Program and the calculus prep course for spring semester, are provided.

Acknowledging those counter arguments, President Marx noted that, since only about one-eighth of Amherst students do honors work during Interterm, and because there is insufficient programming during Interterm at present to utilize it fully as an educational experience, a change in the calendar might make sense. He said that, while he has been working to develop an Interterm Colloquium program, this program will not fill the entire time period devoted to Interterm, under the present structure. The President said that, while he could imagine other interesting programs that could be created for Interterm, they would be costly and would require fundraising. He suggested that time and resources might be more productively spent on other more essential educational projects at the College. Having a shorter Interterm and providing additional time for educational pursuits during three months in the summer might be a good alternative to the current model, the President noted.

Professor Parker agreed that there are merits to such an argument, noting that many Amherst students do not put the Interterm period to educational use. He said that he is aware of many institutions of higher learning that follow a calendar similar to that being proposed by UMass. Professor George noted that if the university changed its calendar and Amherst did not, Amherst students could still take classes at UMass, as long as spring break was moved. The President wondered if that approach is consistent with a spirit of Five-College cooperation. The Dean said that he would send the minutes of the Chairs meeting to the Faculty soon.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, October 2, 2006**

“Under Questions to the Administration,” Professor Parker said that a colleague had brought to his attention an inconsistency between the letter (posted at <http://www.amherst.edu/alumni/future/letter22sep06.html>) that the President sent recently to all alumni, and the minutes of the September 22 meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). Those minutes describe a discussion of whether there should be a writing requirement at Amherst. Professor Parker noted that President Marx states in his letter that the Faculty has “resolved to institute a new requirement: that all students select among courses specifically designed to improve writing and offered across the disciplines.” Dean Call said that some members of the CEP were on leave last year and were not present during the Faculty’s discussion of the Report of the Committee on Academic Priorities. He explained that the Faculty did vote in favor of instituting a writing requirement, but did not endorse a specific proposal. The Ad Hoc Committee on Writing has been charged with developing a proposal for a writing requirement, which will be brought before the Faculty for discussion and a vote.

The Committee returned briefly to the subject of admissions policy. The members continued their discussion of data-gathering and analysis as a means of developing a better understanding of the distribution of academic qualifications in classes over the last decade and the academic experiences of underprepared students at Amherst; informing considerations about how the College can meet the academic needs of all students; and guiding the development of admissions policy at the College. The Committee also focused on identifying what, specifically, the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid should be asked to explore in regard to these issues.

Considering each proposal individually and in the order in which they are listed here, the Committee next voted on the substance (having voted at the September 25 meeting of the Committee to forward the proposals to the Faculty) of the proposals for Five College certificates in: Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies; Asian/ Pacific/ American Studies; and Native American Studies. The members voted four in favor and two opposed (Professors Schneider and Woglom dissented) on the first proposal and three in favor (Professors George, Hilborn, and O’Hara), two opposed (Professors Schneider and Woglom), with one abstention (Professor Parker) on the second and third proposals. The Committee then reviewed the agenda for the Faculty Meeting of October 17 and voted unanimously to forward it to the Faculty.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Thursday, October 5, 2006**

The seventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 8:15 A.M. on Thursday, October 5, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Dean thanked the members for agreeing to gather for a second meeting this week. The Committee agreed to focus on reviewing the Dean’s draft of their request to the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA), so that the FCAFA could begin its work as soon as possible. Professor Woglom said that, before turning to this task, he wanted to share some comments with the members.

While noting that he does not have a problem with the way that his remarks about admissions have been recorded in the Committee of Six minutes in recent weeks, Professor Woglom said that he wanted to make his points more clearly. He noted that he is not concerned with the effects that shifts in the applicant pool have on average SAT scores at the College. He also agrees that, once a student matriculates at Amherst, the College has a responsibility to make him or her feel welcome and to provide the student with the best possible education. He is, however, concerned with the number of matriculating students with low academic credentials and with the fact that these students have apparently been assigned better reader ratings than would have been the case in the past. He believes that the College has a responsibility to keep track of these students’ effect on and engagement with the curriculum. First and foremost, the College needs to know whether these students on average are being well served: 1) Do they take full advantage of our open curriculum; 2) Are there courses available for their particular educational needs; 3) Do they perform up to their potential? In addition, Professor Woglom said, the College has a responsibility to assess the costs of admitting these students to the College as a whole: 1) What is the quality of the students who are denied admission to accommodate non-academic admits; 2) How many resources are devoted to the special needs of these students; 3) What is the effect of these students on our curriculum? Professor Woglom noted that he does not mean to suggest that he knows the answers to these questions, but he feels that it is important to recognize that Amherst has no reliable answers to these questions and no mechanism in place to provide the answers.

The President responded that, in his view, there are three issues to cull from the Committee’s recent discussions about admissions: the need to provide support for underprepared students at the College; the need to explore admissions policy in the context of recent unanticipated events; and the ongoing need for the Faculty to have a full range of data available to inform admission policy decisions. The President reiterated his view that the College can accomplish its goal of increasing further the diversity of the student body while maintaining its academic standards. He said once again that the College will continue to strive to raise the floor in admission for all categories of applicants, through new outreach programs and other strategies, while working toward identified goals.

Professor Schneider noted that challenges surrounding underprepared students at Amherst are longstanding, pre-dating current initiatives to increase diversity. He suggested that issues of

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Thursday, October 5, 2006**

both admissions policy and practice should be examined. Professor O'Hara said that she feels that there are a greater number of underprepared students at the College now than there have been in the past. In her view, it is essential that the Faculty is trained in the best ways to develop the potential of the full spectrum of Amherst students. At present, she feels that the College, after admitting some students, is failing to enable them to fulfill their academic aspirations and meet their career goals.

The President reiterated that the College has been working and will continue to work toward providing a full range of academic support for less well-prepared students. Professor Woglom noted that there may be a threshold for such students at Amherst, and that the College should recognize that the Faculty may not be able to serve the needs of some students with low academic credentials. Professor Hilborn said that the College is currently not facing the consequences of admitting students with a broad spectrum of preparation. The President asked the members if they feel that there should be any adjustments in the admission process while the Faculty develops a better understanding of what is happening with admissions. They agreed that some adjustments might be useful. President Marx reiterated the importance of incorporating more subjective measures into the admissions process, noted the subjectivity also of the SATs, and expressed his confidence in the judgement of our admissions colleagues.

The members agreed that the FCAFA should be asked to examine these important issues surrounding admissions at Amherst and asked the Dean to communicate the following request to the members of the committee:

The Committee of Six asks the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) to analyze the distribution of academic qualifications in classes over the last decade, based on data in the applications for admission, particularly standardized test scores and reader ratings. How do the distributions of these measures compare? The Committee of Six also requests that the FCAFA, Dean Tom Parker, and Marian Matheson review the compilation and presentation of admissions data available to the Faculty, and make proposals for any possible expansion thereof, including longitudinal and comparative studies of admissions statistics and models that will illustrate how student attributes at the time of admission contribute to their academic outcomes at Amherst in relation to their educational and career goals. In making this request, the Committee of Six reminds all members of the community that individual students should not become a focus of this review. The Committee asks for a brief response by the end of December 2006, to be shared with the whole Faculty on a password-protected basis.

Professor Woglom suggested that the Committee recommend that the Faculty postpone discussion of admission issues at Faculty Meetings until the FCAFA completes its report, which should be in December. He also agreed with President Marx that the cases of individual students

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Thursday, October 5, 2006**

should not be discussed at Faculty Meetings. Professor Parker said that he would feel uncomfortable asking colleagues not to ask questions. Professor O'Hara suggested that, at the October 17 faculty meeting, colleagues be asked to forward comments and questions about this admissions issue to the FCAFA. The Committee agreed that this was a satisfactory approach to this dilemma.

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Committee of Six Minutes of Monday, October 16, 2006

The eighth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, October 16, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Dean began the meeting by distributing to the members an amendment to the motion regarding reporting at the Commencement Meeting of the Faculty the minimum grade point average for students earning a degree with Distinction. Professor Tranbarger sent the amendment to the Dean, and Dean Call said that it would be distributed at the Faculty Meeting. It reads as follows:

That the Faculty authorizes the Registrar at the Commencement Meeting of the Faculty to report **information about the minimum distribution of** grade point averages **for students earning a degree. Such information may include,** to two decimal places, ~~for students earning a degree with Distinction~~ **the minimum, maximum, 25th percentile, 75th percentile, median, and mean.**

Some members of the Committee expressed concern that the amendment calls for information that is not relevant to the issue at hand, and that this revised language could confound the consideration of whether the cutoff for a degree with Distinction should be discussed publicly. At the same time, they noted that the full data set of grade distributions would be of interest in other contexts.

The Dean next passed out to the Committee revisions that were made by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) to the revised charge to the committee that was proposed by the Committee of Six. The charge, incorporating both committees’ changes (the Committee of Six’s changes in bold capital letters and the CEP’s changes in bold) follows:

I. *The Committee on Educational Policy.* The Committee on Educational Policy (**CEP**) is composed of five faculty members, each serving a three-year term; **THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY, EX OFFICIO, WITHOUT VOTE; a researcher from the Dean’s office, ex officio, without vote;** and three student members, each serving a two-year term. The Humanities, the Social Sciences and the Natural Sciences must be represented on the committee, by both faculty members and student members. Each year the committee chooses its own chair ~~and secretary~~ from among its five faculty members, **and the researcher serves as committee secretary.** The chair sets the committee’s agenda. Nominations of the faculty members for the Committee on Educational Policy are made by the Committee of Six and reported to the Faculty in advance of the Faculty meeting at which they are to be elected.

The Committee on Educational Policy is expected to **study-review and evaluate, and to report to the Faculty,** on the general educational policy of the college;; to consider suggestions from departments or from individual ~~F~~faculty members or students relating to changes in educational policy, including proposals for new

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, October 16, 2006**

courses, new programs, and altered major programs or honors requirements;; and to make recommendations to the Committee of Six and the Faculty. ~~IN~~ **ADDITION, THE** Committee on Educational Policy advises the President and the Dean of the Faculty about the allocation of **TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK** faculty positions to departments. **IN MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FTE SUCH ALLOCATIONS, THE COMMITTEE CONSIDERS THE CURRICULAR NEEDS OF INDIVIDUAL DEPARTMENTS AND THE COMMITMENT OF DEPARTMENTS TO OFFER COURSES THAT MEET IDENTIFIED COLLEGE-WIDE PRIORITIES AND CURRICULAR NEEDS.**

Professor Hilborn commented that the CEP's revisions are effective in making explicit the role of the CEP and the regularity with which the committee would be reporting to the Faculty.

In regard to the revised charge, Professor George asked the Dean if there are cases of staff members serving on faculty committees and expressed some discomfort with having the CEP Researcher serve on the CEP, even without a vote. He noted that he does not have any objection to the individual who is currently serving as the Researcher, but questioned the structure that is being proposed. The Dean said that the CEP has requested this structure, and that, under this proposal, the Researcher would serve as a liaison between the CEP and the Office of Institutional Research and take the minutes of the CEP meetings. The Researcher has also been asked by the CEP to review course proposals and to bring to the committee's attention courses that appear not to conform to the CEP's stated guidelines. Dean Call noted that the members of the CEP would receive copies of all course proposals, not just those identified by the Researcher in this way. Professor Woglom asked if it might be beneficial for the Director of Institutional Research to serve on the CEP. Dean Call said that such a structure has been discussed, and the CEP felt that it would not be the most efficient use of the Director of Institutional Research's time to have her serve on the CEP, but that she should be asked to meet with the Committee on an as-needed basis. Professor O'Hara agreed that it would be valuable to have an institutional research presence on the CEP, but she did not see the necessity of having the individual who provides the administrative support to the committee serve as a member and of including the Researcher in the charge in this way. Other members agreed. The Dean said that he would convey the Committee's views to the CEP and would report back.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Parker said that he has heard from colleagues that some Amherst students who come from less privileged backgrounds have unique non-academic needs, including debt incurred prior to matriculation, and face substantial economic challenges that should be addressed by the College. He noted that the Dean of Students Office is providing a great deal of valuable assistance, but that it appears that more needs to be done. President Marx agreed, noting that there is a clear need for support in this area, as has been discussed in recent years by many committees of the Faculty. He noted that last year, he created a "green dean" position in his office for the purpose of developing ways to assist students who come from less privileged backgrounds. Rachel Cardona '04, who assumed the position last year and is continuing this year, has helped to establish programs for peer mentoring and to bring families to campus for Family Weekend who otherwise could not afford to come. She has also helped develop systems for resolving financial challenges that are unique to students

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, October 16, 2006**

from these backgrounds. Professor O'Hara said that help seems to be offered most often on an episodic basis and that it is beneficial to put additional systems in place to serve students' needs more effectively and proactively.

The Dean informed the members that, in consultation with Deans Lieber and Snively, he has arranged for supplementary support so that the Writing Center can hire additional tutors and double the number of sessions that will be available to students this year (Sunday through Thursday evenings). In addition, a former Writing Center fellow has been hired to provide further support during crunch times in the semester.

Continuing "Questions from Committee Members," Professor George said that some colleagues have suggested to him that he is attempting to shut off the discussion at Faculty Meetings of issues raised in the Committee of Six minutes. He asked to be recognized at the Faculty Meeting so that he can explain his view that more of a distinction should be made between questions about the Committee of Six minutes and questions to the administration. He said that he would emphasize that the Committee of Six is not an arm of the administration and that the President and the Dean should not be answering all questions for the Committee of Six. Professor Woglom said that an explanation is not necessary, since it is the Committee of Six's responsibility to develop the order of business at Faculty Meetings. Professor George said that he wanted to reassure colleagues that he is not attempting to suppress or manage faculty discussion. The President agreed to recognize Professor George at the Faculty Meeting as he had requested.

In another matter relating to the October 17 meeting of the Faculty, Professor Hilborn noted that the proposals for the three Five-College certificates that will be discussed were endorsed and brought forward by the CEP last year. Typically, a member of the CEP would make the relevant motions at the Faculty Meeting during which these certificates would be considered, he said. The Committee agreed that, because these proposals had been carried over from last year and the membership of the CEP has changed since the endorsement, the Committee of Six's role would be to put the proposals before the Faculty. Current and former members of the CEP and colleagues who are most interested in the proposals should then be called on to address these programs. The Dean said that he had contacted the colleagues who have been most involved in these proposals to see if they wish to speak at the Faculty Meeting.

The Dean was next asked a procedural question relating to personnel matters.

The members reviewed eleven course proposals and voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward them to the Faculty. They expressed concerns relating to enrollment limits, the requirement of instructor's consent, and poor writing in regard to some course proposals. The Dean agreed to convey the Committee's views to the faculty members involved and to make corrections, when needed, before the courses should be forwarded to the Faculty.

In the course of the conversation about enrollment limits, Professor O'Hara recalled a faculty discussion about explicit criteria that the Faculty might use to limit enrollment in their classes during pre-registration. She asked Dean Call to refresh her memory. He said that he believes that the discussion to which she was referring took place in 2003-2004 as part of the CEP's consideration of this issue, which culminated in a motion that was brought before the Faculty and approved in May 2004.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, October 16, 2006**

The Dean reminded the members that all courses now remain open throughout the pre-registration period, even if the number of students pre-registered for a course exceeds the enrollment limit for the course. At the end of pre-registration, faculty members whose courses are oversubscribed may instruct the Registrar to choose by lottery which students to drop from the course. Faculty members continue to have the option of determining their own class lists, whether after pre-registration, or during the add/drop period, the Dean said. The Registrar, at the request of the instructor, will remove students from the class list if they are registered for the course but are not in attendance during the add/drop period.

The Committee then turned to personnel matters.

The Dean next distributed to the members a letter (appended) that was sent to the Committee by Professor Himmelstein, Chair of the Committee on Educational Policy, on behalf of the committee. The CEP expressed concern that there is a discrepancy between the sum and substance of the Faculty's discussion of writing instruction during its consideration of the report of the Committee on Academic Priorities and the letter sent by the President to alumni on September 22, in which President Marx wrote that the "faculty has resolved to institute a new requirement: that all students select among courses specifically designed to improve writing and offered across the curriculum." The CEP expressed the view that the Faculty has not voted to institute a writing requirement and that the Faculty has not agreed that such a requirement would involve courses "specifically designed to improve writing."

President Marx acknowledged that the language used in his letter could have provided greater clarity. He noted that, immediately after the letter was sent to alumni, he began hosting a Web discussion forum at <http://www.amherst.edu/alumni/future/>, which features his responses to comments and questions from alumni, parents, and friends; information about emerging initiatives; and related information. The language used on this site more fully reflects the ongoing process of developing implementation proposals for writing, he said. (The site reads as follows: "In coming months, the Committee on Educational Policy, in consultation with a faculty-led working group on writing and the College's Writing Center, will be formulating an implementation proposal to bring before the faculty for deliberation and a vote.") President Marx said that he continues to respect the Faculty's deliberative process.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty



AMHERST COLLEGE
Department of Anthropology and Sociology

October 13, 2006

Greg Call
Dean of the Faculty

Dear Greg:

Please communicate to the President and the Committee of Six our great dismay at the following assertion in Tony's September 22 letter to "Alumni and Friends":

For the first time since 1978, the faculty has resolved to institute a new requirement: that all students select among courses specifically designed to improve writing and offered across the curriculum.

We don't think that the faculty has in fact voted to institute a writing requirement. We also don't think that the faculty has agreed that such a requirement would involve courses "specifically designed to improve writing."

This is simply not what the "Sum and Substance" of Faculty discussion of the CAP report says. That document says that there was "broad support for the proposition that the College needs to insure better instruction in writing." However, it notes that "some faculty members ... expressed reservations about whether a requirement was the best way to ensure that all students receive the writing instruction they need." It also says that the details of any writing requirement will have to be voted by the faculty. This leaves open the possibility that the faculty might reject any proposal that comes before it.

In addition, neither the Sum and Substance nor the CAP report expresses an opinion on whether these courses need to be "specifically designed." Indeed, the report of the Working Group on Writing defines "writing attentive" courses in a way that many existing courses would qualify.

Tony's letter also pre-empts the CEP, the new Committee on Writing, and the normal channels of faculty governance. We are implicitly under the injunction to come up with a writing requirement. We are apparently precluded from concluding any of the following: (1) A writing requirement is not the best way to insure adequate writing instruction; (2) Priority should be placed on improving the teaching of writing before considering a writing requirement; (3) A writing requirement should be implemented largely using existing courses. The CEP thinks that there is much left to be discussed here before presenting a proposal of any kind to the Committee of Six and the Faculty.

Finally, constraining the role of the CEP in this way runs counter to the CAP's recommendation that the policy-making powers of the CEP be strengthened.

Sincerely,

Jerome L. Himmelstein
Chair, Committee on Educational Policy

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, October 23, 2006**

The ninth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, October 23, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

President Marx noted that the meetings of the Board of Trustees held from October 20 through October 21 were a productive start to the Board’s deliberations on the report of the CAP. In light of the Faculty’s desire to receive reports of the Board’s meetings, he asked the members whether it would be preferable for him to give a report at the next Faculty Meeting or whether he should offer his comments to the Committee of Six, for inclusion in the minutes. The members said that they prefer the latter approach. The President agreed to give the report to the Committee.

The Dean distributed to the Committee the minutes of the meeting of October 16. He asked the members for their thoughts regarding the email (appended) that he had received from Professor Rockwell and had shared with the Committee of Six at his request. Dean Call said that he understands Professor Rockwell’s concerns regarding the possibility of requiring departments to use every time slot for teaching courses before any slot is used a second time. Like language courses, calculus courses at different levels are purposely taught simultaneously so as to offer maximum flexibility for students, Dean Call noted. Professor Hilborn said that the science departments have developed their own scheduling agreement to ensure that introductory science courses do not conflict. Professor Schneider noted that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and the Committee of Six have not yet considered whether this structure might be workable and desirable at Amherst. The members agreed that the CEP should be asked to review this issue and requested that the Dean share Professor Rockwell’s email with the CEP. The Dean said that information about course meeting time usage between fall 2004 and fall 2006 is available on the College’s institutional research Web site at <http://www.amherst.edu/~oir/> and that he encourages the Faculty to review these data.

The Committee next discussed a letter (appended) that Professor Hall sent to the members in which he expresses concerns about the practice of soliciting in-class student evaluations of tenure-track faculty members and about grade inflation. The Dean reminded the members that the Committee of Six does not consider proposals regarding tenure procedures while it is engaged in tenure deliberations. Dean Call suggested that Professor Hall’s letter be shared with the CEP and the Ad Hoc Committee on the Evaluation and Improvement of Teaching. Professor Woglom agreed that the letter should be forwarded to both committees, noting that, given the concerns expressed in the letter, the CEP was the appropriate committee to consider this issue. Professor George expressed the view that the Committee of Six, because of its role in tenure and promotion decisions, should also consider these concerns. Professor O’Hara expressed the view that the CEP should be the starting point, but that the Committee of Six should take up this issue at the appropriate moment, after it has gone through the proper governance channels. The Committee agreed.

The Dean asked the members for their views regarding the distribution of the Committee of Six minutes, since the issue was raised at the October 17 faculty meeting. After some discussion, the Committee agreed that the default should be that faculty members receive the minutes in hard-copy form. If colleagues wish not to have hard copies sent to them, they will be asked to indicate their preference to the Dean’s office. The minutes will continue to be posted

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, October 23, 2006**

online, and all faculty members will be notified when minutes are posted. Acknowledging that the review/approval process for the minutes is time-consuming and is accomplished on a tight schedule, particularly for the minutes of meetings that occur in close succession before a faculty meeting, the Dean, the President and the members agreed to continue to make efforts to make the minutes available in the most timely manner possible.

Discussion turned to the topic of whether there is sufficient business to have a faculty meeting on the next available date, which is November 7. The members agreed that there were not enough action items to warrant a faculty meeting. Professor Woglom proposed that an open meeting might be held to allow for further faculty discussion of the process for refining the recommendations of the CAP and to allow time for discussion of issues raised in the Committee of Six minutes. Most members preferred that time be made available for such discussions at the next faculty meeting in December.

Professor George next suggested that the President stop the business of faculty meetings at 9:15 to allow time for questions to the administration, while continuing the commitment to end the meeting at 9:30. Professor Woglom said that the Faculty should return to the business of the meeting if there are no questions. Professor Schneider expressed his sense that, above all, the Faculty wants to know that time is being given in a conscious way for questions and that there is a sensitivity to this issue. The Committee agreed that it is important for the Faculty to have the opportunity to ask questions of the administration. At the same time, the members view placement of the question period at the end of the meeting, rather than at the beginning, as a way to ensure that ample time is provided for other business of the meeting.

The Dean conveyed a request by Professor Viggo Kann, who is spending this semester at Amherst as a STINT (the Swedish Foundation for International Cooperation in Research and Higher Education) Fellow. A Swedish computer scientist, Professor Kann is using his time at Amherst to learn about how an American liberal arts college functions. He has asked the Dean if he can receive the public minutes of the Committee of Six to aid him in this pursuit. After the Dean reviewed the criteria that his office uses to determine who receives the public minutes, the members agreed to allow Professor Kann to receive the minutes. The Dean next asked the Committee's views on allowing Scott Payne, the College's new Director of Academic Technology Services (formerly Curricular Computing), to attend faculty meetings with voice but without vote. The members agreed that Mr. Payne should attend faculty meetings with voice but without vote.

The Committee then turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

-----Original Message-----

From: Paul Rockwell
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2006 3:17 PM
To: Gregory Call
Cc: Frederick Griffiths
Subject: scheduling and foreign languages

Dear Greg,

I am writing to bring to the attention of the Committee of Six an issue specific to the foreign language departments, which arises because of placement issues for in-coming Frosh.

In the Committee of Six minutes for its meeting at the end of August, it was suggested that perhaps departments should be required to use all of the time slots available for courses before a second course can be taught at an identical time as another course in that same department. I admit that this might be a good strategy in most programs. But for foreign languages, it would cause a problem.

In foreign languages, the students arrive without any reliable means of knowing exactly what level of language instruction to sign up for. Foreign Language courses in secondary schools are notoriously variable in their quality. In some, students learn writing well, but cannot speak. In others the opposite is true. In some, four years of study is equal to two years of study in another.

No reliable placement exams exist that test all four skills (speaking, listening comprehension, writing, and reading). Those institutions that use them are constantly complaining about advanced students placing into introductory courses, etc. etc.

We have dealt with this problem by allowing students to change sections of their courses during the add/drop period. They visit a course and decide that it is too easy or too hard for them, and then change their registrations when they find the level that is reasonable for them.

This is most easily done, for example, when a section of French 5 is being taught in the same time slot as a section of French 7. Students can then migrate between different levels of ability without having to re-do their entire schedule. If they need to move from 5 to 7 or vice versa, they just change their registrations and no scheduling problems emerge from the change.

If French 5 is forced to be scheduled at a different time than French 7, it is possible that a student needing to change levels will encounter a scheduling conflict at the different time slot.

The end result of this well-intentioned proposal is that more students would end up taking foreign language courses at levels that do not correspond to their level of competence at the time of their arrival on campus. This is not setting students up for success. If a student takes a course that is over his or her head, then they will surely not have a good first-semester experience. If a student enrolls in a course that is too easy, simply to satisfy a bureaucratic desire to spread the course schedule out over the full range of scheduling times, he or she is not going to encounter the proper challenge to his or her abilities in their first semester.

If this proposal is eventually to be adopted as policy, then perhaps certain exceptions could be made for foreign language placement purposes.

Yours sincerely,

Paul Rockwell
Dean of New Students

AMHERST COLLEGE
Department of Physics

September 29, 2006

The Committee of Six
c/o Dean Gregory S. Call, Secretary
Campus Box 2209

Dear Colleagues,

I write as a recently tenured member of the faculty to express some concerns about the College's current practice of soliciting in-class student evaluations of its untenured faculty. These concerns are related principally to what I see as undesirable side-effects of the otherwise laudable goal of ascertaining how our junior colleagues are faring in the classroom, and are informed in part by my own experiences as an assistant professor.

Let me begin with the widely-held perception that student evaluations play an extremely important role in the tenure decision. This perception, whether or not justified in fact, constitutes a subtle pressure to teach in ways that lead towards more positive student evaluations. In perhaps its most obvious manifestation it is another upward pressure on the grades we assign in the classroom, at a moment when many of us feel that the scale is such that the distinctions nominally available to a thirteen-point system are already reduced to only three or four.

I believe this pressure can be even more profoundly damaging in two fundamental ways. First, maintaining broadly positive student evaluations can lead to conservative teaching approaches that stifle innovation and experimentation, especially among our younger colleagues. There is considerable risk associated with developing new teaching techniques, especially those unfamiliar to the students, if experimental "failure" (as measured by student evaluations) is perceived to be closely linked to whether or not the instructor is reappointed or tenured.

Second, the use of student evaluations in reappointment and tenure decisions can pressure the faculty to make courses less demanding and less rigorous, out of a fear that students will view an instructor more favorably if they are not constantly being pushed to their limits. Again, it is the perception, if not the fact, of the role of the student evaluations in the tenure process that

contributes to this pressure. I believe most of us are aware of this pressure and resist it as best we can, but this is not to say we are uniformly successful. I know I have not always been.

Finally, the constant use of student evaluations may be feeding a growing sense of entitlement among the students, in which the faculty are viewed as merely employees of a kind of service industry.¹ The diminution of faculty status makes it more likely, in my opinion, for evaluations to be used in ways that compromise our ability to teach and grade fairly. The most vulnerable among us are those for whom the evaluations are directly interpreted by tenure committees as measures of our suitability for continued employment. I am also concerned about how these side-effects will develop as we contemplate student evaluations for the senior faculty, where promotion and salary may one day replace reappointment and tenure as the loci of apprehension.

I suspect that these concerns, and others, have been articulated and discussed many times over the course of the past decade. Yet it seems appropriate to ask the Committee to revisit them as we contemplate the expansion of the role of student evaluations beyond the junior faculty. Perhaps the most pernicious side-effects of our current use of student evaluations can be ameliorated or even eliminated with some creativity in their administration and use. At the very least, we owe it to our junior colleagues to give the matter some additional thought.

Sincerely yours,

David S. Hall
Associate Professor of Physics
(413) 542-2072, -5821 (FAX)
dshall@amherst.edu

¹Benton, Thomas H. 2006. A Tough-Love Manifesto for Professors. Chronicle of Higher Education, 9 June. Available at <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v52/i40/4Oc00101.htm>.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, October 30, 2006**

The tenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, October 30, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The minutes of October 16 were approved, and changes to the minutes of October 23 were given to the Dean. During the review of those minutes, Professor O’Hara observed that the language of the following motion, which was approved by the Faculty on October 17, authorizes the Registrar to report information about the distribution of grade point averages in an ascending fashion:

The Faculty authorizes the Registrar at the Commencement Meeting of the Faculty to report information about the distribution of grade point averages for students earning a degree. Such information may include, to two decimal places, the minimum, maximum, 25th percentile, 75th percentile, median, and mean.

She noted that the Committee’s conversation about the distribution of grade point averages—and questions on this topic that have been raised during previous faculty meetings—has occurred in the context of discussions about the cutoff for earning a degree with distinction. As a result, the distribution has typically been described in descending order, that is, from the top 25 percent down. Professor O’Hara suggested that it would be best if the distribution of grade point averages is discussed in a consistent way in the future. The Dean agreed.

Under his announcements, President Marx informed the members that he has received many responses to the letter that he sent to alumni this fall about the priorities and future directions of the College. He noted that a number of alumni have expressed the view that the College should provide students with assistance with public speaking, a skill that many Amherst graduates find is of great value. President Marx remarked that this emphasis on public speaking took him a bit by surprise, and he asked the members where this question might be directed for consideration. Professor Hilborn asked the President whether the alumni who wrote feel that Amherst alumni lack public speaking skills. President Marx replied that it is more his sense that the alumni feel that it would be desirable to provide students with the opportunity to receive training or instruction in this area.

Professor Schneider said that he feels that faculty members in most disciplines already provide a healthy amount of instruction in public speaking within their classes by assigning students presentations and offering feedback on student performance. Professor Parker acknowledged the roles that oratory played at earlier moments in the College’s history, and noted the vestigial traces of its former prominence in the public speaking and debate competitions held on campus each year. He hoped that the alumni who wrote to the President about this issue would be interested in learning why, today, the notion of public speaking as a curricular end in itself is widely considered foreign to the mission of the liberal arts. Professor O’Hara wondered if addressing this request from alumni might be done through teaching and learning programs.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, October 30, 2006**

Continuing his announcements, the President informed the members that Dean Call and he met with the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) on October 27. The CEP stressed to them that it would like to ensure that, after a number of years of intensive planning and the creation of a variety of ad hoc committees, the College should return to normal channels of faculty governance and should regularize the CEP's enhanced role. The President and the Dean agreed. They reviewed with the CEP the process by which the Ad Hoc Committee on Writing and the Ad Hoc Committee on the Evaluation and Improvement of Teaching were created and the committees' role in the process of refining the relevant CAP recommendations.

President Marx conveyed to the members that there has been some confusion about the role of the CEP in this process. He noted that the Committee of Six assigned to the CEP the role of working with the Ad Hoc Committee on Writing to develop a proposal for a writing requirement, which will be brought before the Faculty for discussion and a vote. However, the CEP has been under the impression that it would be developing this proposal. After discussion, it was agreed that the two committees should work together on a writing proposal, that the Ad Hoc Committee would issue a report that would go to the CEP, and that the CEP would deliberate on the report and then forward it, with its recommendations, to the Committee of Six. In turn, the Committee of Six would review the proposal and forward it to the Faculty for a vote.

In terms of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Evaluation and Improvement of Teaching, the President said that the CEP was not among the bodies originally charged by the Committee of Six with exploring and recommending ways to improve teaching, including a system of evaluating the teaching of senior faculty members. Because this issue was not strictly curricular, the Committee of Six had imagined that the Ad Hoc Committee would issue its report to the Committee of Six directly. The President said that the CEP feels that it should play a role in this process, particularly because the report may focus on broader pedagogical matters, not just evaluation, and because including the CEP in this reporting chain would be consistent with the enhanced role of the committee. The members agreed that it would be beneficial to have the CEP deliberate on the Ad Hoc Committee's report before the document comes to the Committee of Six, although several members said that it is important not to set a precedent that all committee proposals be channeled through multiple committees.

President Marx next shared with the members a report of the recent meetings of the Board of Trustees, as requested: "The Board is encouraged by the faculty endorsement of the CAP goals and priorities, informed by the sum and substance of the Faculty's discussion. The January Instruction meeting of the Board will be an opportunity for conversations with faculty members on pertinent College committees. The trustees look forward to discussing curricular, access and financial implications of the CAP goals and priorities with, among others, the Committee on Educational Policy, the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid, and the Committee on Priorities and Resources. These conversations should lead to the further refinement of plans for the future, including for a fundraising campaign." The members thanked the President for conveying this summary of the Board's views.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, October 30, 2006**

The Dean made several announcements. He noted, with great sorrow, the death on October 29 of Trinkett Clark, Curator of American Art at the Mead Art Museum. He informed the members that the Amherst community can share memories, condolences, and thoughts about Trinkett Clark at www.amherst.edu/mead. Entries are public, but there is an option to leave a private message that will be delivered to the family. Plans are under way for celebration at the College of her life, and the Dean said that he will keep the community informed as details are finalized. The members expressed their sadness at this tragic loss.

The Committee then turned to personnel matters.

Dean Call next informed the members that the UMass Calendar Committee has decided that no changes will be made to the UMass calendar before 2009-2010. The Five-College Deans agreed that a Five-College calendar task force (made up of two faculty members from each institution) should be formed to deliberate on the university's proposal to begin the spring semester two weeks earlier than it starts at present and to assess the effects of such a change on the academic programs of the five institutions. After discussion, the members requested that the Dean ask the members of the College Council to put forward two of its faculty members as Amherst's representatives on the task force. He agreed.

Continuing his announcements, Dean Call confirmed that a search committee has been formed for the position of Director of the Mead Art Museum. The members are Professors Robert Bezucha (Chair), Carol Clark, Rick Griffiths (Associate Dean of the Faculty), and Carol Keller; Suzannah Fabing, former Director of the Smith College Museum of Art; Michael Kasper, Reference Librarian/Coordinator of the Collection Development for the Amherst College Library; and Kenneth Rosenthal '60, attorney, businessman, and former treasurer of Hampshire College. Lisa Graziose Corrin, Director of the Williams College Museum of Art, will be of counsel to the search committee. The Dean and the Committee expressed gratitude for the willingness of these colleagues to serve on the search committee.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Parker asked that the Committee discuss, sometime in the future, the topic of departmental external reviews. The Dean agreed to add this subject to the Committee's agenda.

The Committee then returned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Thursday, November 2, 2006**

The eleventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Thursday, November 2, 2006. Present were Professors S. George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Associate Dean Griffiths, Recorder. Professor Schneider was unable to attend because of a prior engagement. President Marx left the meeting at 3:40 to honor a prior engagement.

The Committee turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Committee of Six Minutes of Monday, November 13, 2006

The twelfth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, November 13, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The minutes of October 23, October 30, and November 3 were approved.

Under “Announcements from the President,” President Marx asked the Dean where the discussion stands about the proposal that Amherst staff members be permitted to enroll in credit-bearing courses at the College. He was queried about the status of this proposal at an open meeting that he had with staff members on November 8. The Dean informed the members that, last year, the Committee of Six and the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) recommended that staff members be permitted to enroll in courses if they receive the approval of the faculty member teaching the course and if this approval is communicated in writing to the Registrar prior to enrollment. Dean Call said that he believes that the CEP still needs to give its final approval and that he would check to see when the committee plans to revisit this issue.

Dean Call shared with the members three letters (appended) sent to the Committee by the CEP. The Committee discussed first the CEP’s suggested changes to Professor George’s proposal that the section of the College Catalog on Examinations and Extensions (page 56) be clarified. After some discussion, the members agreed on the following language, which incorporates the CEP’s changes and some small additional revisions, and asked the Dean to share the following revised version (with all changes in bold capital letters) with the CEP:

Examinations are held at the end of each semester and at intervals in the year in many courses. At the end of each semester, final grades are reported and the record for the semester is closed. In conformity with the practice established by the Faculty, no extension of time is allowed for ~~intraterm~~ papers, examinations, and ~~incomplete~~ laboratory or any other course work, **OTHER THAN FINAL EXAMINATIONS, PAPERS, AND PROJECTS** beyond the date of the last scheduled class period of the semester unless an extension is granted in writing by both the instructor and Class Dean. **LIKewise NO EXTENSION BEYOND THE LAST DAY OF FINAL EXAMINATIONS IS ALLOWED FOR SCHEDULED, SELF-SCHEDULED OR TAKE-HOME EXAMINATIONS TO BE TAKEN DURING THE FINAL EXAMINATION PERIOD, INCLUDING FINAL PAPERS AND PROJECTS DUE DURING THE EXAMINATION PERIOD, UNLESS AN EXTENSION IS GRANTED IN WRITING BY BOTH THE INSTRUCTOR AND CLASS DEAN.** Only for medical reasons or those of grave personal emergency will extensions be granted beyond the second day after the examination period.

The Dean agreed and confirmed for the members that a vote of the full Faculty is not required to revise this language since it is meant only to communicate current policy.

Committee of Six Minutes of Monday, November 13, 2006

The Committee next discussed the CEP's letter regarding the revised charge to the committee and the Committee of Six's concerns about the proposal to add a researcher as a member ex officio of the CEP without vote. Professor George said that he feels strongly that a researcher should not be added to the committee's membership. He offered the examples of several administrators who play crucial roles in the work of faculty committees (the Fellowships Coordinator, for the Committee on Student Fellowships, and the Assistant Dean of the Faculty, for the Committee of Six) who are not members of the committees that they support. Professor George commented that, even without vote, as a member of the committee, the researcher would play a role in implementing educational policy, which he feels is not appropriate and is unprecedented. He noted that senior administrators are asked to serve on some committees because they are involved in making and implementing policy. He offered the example of the Treasurer and Director of Human Resources serving, ex officio, on the Committee on Priorities and Resources and the Associate Dean of Students/Associate Director of the Career Center serving, ex officio, on the Committee on Health Professions. Professor George noted that students serve on some faculty committees because they are affected by the decisions and policies made by these committees.

Professor Schneider said that he was persuaded by these examples and arguments and that he agrees that the researcher should not be a member of the CEP. Professor Parker commented that, for reasons of equity in the way faculty committees are structured, he concurred that the researcher should not be on the CEP. He suggested that the role of the researcher be written in to the CEP's charge as a way of ensuring that this position is regularized. The Committee agreed to modify the language (the Committee of Six's most recent changes in bold capital letters) in the following way and asked the Dean to share it with the CEP:

I. The Committee on Educational Policy. The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) is composed of five faculty members, each serving a three-year term; THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY, *EX OFFICIO*, WITHOUT VOTE; ~~A RESEARCHER FROM THE DEAN'S OFFICE, EX OFFICIO, WITHOUT VOTE;~~ and three student members, each serving a two-year term. The Humanities, the Social Sciences and the Natural Sciences must be represented on the committee, by both faculty members and student members. Each year the committee chooses its own chair ~~and secretary~~ from among its five faculty members; **A RESEARCHER APPOINTED BY THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY INFORMS AND SUPPORTS THE WORK OF THE CEP AND THE RESEARCHER SERVES AS COMMITTEE SECRETARY.** The chair sets the committee's agenda. Nominations of the faculty members for the Committee on Educational Policy are made by the Committee of Six and reported to the Faculty in advance of the Faculty meeting at which they are to be elected.

The Committee on Educational Policy is expected to ~~study~~ REVIEW AND EVALUATE, AND TO REPORT TO THE FACULTY ON, the general educational policy of

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, November 13, 2006**

the college; to consider suggestions from departments or from individual Faculty members or students relating to changes in educational policy, including proposals for new courses, new programs, and altered major programs or honors requirements; and to make recommendations to the Committee of Six and the Faculty. ~~In addition,~~ The Committee on Educational Policy advises the President and the Dean of the Faculty about the allocation of TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK faculty positions to departments. IN MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FTE SUCH ALLOCATIONS, THE COMMITTEE CONSIDERS THE CURRICULAR NEEDS OF INDIVIDUAL DEPARTMENTS AND THE COMMITMENT OF DEPARTMENTS TO OFFER COURSES THAT MEET IDENTIFIED COLLEGE-WIDE PRIORITIES AND CURRICULAR NEEDS.

Turning to the last of the letters from the CEP, the members noted that they had already addressed the questions (as discussed in the minutes of October 30, which had yet to be sent to the CEP and the Faculty as a whole) raised by the committee in its letter regarding the role of the CEP in the process of refining the relevant recommendations of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) and the need to return to normal channels of faculty governance after a lengthy period of planning and ad hoc structures. In terms of questions about the CEP's role in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on Writing and the Ad Hoc Committee on the Evaluation and Improvement of Teaching, the Committee of Six has agreed that the CEP and the Ad Hoc Committee on Writing should work together on a writing proposal and that the Ad Hoc Committee would issue a report that would go to the CEP. The CEP would deliberate on the report and then forward it, with its recommendations, to the Committee of Six. In turn, the Committee of Six would review the proposal and forward it to the Faculty for a vote. In terms of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Evaluation and Improvement of Teaching, the Committee of Six has agreed that it would be beneficial to have the CEP deliberate on the Ad Hoc Committee's report before the document comes to the Committee of Six.

Professor Woglom, while agreeing with the process described above and acknowledging the need to return to the normal practices of faculty governance, raised some concern about delays and logjams that might be caused by the unusually high volume of issues that will be funneled through the CEP. Professor O'Hara agreed and suggested that specific timetables should be set for the ad hoc committees' reports to the CEP, and for the CEP's report to the Committee of Six. Several members of the Committee expressed concern that, under the current schedule (both committees have been asked to complete their work by the end of this academic year), proposals regarding writing and senior teaching evaluations would not come before the Faculty for conversations and votes during this academic year. Professor Hilborn noted that the ad hoc committees would certainly have interactions with the CEP and conversations with the Faculty this year, as the committees develop proposals. Professor Woglom said that, even if this is the case, he is concerned that momentum will be lost if the Faculty waits until a year from now to take action. He worries about the effect that such a delay will have on the Board's

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, November 13, 2006**

deliberations about the funding goals of the upcoming capital campaign. President Marx noted that he is mindful of the time that is needed for the ad hoc committees to do their work, and he agreed that it would be helpful for the Board to have any further indications of the Faculty's plans and implementation that can be provided this year, if possible. Professor Woglom wondered if at least one proposal could come before the Faculty this year. The other members agreed and asked the Dean to convey the Committee's view to the CEP. He agreed to do so.

The Dean next discussed with the members a question about the ballot for the upcoming Committee of Six election. The members asked the Dean about the precedent for allowing eligible colleagues to come off the ballot. He responded that to his knowledge colleagues have been removed for medical reasons only. Professor Woglom noted that there have been some exceptions to this rule in the past. Professor Schneider raised questions about the exemption policy, which he views as outdated in light of the College's raised expectations in recent years for Faculty to engage in their scholarly fields in broad ways. Professor O'Hara suggested that each faculty member should have the opportunity, once in a career at Amherst, to be taken off the ballot for extraordinary circumstances. Professor Hilborn said that any number of faculty members take on professional obligations and offered the example of journal editorships. He feels that those who take on such positions should be responsible for balancing their professional obligations with their responsibility to serve the College. The Dean noted that he has had conversations with colleagues about their potential service on the Committee when they are facing unusual challenges, and he said that he is often able to provide support under such circumstances. The members agreed that this is a weighty issue and that they might discuss it more generally in the future.

The members turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

AMHERST COLLEGE
Department of Anthropology and Sociology

November 6, 2006

The Committee of Six and
Gregory A. Call, Dean of the Faculty

Dear Colleagues,

The Committee on Educational Policy has reviewed the proposed change in the "Examinations and Extensions" section of the Amherst College Catalog. We believe that the underlined addition, while important, renders the paragraph-confusing. The third sentence seems to say that no extensions may be granted past the last day of classes for "examinations" or "papers" of any kind without written permission. The fourth sentence clearly implies that some papers and examinations may rightly be completed during the final examination period after classes have ended.

Accordingly we suggest adding to the third sentence after "or any other course work" the phrase "other than final examinations and final papers".

Sincerely,

Jerome L. Himmelstein
Chair, Committee of Educational Policy

AMHERST COLLEGE
Department of Anthropology and Sociology

November 6, 2006

The Committee of Six
c/o Dean of the Faculty

Dear Colleagues:

The Committee on Educational Policy has discussed further the revised charge that the Committee of Six has submitted to us. We understand that several of you have concerns about a "Researcher" being written into the charge as an "ex officio" member of the CEP.

The CEP recommends strongly that the charge remain as currently written. The new responsibilities of the CEP require that the committee have a Researcher available on a regular basis and that this position be institutionalized. Our experience so far is that the Researcher is an integral member of the committee, central to our ongoing deliberations. Making the Researcher a member "ex officio, without vote" is the most straight-forward way to insure that the CEP will have this position available on an ongoing basis and to accord the person holding this position the status she/he deserves.

We are not concerned with the balance on the CEP being somehow tipped away from its faculty members with the addition of an extra ex officio member. We should note that in addition to student members, the Committee on Priorities and Resources has five ex officio members. The current Chair of the CEP, who served on the CPR during 1998-2000, does not recall any dilution of faculty governance as a result.

We look forward to reaching a consensus with you on this matter and forwarding the CEP's new charge to the Faculty.

Sincerely,

Andrea Gyorody '07
William Havemann '07
Jerome L. Himmelstein, Chair
Helen Leung
Susan Niditch
Rohit Raj '08
Robert Sweeney
Martha Umphrey

AMHERST COLLEGE
Department of Anthropology and Sociology

November 6, 2006

The Committee of Six
c/o Dean of the Faculty

Dear Colleagues,

The Committee on Educational Policy met with the President and Dean on October 27. We readily agreed that all proposals regarding the curriculum and pedagogy should go through the CEP, whatever their source and whether or not they are CAP-related. The CEP will discuss these proposals, suggest changes where appropriate, forward them to the Committee of Six, and present them to the faculty. We all agreed that it is time to re-assert the normal channels of faculty governance on curricular and pedagogical issues after a long period of special committees, working groups, and the like.

One issue that we discussed at length was whether or not proposals on requiring student evaluations of senior faculty are a curricular/pedagogical issue. The CEP strongly believes that they are. We note that the ad hoc committee considering this issue has the broader charge of examining the "improvement of teaching" as well. Whether this committee decides that requiring student evaluations of senior faculty is part of improving teaching or in some sense is a separate issue, they are making a pedagogical decision. That is, they are deciding what the improvement of teaching does or does not include.

The CEP looks forward to taking on the expanded responsibilities that the CAP and the Committee of Six have given us.

Sincerely,

Andrea Gyorody '07
William Havemann '07
Jerome L. Himmelstein, Chair
Helen Leung
Susan Niditch
Rohit Raj '08
Robert Sweeney
Martha Umphrey

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Tuesday, November 14, 2006**

The thirteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 4:00 P.M. on Tuesday, November 14, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The members focused on personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Friday, November 17, 2006**

The fourteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Friday, November 17, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with the Dean informing the members that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has approved the most recent version (see minutes of November 13) of changes to the section of the College Catalog on Examinations and Extensions (page 56). In addition, the Dean announced, the CEP voted to permit Amherst staff members to enroll in courses for credit, if they receive the approval of the faculty member teaching the course and if this approval is communicated in writing to the Registrar prior to enrollment. The members expressed their pleasure with the decision. The Dean reported that the CEP also reviewed the most recent version (see minutes of November 13) of the enhanced charge to the CEP and now plans to offer an amendment to the charge to make the Researcher a member ex officio of the committee. The CEP informed the Dean, who absented himself at the CEP’s request during the committee’s discussion of this issue, that writing the Researcher into the charge, as proposed by the Committee of Six, does formally give the CEP the ongoing services of a Researcher, but it does not do justice to the role the Researcher has played and will have to play on future CEPs. In the CEP’s view, the Researcher is not someone who does work on an ad hoc basis for the committee, but instead is an integral part of what the CEP does and is. The members of the Committee of Six said that they do not see the necessity of making the Researcher a member of the CEP. The Committee then voted six to zero in favor on the content of the enhanced charge to the CEP and six to zero to forward the motion to the Faculty.

Professor Schneider next thanked the Dean for inviting the Faculty by email to host students who would be remaining on campus for Thanksgiving. The Dean said that Rachel Cardona, Special Projects Fellow in the Office of the President, has informed him that all the students have been matched with members of the Amherst community, and he thanked colleagues for celebrating the holiday with them.

Under “Questions to the Administration,” Professor George said that there is some concern on the part of the Faculty that tenure decisions might not be made by the end of December. The Committee noted that a motion to extend tenure deliberations beyond December had failed to receive the support of the Faculty. The Dean said that the motion was voted down, but he recalled, as noted in previous years (2004-2005 and 2005-2006) Committee of Six discussions, that it has been determined that language in the *Faculty Handbook* does not preclude tenure deliberations from extending beyond December. The President and the Dean said that there has been no change in the commitment to complete tenure deliberations by December, if at all possible.

The members turned to personnel matters and then discussed a departmental issue.

Dean Call next discussed with the members the positions of lecturers, senior lecturers, and visitors who teach at the College, noting that he is interested in assessing the structure of these positions, not the colleagues who hold them. He informed the Committee that he has

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Friday, November 17, 2006**

already discussed with the CEP the issue of regularizing processes and parameters surrounding these positions and setting term limits for some of them. The Dean said that coaching positions also fall under the category of non-tenure line teaching personnel.

In response to some members' questions of definition, Dean Call noted that visiting professors hold non-tenure-track positions with contracts that are renewable for up to three years, or occasionally four years, and who are often appointed to one-year terms. They generally teach two courses per semester and pursue scholarship. While such positions are designed to fill a temporary need, over time, the Dean said, a few departments have fallen into arrangements in which long-term visitors staff their regular curriculum, a situation that he feels is not in the long-term interests of the individuals or departments involved. The President noted that such long-term visiting positions could have been an end-run around the structures of faculty governance that determine how faculty lines should be distributed. Professor George asked if having such long-term visitors is a violation of the rules of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The Dean replied that the AAUP would not support long-term visiting professorships, since they can evolve into mutually exploitive arrangements. Dean Call said that he has taken steps to move away from long-term visitors. Instead, he has asked departments either to request long-term lectureship positions or, if they deem it more appropriate, to make FTE requests for a tenure-track position. Professor Schneider indicated that, since his wife, Klara Moricz, teaches courses as a visitor at the College, he would not participate in this discussion.

Continuing with his review of position definitions, the Dean noted that Lecturers are hired on three-year contracts, generally teach three courses per semester, and, typically, are not evaluated on their scholarship. After two three-year terms, a lecturer may be eligible for promotion to Senior Lecturer, receiving a five-year contract. Lecturers typically teach regularly for the College. A similar model for coaches, who are hired through national searches, but with four three-year contracts leading, upon successful renewals, to a four-year contract, has now been implemented. After having their contracts renewed for twelve years, coaches are eligible for promotion from Coach to Senior Coach. Regularizing the process of appointing and evaluating coaches has been a focus of the Department of Physical Education and Athletics and the Dean. The President applauded their efforts in this regard, which have resulted in the implementation of a fairer and more professional process. The members agreed that regularizing the positions discussed by the Dean is a positive step for the College.

In the context of considering this array of positions and the Faculty's expression (during the process of the Committee on Academic Priorities last year) of support for building the Faculty by adding practicing artists, the Dean and the President asked the members to consider the pros and cons of adding non-tenure lines for practicing artists or tenure-track lines. They asked whether adopting an artist-in-residence model, which would include most of the privileges of tenured faculty members and a specific-length contract, might be most appropriate for some needs in arts departments. Professors Woglom and Schneider expressed support for exploring various types of appointments for practicing artists, while not precluding tenured and tenure-track appointments. These members agreed that the traditional tenure-track model can be a

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Friday, November 17, 2006**

difficult fit for some practicing artists. Professor Schneider expressed the view that this is a vexed and complex question that requires substantial review and discussion. The Committee agreed, while expressing support for developing creative, but also effective, approaches to this issue. On a related matter, Professor O'Hara said that it is her hope that the College will continue to bring distinguished visitors here to teach. The President said that he supports having distinguished visiting scholars teach at Amherst for short periods, and that the concerns that have emerged surrounding visiting faculty positions relate to having visitors at Amherst for extended periods of time.

Continuing the conversation about faculty positions, Professor Woglom noted that the moment of lifting the FTE cap seems like a good time to be addressing these issues, since departments will be making additional FTE requests. He once again expressed concern that faculty members who become members of the administration remain included in the FTE count and that departments and students may suffer as a result. Professor Woglom suggested that, when a faculty member moves to the administration, he or she should no longer be included in the FTE count. When that faculty member returns to teach in his or her home department(s), his or her FTE would be added back to the FTE count, and one less FTE would be available from the FTE pool that year. He suggested that the President and the Dean ask the Board to consider additional FTEs as faculty replacements for colleagues who are currently serving in the administration. The Dean and the President said that they would consider this idea.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, November 27, 2006**

The fifteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, November 27, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Corrections to the minutes of the meetings of November 13 and 14 were given to the Dean.

The Committee first discussed how best to structure the upcoming faculty meeting of December 5. The Dean told the members that the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) has informed him that the committee is still in the process of considering admission and other data that bear on the questions that the FCAFA is exploring at the request of the Committee of Six. While recognizing that the FCAFA has not yet reached conclusions regarding these questions, the members agreed that it would be beneficial for the Faculty to have an update from the committee at this point. The members suggested that the Dean ask the FCAFA if it would offer at the faculty meeting such an update, a part of which should include a presentation by Tom Parker, Dean of Admission and Financial Aid, and Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research, who provided the committee with much of the data being considered. Professor George expressed concern about having a lengthy discussion of this sort when there would not be a motion before the Faculty. The other members felt strongly that it is important for the full Faculty to learn about this important information at this juncture. The Committee agreed that questions raised by the Faculty at the meeting and individual faculty members’ subsequent communication with the FCAFA, which should be encouraged, could inform the committee’s final report. Due to the sensitive nature of the information that would be discussed, the members agreed that students (with the exception of those who serve on the FCAFA) would not be present during the FCAFA update at the faculty meeting. The members also decided that the Committee’s charge to FCAFA, which was previously included in the Committee of Six minutes, would be attached to the faculty meeting agenda for the Faculty’s convenience. The Dean agreed to convey the Committee’s views to the FCAFA.

In relation to the enhanced charge to the CEP, which would be on the agenda as well, Professor George asked Dean Call if the Committee on Educational Policy feels confident that the position of Researcher is not temporary. The Dean said that he believes that the CEP is aware that, in accordance with standard practice, this position was vetted and endorsed by the Committee on Priorities and Resources and is now a regularly budgeted half-time FTE in the Dean’s office. The members then approved the faculty meeting agenda and turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Wednesday, November 29, 2006**

The sixteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 4:00 P.M. on Wednesday, November 29, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The minutes of the meetings of November 13, November 14, November 17, and November 27 were approved.

The Committee focused on personnel matters.

The Committee adjourned at 6:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Thursday, November 30, 2006**

The seventeenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Thursday, November 30, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Committee focused on personnel matters.

The Committee adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, December 4, 2006**

The eighteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by the President in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, December 4, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The President began the meeting by presenting the Committee with several choices of lecture topics proposed by a speaker who is planning to speak at the College; the members expressed their views on the matter.

The Dean next informed the Committee that the special election for the new member of the Committee of Six, who will join the Committee this spring, is going well. He noted that the online election may have resulted in increased participation, which was at record highs for both rounds of voting that have been completed. Professor George asked the Dean how many colleagues voted in the first two rounds. Dean Call reported that 134 colleagues participated in round one and 142 participated in round two. The results of round three would be available this week, the Dean said.

Dean Call also informed the members that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has told him that the CEP no longer plans to offer an amendment to the enhanced charge to the committee at the faculty meeting on December 5.

The Committee turned to personnel matters.

At the conclusion of that discussion at 4:45, Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research, joined the meeting and reviewed with the members the presentation that she and Tom Parker, Dean of Admission and Financial Aid, would give to the Faculty at the December 5 faculty meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Thursday, December 7, 2006**

The nineteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by the President in his office at 4:00 P.M. on Thursday, December 7, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The Committee turned to personnel matters.

In the time remaining, the Committee discussed the presentation made by Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research, at the December 5 meeting of the Faculty. Some members of the Committee expressed the view that the College should track the performance of students with the lowest scores on standardized tests to see if such students succeed at Amherst. Professor Woglom noted that he has done such studies for students who enroll in Chemistry 11, Math 11, and Economics 11, and that it would be a simple matter for the College to do such research more broadly. He noted that he is not in favor of an SAT cutoff, but he is concerned that the number of low scorers in the Class of 2010 is higher than it has been in recent classes.

The Dean commented that the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) plans to examine the performance of student cohorts by reader rating to determine the distribution of academic achievement evident in each reader rating cohort. He suggested that, since it is clear that individuals may be approaching these data differently and that presenting different approaches can be confusing, it would be worthwhile for those faculty members and administrators who are working on this issue to agree about how the data should be presented. The Committee agreed and suggested that a meeting be organized of those who work with these data.

President Marx noted that it will be important to think carefully about the process of moving forward on the discussion of admissions issues. He commented that the College has made unprecedented progress in the realm of transparency regarding these issues, and that he is strongly supportive of having as full a discussion as possible. He noted concern about discussing a handful of current students (the so-called “low scorers”) on the floor of the Faculty, because they could be identifiable. Professor O’Hara said that she would be interested in having the Committee of Six meet with the FCAFA face-to-face to discuss these issues. The other members agreed that such a meeting should occur.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Friday, December 15, 2006**

The twentieth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by the President in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Friday, December 15, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The Committee turned to personnel matters.

Dean Call informed the members that a colleague who is serving as a faculty liaison to an athletic team has asked if faculty liaisons should be given transcripts of students on the teams with which they are working. Further, the colleague asked whether faculty liaisons should be noted as second advisors on student-athletes’ transcripts. The Committee noted that, as faculty members (and in accordance with normal practice), any liaison should feel free to request an individual student-athlete’s transcript from the Registrar. The members agreed that the liaisons should not receive an entire team’s transcripts as a matter of course, since instituting such a practice would create an anomalous procedure for student-athletes. For this reason, the Committee was also opposed to listing liaisons as second advisors on student transcripts.

The Committee returned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, December 18, 2006**

The twenty-first meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by the President in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, December 18, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, O’Hara, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Committee discussed a departmental matter.

The Dean next shared with the members a portion of his recent conversation with the College Council. The College Council has had a series of conversations about Amherst’s academic calendar, in light of the proposal by the University of Massachusetts that the spring semester begin two weeks earlier than it does at present. The Dean told the members that the College Council plans to write a report on this issue, which will be shared with the full Faculty. The President noted that the Five-College presidents are concerned that the prospect of multiple schedules might undermine Five-College cooperation.

The members then turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Wednesday, December 20, 2006**

The twenty-second meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006–2007 was called to order by the President in his office at 5:00 P.M. on Wednesday, December 20, 2006. Present were Professors George, Hilborn, Parker, Schneider, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor O’Hara was absent by prior arrangement. The minutes of December 15 and December 18 were approved.

The Dean informed the members that the Memorial Minute Committee for Benjamin McCabe, Parmly Billings Professor of Physical Education, Emeritus, who died on September 13, has been finalized. Bill Thurston (Chair), Professor of Physical Education; Peter Gooding, Professor of Physical Education; and Jack Arena, Senior Coach, will serve on the committee.

The members turned to personnel matters.

On behalf of the Committee and the College, the Dean expressed best wishes and gratitude to Professor Hilborn, presenting him with a gift and thanking him for his fine service to Amherst. The President and the members joined Dean Call in wishing Professor Hilborn well.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, January 29, 2007**

The twenty-third meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006-2007 was called to order by the President in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, January 29, 2007. Present were Professors George, O'Hara, Parker, Schneider, Sinos, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Committee discussed and then approved the minutes of the meeting of December 20, which included final discussions regarding tenure this year. In this context, Professor George informed the President that some assistant professors who would be coming up for tenure in the next several years have shared with him their concern that, since there have been only positive decisions for the past two years, there may be some pressure to have some negative decisions in upcoming years. President Marx replied that tenure decisions will continue to be based on the merits of the individual cases and that there is no quota for positive or negative decisions.

At the structural level, the President said that it is essential for maintaining the high quality of the Faculty that the College be confident that it is using the best system for determining which faculty members should be tenured and which should not. The Committee agreed to review at a future meeting Amherst's tenure process and to discuss, at a procedural level, ideas for improving the system.

President Marx next raised several issues for the purpose of seeking the members' advice. He discussed with the Committee a proposal from the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) that the committee and the admission office be given the flexibility to add student spaces in next year's first-year class for students with admission academic reader ratings of one or two. The President noted that, in the last several years, not all such students had been admitted. There should also be further discussion about the expressed view of some faculty members that the College should begin developing, sooner rather than later, curricular and co-curricular proposals to meet the needs of less well-prepared students, an issue that has been discussed by the Faculty for some time. Finally, the President said, questions of procedure have arisen surrounding the best ways to prioritize and implement CAP recommendations.

Discussion focused first on the resources that would be needed if the size of next year's first-year class is increased. Dean Call said that the Trustees have agreed that additional resources would be provided to support supplemental visiting faculty members. This would be a necessary step even if the FTE cap is raised; if requests for new FTEs are granted this year, searches could not be conducted until 2007-2008 and new faculty would not begin working until 2008-2009.

Professor George asked what the procedures would be for raising the FTE cap and making proposals for FTEs. He commented that the idea of allocating some FTEs for specific CAP recommendations, on an unexpected schedule, might imply that a major CAP initiative is moving forward irregularly, and without going through the proper channels of faculty governance. He feels that there could be a perception among the Faculty that certain CAP recommendations and departments are being privileged over others. Professor George noted that, if eighty more students are added over the next four or more years, eight to ten of the eighteen FTEs will need to be allocated in order for the current faculty-student ratio to be maintained. He

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, January 29, 2007**

feels that having the implementation process unfold in this way would not be consistent with a college-wide process. The President responded that FTE proposals must come from the Faculty to the CEP, and that the FCAFA and admission office would determine the scale and pace of any increase in student enrollment, within the range proposed by the CAP.

Professor Woglom asked what the proper channels of faculty governance would be for raising the FTE cap. Would it be appropriate for the Faculty to vote to ask the Board to authorize two FTEs above the current cap to support the needs of less well-prepared students, he wondered. Professor O'Hara said that it is her impression that the CEP, according to its regular procedures, should advise the Faculty, in its letter to departments about FTE requests, about the CEP's willingness to accept proposals for replacement and new FTEs, with the possibility that some new FTEs would be available and that CAP priorities can be incorporated into proposals. Professor Woglom asked if the letter should say something to the effect that proposals with a quantitative emphasis that address the needs of less well-prepared students are particularly welcome. Professor Sinos said that she feels strongly that the CEP should not do so.

Continuing with the procedural discussion, Professor O'Hara said that the next step should be for the CEP to rank departmental proposals and make recommendations. The Dean noted that, as part of its regular process of ranking requests for FTEs, the CEP could rank requests for new FTEs over replacements, if it saw fit. The administration would consider the recommendations of the CEP and, if those recommendations included FTEs designated to meet some of the priorities identified in the CAP report, the administration would consider making a request to the Board to raise the cap this year by a small increment. The President and the Dean noted that these procedures would fall within the normal purview of the CEP. Professor Sinos said that the CEP should not determine which requests it will receive by encouraging departments to make FTE requests that would target particular CAP recommendations. Several members argued that it would be unfair and disingenuous to have faculty members devote their energies to making FTE requests that do not focus on the needs of less well-prepared students, if there is agreement that this is the CAP priority that should be implemented first.

President Marx said that the Board, the Dean, and he are trying to be responsive to faculty members who have said that they are ready to move forward to meet particular curricular needs and to consider adding to the faculty ranks. The Faculty has focused on these needs as part of the CAP process in prior years. Until this point, the specifics of how FTEs would be phased in have not been discussed, and this part of the process is still emerging, based on these sorts of conversations. However, one thing that is clear to all is that the allocation of FTEs should be educationally driven and should not be so rigid as to be only a function of the faculty-student ratio. He noted that the proposed increase in Faculty is proportionally twice that of the proposed increase in students.

Professor Woglom concurred, while agreeing with Professor George that adding students puts a larger burden on the Faculty and that FTEs must be added to keep up with the growth of the student body. President Marx wondered if the FCAFA might be asked to slow things down a bit and to aim for an eventual twenty students more per class over a seven- or eight-year period,

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, January 29, 2007**

allowing for assessment over that time. Such a schedule would allow more time to phase in FTEs while improving the current student-faculty ratio. Professor O'Hara noted that, once admission criteria are set, students can be added quickly, but that, appropriately, the process of adding faculty members is much more complex and time-consuming. The Committee agreed that the pacing at which additional students and faculty would be added would be critical.

Professor Woglom asked when a request for additional FTEs could be brought to the Board. He suggested that, in April, the administration should ask the Trustees if they would approve additional FTEs devoted to the needs of less well-prepared students. President Marx said that he believes that the Trustees will not guarantee lifting the FTE cap without specific proposals being brought forward to the administration. However, in April, he could inform the Board that, if the CEP is moving in the direction of recommending specific FTE requests that would result in the need to raise the FTE cap, it should be prepared to make a decision in May about lifting the cap.

Professor Sinos reiterated her belief that it is inappropriate for either the CEP or the Board to say that they will only entertain a certain kind of proposal. It is the Faculty's prerogative to bring to the CEP any requests it sees as valuable to the curriculum, she said. President Marx responded that it will be up to the CEP to decide whether requests that focus on meeting the needs of less well-prepared students should be a priority. Professor Schneider suggested that, because the process of requesting FTEs seems unusual because of the possible availability of additional FTEs, it will be important to communicate with the Faculty about the process in a full and timely manner. The President and the Dean agreed.

Returning to a previous conversation, Professor George expressed the view that, within the framework of eighteen additional FTEs, a multi-year approach that includes all of the priorities identified in the CAP Report should be taken. It will also be important to coordinate any increases in the size of the student body with increases in the size of the Faculty. Professor Woglom agreed that such an approach would be appropriate, noting that the implications of adding twenty more students per year over a period of years should be thought through. The President said that he is confident that the Board would acknowledge the need for increasing the size of the Faculty and the student body in a coordinated fashion. Professor Woglom asked over what period the Board would allocate the eighteen FTEs and when they would decide to do so. The President said that it is his impression that the Board will possibly make this decision in the fall, and the Dean said that it should take six to nine years to phase in the FTEs, if two or three are allocated each year.

The Committee agreed that it should meet with the FCAFA to discuss previously raised questions about this year's applicant pool and its least-prepared students and the proposal to add up to twenty additional students and the composition of those students. Professor O'Hara expressed her concern that reserving these additional slots for students ranked as academic ones and twos would exacerbate bimodality problems in the classroom. The Committee agreed to suggest that the FCAFA may want to consider slowing the pace of the anticipated growth of the student body.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, January 29, 2007**

The members concurred that spreading the increase out over a longer span of years would allow FTEs to be phased in more gradually and in accordance with college-wide priorities. Professor Schneider said that the College should be aware that small changes in the student body can have major ramifications. He suggested that it might be best to add ten students to next year's first-year class and then to evaluate the effects of doing so. Some members argued that, if the student body is to be increased by eighty students, it should be done over eight years so that the phasing in of FTEs keeps pace with the growth of the student body. The President said that the CEP should closely monitor the situation and would be able to make adjustments in any schedule for implementation. President Marx noted that it is the College's hope, through networking efforts and by casting a "wider net" to raise the floor in all categories, without decreasing the diversity of the applicant pool. Professor O'Hara said that it will be important to monitor carefully the performance of students at Amherst. The President agreed, while noting that there are challenges ahead in terms of how best to measure accurately student success at Amherst.

In connection with the conversation about the needs of less well-prepared students, Professor Parker asked the Dean if the minutes of the meeting that the President and the Dean had recently with some faculty members and senior administrators in the sciences could be shared with the full Faculty, since he thought that colleagues would find the conversation informative. The Dean said that he would ask the meeting's participants if those minutes could be appended to the Committee of Six minutes. The Dean noted that he had had a follow-up meeting with some members of the original group, and that plans were now under way for a quantitative course for first-year students that would be taught by two colleagues.

Dean Call next made a series of announcements. He proposed that the College Council report for 2004-2006 be sent to the Faculty. The members agreed and said that they would discuss the report at an upcoming meeting. Professor Parker asked that the Committee be provided with the current language of the *Student Handbook* that focuses on fraternities. The Dean agreed. He next discussed with the Committee issues about security and anonymity in regard to electronic voting for the Committee Six that were raised by Professor Kaplan (appended) in a letter to the Committee. Dean Call noted that he is confident that the Department of Information Technology, at his specific request, has designed a voting system that protects the anonymity of those voting in Committee of Six elections. The Dean of Faculty's office only has access to vote totals and cannot determine which faculty members have voted, let alone their selections. Professor Schneider asked if the email addresses of voters can be linked to their votes by anyone at the College. The Dean said that he will convey that question to Peter Schilling, Director of Information Technology. He suggested that Mr. Schilling speak with Professor Kaplan about the voting system and that Mr. Schilling provide the Committee with a statement, for inclusion in the minutes, about the protections that have been put in place for electronic voting. The members agreed.

Dean Call brought to the Committee's attention that, in accordance with decisions made last year about the Schupf Scholars program, one or two current first-year students would soon be named Schupf Scholars.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, January 29, 2007**

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Sinos asked for clarification about the title of Lecturer at the College. Dean Call said that he could certainly understand how there might be some confusion about the title, particularly during this time of regularizing processes and parameters surrounding non-tenure-track positions. He explained that visiting professors hold non-tenure-track positions with contracts that are renewable for up to three years, or occasionally four years, and who are often appointed to one-year terms. They generally teach two courses per semester and pursue scholarship. While such positions are designed to fill a temporary need, over time a few departments have fallen into arrangements in which long-term visitors staff their regular curriculum. The College has taken steps to move away from long-term visitors. Instead, departments have been asked either to request long-term lectureship positions or, if they deem it more appropriate, to make FTE requests for a tenure-track positions. Lecturers are hired on three-year contracts, generally teach three courses per semester, and, typically, are not evaluated on their scholarship. After two three-year terms, a Lecturer may be eligible for promotion to Senior Lecturer, receiving a five-year contract. Lecturers typically teach regularly for the College. Professor Sinos asked if having Lecturers is an option for all departments. The Dean said that any department is welcome to request a Lecturer position. Visiting Lecturers, on the other hand, are colleagues who teach on a per-course, non-benefitted basis for the College. If colleagues from another Five-College institution teach courses at Amherst, they are granted a visiting professor’s title at the rank that they hold at their home institution.

Dean Call next asked the members for suggestions for the Memorial Minute Committee for Theodore Greene ’43, Winthrop H. Smith ’16 Professor of History, Emeritus, who died January 15. The Committee then reviewed one course proposal forwarded from the CEP and voted unanimously to send it to the Faculty for approval. The Dean discussed with the members possible dates for faculty meetings. Given the need to complete a great deal of business this term and the conflict with our usual dates and Passover, as well as spring break, the Committee agreed to consider having faculty meetings on the second and fourth Tuesdays of some months, and on the first and third Tuesdays of other months, and to try having one meeting in May at mid-day. Since the schedule is unusual, the members asked the Dean to communicate the schedule to the Faculty as soon as possible, and he agreed. The Faculty will be asked to hold the following dates for possible faculty meetings: February 20, March 13 (second Tuesday), March 27 (fourth Tuesday), April 10 (second Tuesday), April 17, May 1, May 18 (Friday, 12 noon, lunch to be provided, location to be announced), and May 24 (Thursday, 9:00 A.M.). The Committee then turned briefly to personnel matters. The Committee then set dates to be held for additional Committee of Six meetings, should they become necessary. The members also agreed to meet on Mondays at 3:00 during the spring semester. Dean Call told members that the Registrar had forwarded a thesis written by a member of the Class of 2007E for consideration for *summa*. A member volunteered to read the thesis for the Committee.

The Committee turned to a draft of the Faculty Meeting agenda of February 6. After some discussion, the members agreed that it would be important for the Faculty to continue the discussion regarding admissions that it began at the December 5 meeting and to have the

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, January 29, 2007**

opportunity, in particular, for colleagues to respond further to the presentations given then. Most members of the Committee felt that it would also be helpful to have an initial discussion about the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion, with introductory remarks by the members of the committee. Professor George raised concerns about having a faculty meeting in which motions are not being put before the Faculty for a vote. He said that if discussion is the only item on the agenda, an open meeting would be preferable. Professor Parker worried that colleagues might not have had time to prepare for a discussion about the promotion report, which was only recently distributed to the Faculty. He also argued that the Faculty would benefit from more instruction about admissions issues, while they now have information in hand about promotion in the form of the report. Professors Woglom and Schneider each said that it would be desirable for the Faculty to become better informed about both issues through discussion. The Dean noted that the discussion of the promotion report could inform the Committee's process of formulating motions based on the promotion report, and most members agreed. The members then voted four in favor, with two abstentions (Professors George and Parker), to approve the faculty meeting agenda and to forward it to the Faculty.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Scott F. Kaplan
Dept. of Mathematics and Computer Science
Amherst College
Amherst, MA 01002-5000
sfcaplan@cs.amherst.edu

December 21, 2006

Committee of Six
Amherst College
Amherst, MA 01002-5000

To the members of the Committee of Six:

I am troubled by our new, online method of voting for members of the Committee of Six. Specifically, I am concerned that voters are anonymous not because the voting method guarantees it, but rather because the Office of The Dean of The Faculty promises that it will not collect or examine our names. I find this potential loss of anonymity unacceptable, and I urge the Committee to examine this issue.

Please notice that I am not concerned with this Office of The Dean of The Faculty. I do not suspect its current members, nor any member of the administration or staff, of any wrongdoing in conducting these elections. However, the College's policies should not be specific to the people currently holding particular positions.

How important is anonymity in our voting? Observe our practice during Faculty Meetings, where a single person's request for a paper ballot must be honored without discussion, justification, or further approval from the body or chair. Whether that person's concern is founded in a real risk of being associated with a particular vote is irrelevant; we avoid the undue influence of perceived concerns associated with a "named" vote by offering an anonymous option at the slightest suggestion. This same respect for anonymity should apply to all faculty votes, ensuring that voters make unfettered choices.

I am particularly concerned about the participation of the untenured members of the faculty. They may reasonably feel more at risk in expressing their choices than other faculty and may alter their voting behavior because their identities could be associated with their votes. The tenure-track members of our faculty have perhaps the greatest interest in the selection of C6 members, for that committee is the one charged with reappointment and tenure evaluations. We should expect and encourage junior faculty to participate as fully as possible in governance, and I would not want the convenience of online voting to outweigh the importance of their participation.

I understand the desire for greater participation that online voting may yield. Thus, I do not expect an abandonment of online voting. However, online voting can be anonymous, and I would be happy, upon request, to describe specific, realistic mechanisms by which it can be achieved. Since anonymity is possible and, I believe, critical, I ask that the Committee of Six raise this topic with the administration. I consider this issue sufficiently important that the use of online voting should be suspended until issues of voter anonymity have been sufficiently remedied.

Sincerely,

Scott F. Kaplan
Assoc. Professor of Computer Science

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 5, 2007**

The twenty-fourth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006-2007 was called to order by the President in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, February 5, 2007. Present were Professors George, O'Hara, Parker, Schneider, Sinos, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

After a brief conversation about the Committee's upcoming agenda and procedures for setting the schedule and the topics of discussion, the Committee was joined at 3:15 P.M. by the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA). Present from the committee were Professors Courtright, Lembo (Chair), and C. McGeoch; Deans Parker, Fretwell, Case, and Lieber; and Octavia Foarta '09. It was agreed prior to the meeting that student members of the FCAFA would leave the meeting when currently enrolled students were being discussed as individuals, rather than as an aggregate. The Committee had requested a meeting with the FCAFA to discuss previously raised questions about this year's entering class and its least-prepared students and the FCAFA's response to the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) proposal to add students to next year's first-year class and the composition of the additional students.

The Dean thanked the members of the FCAFA for meeting with the Committee of Six. Professor Parker began the discussion by asking the FCAFA to describe its recent conversations with the Board. Professor Lembo noted that his committee had prepared a written proposal, and had presented it to the Student Life Committee of the Board, that the size of the incoming class be increased and that the increase be split between international students with academic reader ratings of one and two and financial need, and "intellectually vibrant" students with academic reader ratings of two. Professor Lembo said that his committee made this proposal in response to recommendations from the CAP to increase the size of the entering class and the proportion of non-U.S. students and to make admission for non-U.S. students need-blind. He said that it is his committee's hope that the proposal would enable the College to assess students' academic performance, including their "navigation of the curriculum" and educational outcomes, in relation to academic qualifications, and would enable Amherst to clarify the validity and usefulness of empirical indicators of performance beyond GPA.

Professor Lembo noted that, in response to the proposal, the Student Life Committee raised questions around support and resources. Some student members expressed some concern about the impact of increasing the size of the student body. Dean Fretwell noted that the students on the Student Life Committee are not members of the FCAFA and had not been informed by the committee's conversations that led to the proposal. Professor Courtright commented that the question of whether additional faculty FTEs should be in place before the student body was expanded was also discussed with the Student Life Committee of the Board.

Professor Woglom asked about the genesis of the FCAFA proposal. Professor Lembo responded that the committee had met with President Marx and Dean Call in mid-October to discuss possible ways of addressing the recommendations that were forwarded by the Committee of Six to the FCAFA for further deliberation. At that meeting, the Dean and the President reported that they had heard faculty concerns about the College not admitting all of the academic ones and twos desired (having not admitted all academic ones who applied for several years), and whether additional student spaces should be used to meet that concern in the next admissions cycle. Dean Call noted that the President and he had had similar meetings about implementation

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 5, 2007**

with the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR). Professor Courtright commented that it is not the FCAFA's prerogative to change the size of the student body; it is the prerogative of the Trustees. It was the President, representing the Trustees, who rightly brought up this issue with the FCAFA, she said, and the committee deliberated on how to implement this change. Dean Parker had modeled for the committee different ways of implementing the CAP's recommendation to increase the size of the student body, Professor Courtright noted, and the FCAFA settled on its current proposal—with the knowledge and intention that its recommendations would move through the normal processes of faculty governance.

Professor O'Hara reiterated her concern that increasing the number of students at the highest end of the academic spectrum could exacerbate problems of bimodality in the classroom. She asked the FCAFA members if they had considered a schedule for implementing their proposal and whether adding students might be done gradually. Professor Courtright responded that there hasn't been time yet for the FCAFA to focus on a schedule or phasing plans; she noted that bimodality in the classroom might be more of an issue in some disciplines than others. Professor Courtright agreed that it would be important for the issues raised by Professor O'Hara to be considered. Dean Lieber asked if Professor O'Hara was suggesting that the College add more students of more modest abilities. Professor O'Hara responded that the CAP recommended that the socioeconomic diversity of the student body be increased, while raising the standards for admission across all categories of students that the College wishes to admit. She suggested that Amherst should be looking for students with "intellectual spark," who are capable of making the transition to Amherst and who would act as change agents on campus, noting that such student attributes should be assessed through measures beyond academic reader rating. Professor O'Hara contended that changes to the size and expertise of the Faculty should keep pace with any changes in the student body. Several Committee members noted that expanding the size of the class is a separable issue from the increase in the number of less well-prepared students. Dean Parker agreed, noting that the current proposal only seeks additional students with strong academic preparation (academic reader ratings of one or two). Professor Woglom expressed the view that the College should admit the most promising candidates regardless of academic reader rating.

Dean Parker noted that the College has already met the CAP goal for increasing socioeconomic diversity in the Class of 2010 and anticipates that it will be able to meet this goal for future classes. The FCAFA focused on what the composition of students should be if additional slots in the first-year class are made available. After reviewing different possibilities, the committee chose to propose increasing the number of excellent international students who have financial need and the number of "vibrant academic twos," who, usually because of one academic indicator (e.g., one test score, one grade), fall just short of being academic ones. On the basis of all other indicators—essays, letter of recommendation, etc.—these students would be among the most promising in the applicant pool. Dean Parker warned about the danger of over-precision when it comes to setting qualitative and numeric goals and discussed the need to "speak in ranges." Many aspects of the admission process are unpredictable, he noted. Professor Schneider suggested that the increase in next year's class be limited to ten students, rather than

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 5, 2007**

the maximum of a possible twenty, so that any repercussions that would be felt would be minimal.

Members of the Committee asked how the results of taking these students—for example vibrant academic twos over academic ones—would be assessed. Dean Parker said that he plans to interview first-year seminar instructors and to work with the Office of Institutional Research to develop other tools of assessment, in addition to examining the traditional quantitative indicators of academic performance. Professor Lembo noted that there has been a great deal of focus recently on students who are less well prepared; the committee agreed that the College should also seek to understand the experience of students at the higher end of academic reader ratings. Dean Parker said that the FCAFA plans to see if the vibrant twos stand out in the classroom and their level of academic achievement, and to assess these indicators over time. If the vibrant twos do not meet expectations, the FCAFA would re-examine admission policy and would re-adjust. Professor O'Hara said that she looks forward to learning more about how the vibrant academic twos navigate the curriculum.

Turning to questions about how the FCAFA proposal moved forward, the President brought up broader questions of process. He said that he recognizes that deliberations about parts of an overarching plan (the CAP Report) are moving forward through committees, but that, the implementation process thus far has not encouraged the consideration of the pieces of the report as they may relate to one another. In this case, the FCAFA discussed with the Board, for the most part, one recommendation (increasing the size of the entering class). It is clear that another recommendation (increasing FTEs) being considered by other committees (the CEP and CPR) should be thought about in coordination with the recommendation to increase the size of the student body. The Committee of Six, after considering the broader ramifications of the FCAFA's proposal, has suggested that any increase in the student body be phased in gradually so that the growth of the Faculty can be increased at least in proportion to the growth of the student body. The President noted that the targeted growth of the Faculty will be twice that of the student body. Professor Courtright reiterated that the FCAFA does not feel that it was within its purview to consider the size or pace of the increase, but only the composition of the body of students that make up the increase. Professor McGeoch noted again that the FCAFA also did not consider a schedule for the increase.

In this vein, Professor Lembo asked who, in fact, would make the decision about whether the size of the student body would be increased, at what pace, and in what numbers. The President noted that the Board has the final authority in terms of a budget decision. Dean Parker said that he would have to know by the last week of February whether the target size of next year's entering class is to be increased and by what amount. President Marx noted that it is important to recognize that any number that is set will only be a target. Dean Parker agreed, commenting that the target size of the class is dictated by bed space in freshman dorms and is set each year by the enrollment management committee, largely for the College's budgetary purposes. (The Enrollment Management Committee, which is composed of the Dean of Admission and Financial Aid, the Director of Admission, the Director of Financial Aid, the Registrar, the Dean of Students, and the Treasurer, convenes in the fall and spring each year to set numerical enrollment goals for the coming semester based on the availability of student beds. The group targets an average enrollment across the two semesters of 1,590 and assists in

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 5, 2007**

developing yield estimates. The offices represented by the members of the committee share figures for study abroad, Twelve College Exchange, off-campus student figures, etc., to assist in the committee's calculations.)

Several members of both committees noted that the Board of Trustees, which has fiduciary responsibility for the College, would have to approve the additional \$400,000 in financial aid needed to add ten international students with financial need. The President agreed. Professor George asked, if the eventual target for increasing the size of the student body is eighty, would half of those students be international students and at what cost? The President responded that the cost for forty additional international students with financial need would be approximately \$1,600,000 annually, but noted that this year's first-year class already has a larger number of international students. He said that, in accordance with the recommendation of the CAP, the total increase could be at that level. Professor George said that he feels that many Faculty members may not realize the extent of the proposed commitment. He suggested that the Faculty would need time to discuss such specific recommendations, now that the general principles of the report have been endorsed. Professor Sinos agreed. The President said that the Board is being responsive to the Faculty's readiness to implement the recommendation to add funding for international students, and that the Trustees are willing to authorize the resources necessary before they begin fundraising for the other CAP priorities. The FCAFA has recommended a target for international students that is consistent with the CAP's recommendation and reserves the right to adjust according to the pool each year.

Professor Woglom said that the Faculty should discuss as soon as possible the linkage between the opportunity for additional FTEs and the proposal by the FCAFA. He suggested that the proposal (attached) be appended to the Committee of Six minutes, and the members of FCAFA agreed. Professor Courtright noted that it will be up to the President, the Dean, and the Committee of Six to develop a process for considering these and other CAP proposals. Professor George said that a multi-year plan should be in place to set the pace for the increase in the size of the student body. He asked why an increase in the size of the first-year class couldn't wait for a year. Dean Parker said that Amherst would be a better college for adding up to ten vibrant twos and ten international students with need. Some members wondered whether additional recruitment efforts would be needed in order to implement the plan to add the vibrant twos and international students being sought. Dean Parker said that the desired categories of students are already present in the College's applicant pool. International students who have been denied admission in the past purely for financial reasons are most likely either academic ones drawn from Eastern Europe, the Indian subcontinent, and Singapore or academic twos from Africa and Latin America.

Professor Woglom suggested that the Faculty, to take advantage of the current opportunity for additional FTEs, should endorse increasing the size of the first-year class by up to twenty students and should propose to the Trustees that they should allocate two FTEs over the current FTE cap. Based on faculty proposals, the CEP should then make a recommendation to the administration for FTEs that would support CAP priorities. Dean Call said that such a procedure could be viewed as an initial step, with a more substantial process of prioritization to follow for the remaining FTEs.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 5, 2007**

Discussion turned to the FCAFA's progress on the Committee of Six's charge to the committee. Professor Lembo said that Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research, has been working on a second set of data that he will begin to review and analyze soon. He is also interested in conducting interviews with faculty and students to gain some qualitative data about how students are navigating the curriculum. He said that the FCAFA is also planning to work with the Offices of Admission and Institutional Research, with the goal of coordinating and systematizing the process of data-gathering and analysis.

The committees next reviewed the performance in the first semester of the ten students in the first-year class who had the lowest composite SAT scores (as determined after ACT scores had been converted to composite SAT scores). Dean Parker noted that, of that group two students have GPAs that are in the bottom twenty-five GPAs in the class; two students have GPAs that are in the bottom fifty GPAs in the class but not in the bottom twenty-five; and the remaining six students have GPAs that are above the bottom fifty. All agreed that these results are encouraging. Dean Parker also informed the members that the Pell recipients in this year's first-year class had both the strongest GPAs and the strongest academic reader ratings of any cohort of Pell recipients admitted by the College in the last four years. Professor Woglom said that Professor Rockwell, Dean of New Students, has reported to him that this year's entering class is doing well overall. Fewer students have gone before the Committee on Academic Standing than at any time in recent memory, only one student is on academic probation, no student has been dismissed, and only one student received a grade of F in the first semester.

Professor Courtright said that the FCAFA was considering looking at how students who had been subjects of concern in the first semester of their first year performed in their junior year, as a more accurate measure of how well they were doing here. Professor O'Hara noted that, because the scheduling of math and chemistry courses was changed this semester, a number of less well-prepared students did not take Chemistry 11 in the fall. They will take Chemistry 11 in the spring. She commented that, in a typical year, four or five students ultimately receive Cs, Ds, and Fs in Chemistry 11.

President Marx asked if grade inflation makes it difficult to assess students' performance. Professor Woglom said that it is indisputable that this is the case, and he wonders if the grade of C has become the new D. Professor Sinos noted that not only is there a problem of grade inflation, but some faculty members have reported lowering the substantive content in their courses to meet student needs. Professor George wondered how many students change their minds about majoring in a particular area because they feel they can't get through the curriculum or because they have failed. It was also noted that students do change their minds about their majors for reasons other than failure. Dean Parker commented that there are plans in place to gather information on entering students' intended areas of study at the time that they arrive at the College, so more information relating to this issue will be available in future years. In the past, such data were based on students' views when they were in tenth grade, which is far less useful.

The Dean thanked the members of the FCAFA, and they left the meeting at 5:00. Professor Woglom next proposed that the Committee draft a resolution for possible distribution at the Faculty Meeting, with the goal of having the Faculty endorse the FCAFA's proposal to increase the size of the incoming class (filling these slots with excellent international students with financial need and vibrant students with academic reader ratings of two) and to increase the

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 5, 2007**

size of the Faculty at least in proportion to the increase in the size of the student body. He noted that time will be of the essence because of the need for the admission office to know the target size of the incoming class by the last week in February. Professor Schneider said that he feels strongly that the amount of change should be moderated. He reiterated his view that the first-year class should be increased by ten students, while noting that it seems important not to lose momentum with the Trustees. Professor O'Hara cautioned that, while moving forward is important, the devil is in the details.

The Committee agreed to develop a resolution before the February 6 Faculty Meeting. Noting that time would not permit such a resolution to be finalized before that meeting, the members agreed that the Dean should summarize the draft resolution. The Committee also agreed to finalize the resolution as soon as possible and to distribute it to the Faculty so that it could be considered at the Faculty Meeting of February 20. The Committee decided that the minutes (appended) of a meeting of the Committee of Six and the Committee on Educational Policy, which was convened by the President on January 25 to inform faculty of the discussion between the FCAFA and the Student Life Committee of the Board of Trustees, should be shared with the full Faculty—now that both committees have reviewed them for accuracy.

In the time remaining, the members reviewed the thesis and transcript of a student recommended by her department for a *summa cum laude* degree and having an overall grade point average in the top 25 percent of last year's graduating class. After a discussion of the thesis and the departmental statements, the members voted unanimously to forward it to the Faculty. The members next reviewed the College Council report (appended) for spring 2004-2006 and commented on the fine work done by the committee. Dean Call asked for proposals for colleagues who might serve on a Memorial Minute Committee for Calvin H. Plimpton '39, who served as president of Amherst from 1960 to 1971, who died on January 30. Dean Call thanked the members for their suggestions and said that he would inform the Faculty of the make-up of the committee once it has been finalized.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

The FCAFA proposal for increasing the size of the entering class made to the Student Life Committee of the Board of Trustees, January 19, 2007

The FCAFA proposes that the College enlarge the size of the incoming class by adding ten international academic "1's" and "2's" with financial need and ten "intellectually vibrant" academic "2's".

This proposal:

a) addresses recommendations found in Part II of the CAP Report. the "entering classes be increased by between 15 and 25 students" (#5 in the report); the "proportion of non-US students admitted be increased from about 6 to about 8 percent" (#3); and "admission for non-US students be made need-blind" (#4).

b) enables us to assess students' academic performance, including their "navigation of the curriculum" and educational outcomes in relation to academic qualifications, and, in doing so, to clarify the validity and usefulness of empirical indicators of performance beyond GPA as part of more broad-based and systematic assessments in the future. (Committee of Six charge, 10/5/06)

Synopsis of the Meeting between the Committee of Six and the Committee on Educational Policy

President Marx convened a meeting of the Committee of Six and the Committee on Educational Policy on January 25, 2007, to inform faculty of a discussion that recently took place between the Faculty Committee of Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) and the Student Life Committee of the Board of Trustees. Acting on one of the provisions of the Report of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP), the FCAFA proposed to the Trustees that the admission office be given the flexibility to add up to twenty students with academic reader ratings of one and two to next year's first-year class. In the last several years, not all such students had been admitted, the President said. Half of these additions would be international students whose financial need the College would meet in full.

The President informed the committee members that the Trustees had discussed the possibility of some enrollment growth at their meeting the prior weekend; they agreed that resources could be found for such an increase if the FCAFA and the admission office judged the applicant pool sufficiently strong to justify the increase. President Marx noted that the Board did not mandate that the size of the class should be increased or the precise number of students that might be added, but entrusted the FCAFA and the admission office with basing such expansion on educationally sound and responsible reasons. Professor George asked if plans to increase the student body by eighty students would be implicit in increasing the size of the entering class by twenty students. President Marx responded that an increase of eighty students could be the eventual target, but that an increase could be phased in over a period of seven or eight years. All agreed that it would be critical that any increase in enrollment be coordinated with at least proportional increases in the size of the Faculty.

Turning to the topic of less well-prepared students, the President noted that many faculty members have conveyed the need to develop curricular and co-curricular solutions to meet the needs of less well-prepared students, particularly in the areas of writing and quantitative skills. This pressing need has guided faculty planning and innovation for many years, he commented. In this vein, the President and the Dean described a recent meeting that they had with twenty-two faculty members and some senior administrators, mostly from the sciences. These colleagues expressed willingness to launch new courses that would meet the needs of their students, for instance new or additional "gateway courses" or science skill courses, as discussed by the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP). President Marx said that he agrees with faculty members who argue that there are pressing needs that would justify moving forward expeditiously on CAP initiatives to support students and to expand the Faculty and the curriculum. The College must also do its best to provide support, he noted, and additional resources to meet student needs should be found. The Dean described various steps in this direction already taken and expressed an openness to further proposals.

President Marx next discussed with the committee members the possibility of the Faculty requesting some small number of FTEs beyond the current cap, to be brought forward before the total request of eighteen FTEs has been approved, to meet current needs and proposals from the Faculty. Committee members commented on the necessity of having additional FTEs if needs are to be met and argued that there would also be a distinct need for additional faculty implicit in any increase in student enrollment. Professor Woglom said that, if the size of the College is not expanded, Amherst will continue to exclude some of the best students. He believes that, if the

Faculty is to teach 1.25 percent more students next fall, the Faculty should pursue the needed resources, including making a request this spring for FTEs to support quantitative initiatives. Professor O'Hara agreed that the College needs to invest in the needs of less well-prepared students as soon as possible. Professor Parker noted that meeting the needs of all Amherst students certainly seems to be a pressing situation. Professors Sinos and Sweeney argued that the addition of new faculty should not be dependent upon the CEP's privileging proposals intended to address the needs of less well-prepared students. President Marx responded that, if the CEP chose to focus on some CAP recommendations earlier, doing so would not disparage or curtail other college-wide priorities.

The committee members made clear that any proposals for new FTEs would, of course, follow the normal process of departmental requests and vetting by the CEP.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

AMHERST COLLEGE
Department of English

MICHELE AINA BARALE, Professor

Dean Gregory S. Call
Office of Dean of the Faculty
Amherst College

23 August, 2006

**College Council
Report for Spring 2004 - Spring 2006**

Members:

2004 - 2006: Professors J. Moore (Chair, Fall '04), Barale (Chair, Spring '05), Marshall, K. Sweeney; Deans Boykin-East, Hayes, Lieber (*ex officio*); President of the AAS; five students to be elected

The College Council discussed the following matters and made the following recommendations and decisions:

Room Draw will continue unchanged. The present process, labor intensive though it is for the Dean of Residential Life, seems to best address the variety of problems that need attention.

Dorm Damage has decreased over the past few years. While this might seem like an opportunity for wild elation, it is more likely no more than a stage in an inexplicable rhythm of student mayhem that wanes at present only to wax in the future. Fines, restitution through work, and even harsher penalties will continue to be imposed on offenders. A new schedule of **parking fines**, one that is more in keeping with the seriousness of the infractions has also been instituted. In particular, fines will be increased for parking in posted Fire Lanes, or outside marked lanes, or parking so as to impede the flow of traffic.

The College Council reviewed **Theme Houses**. At present, approximately 10% of the students reside in Theme Houses. While it has been suggested that some students opt for theme housing for no other reason than to get better accommodations, the situation is too complicated to allow for any clear sense of that. What is consistently clear is that a number of student leaders live in Theme Houses; that there is considerable cross-campus attendance at Theme House events; and that the Houses all collaborate with one another. Moreover, there is a great deal less damage in theme housing. In short, Theme Houses are good places to live and bring positive things to the campus as a whole.

Nonetheless some problems did present themselves. As renovation of Porter begins, and the College Council began to discuss temporarily relocating the Russian and German Theme Houses to Garman, it became clear that not all real estate in the Valley is prime. The emphatic desire of

every single group we spoke with was to have a kitchen. Because of state fire laws enacted after the Seton Hall University fire a few years back, all dorm kitchens must now meet the standards of commercial kitchens in terms of ventilation; this is simply not possible to facilitate in most of the Theme Houses. Houses that had full kitchens now have or will have microwaves instead... and as was pointed out during a meeting with the members of the Russian House, and La Casa, Blinis do not thrive and Latino food does not prosper in a microwave environment. Thus our decision to permanently relocate La Casa to the third floor of Moore caused them, and us, some real grief. Despite the fact that La Casa members did not actually like living in Seligman, they were loathe to give up their proximity to Newport's kitchen. However, the College Council hoped that their new central campus location might give La Casa's dwindling membership a boost. And Moore provides them with the kitchen that they lost in Seligman.

The stigmatized status of Seligman was the second problem that revealed itself over the course of the Theme House discussion. Having moved La Casa, we now had a lovely piece of real estate. But - no one wants to live there. It doesn't matter that it has quite a few rooms, 15 parking slots, and a ball room, Seligman is the arctic, the margin, the gulag, the outmost fringe of hell. It is so far from campus that no one wants to attend events there; so far from campus that its residents might as well attend Williams. We have moved Health and Wellness into Seligman, allowing that group to all be in one space and offering Sophomores a chance to get singles, but we fear that H & W feel punished rather than rewarded for their substance-free and highly successful efforts. Residential Life Coordinators are going to work especially hard to help Health and Wellness make Seligman work for rather than against them.

The College Council fully understands that commercial kitchens cannot be built for each residence hall. However, it also feels that the College needs to make every effort to create a common kitchen space, whether in the basement of the Campus Center or in the Alumni House, that could be used by un-kitchened Theme House members as well as by other groups who might find use of a kitchen a meaningful part of an event they plan. As one Council member noted, making additional provisions for communal cooking and eating seems like it should be a no-brainer given the College's efforts to interrupt the sorts of self-segregation that computers encourage.

At the request of the Chair of the Building and Grounds Committee of the Board of Trustees, the College Council visited the Social Dorms in order to better assess and compare older and newer spaces.

The Amherst College Residential Master Plan: Phase 1: Analysis and Synthesis describes the present situation in this way:

The Social Dorms include a series of suite-style buildings constructed in two separate time periods. Located on the eastern edge of the main campus, Coolidge, Crossett, Davis, Pond [,] and Stone were built in 1963 and 1964; Jenkins and Taplin were built in 1978. Social Dorms contain 4,5, and 6-person suites with single or double bedrooms, large living rooms, and multi-fixture bathrooms. Interval level changes create somewhat

confusing floor plans, but the space within each suite is quite generous. Students are generally satisfied with their suite, but complain about the difficulty in meeting and socializing with students from other suites. Common space for this neighborhood is not particularly desirable, located in basements and not within normal day-to-day circulation patterns.

After Council members toured Davis, Crossett, and Pond, we all agreed that the space did not seem to lend itself to renovation. For example, while students who have locomotion problems would not be housed in these dorms since elevators cannot be installed, it would seem that we would also have to house students whose parents had locomotion problems elsewhere as well, since everything is one half floor up or down, and at least one of us became ill-tempered at her inability to negotiate the stairs. A number of rooms were dark - in fact, dismal is not too strong a word - and slightly scary to walk through since cords for computer and television hook-ups - not to mention hair driers -- ran overhead and laundry lay underfoot. Some of us wondered how well and how quickly students could exit this sort of situation. In addition, a number of rooms could access the communal bathroom only by passing through another student's bedroom; this seemed like a real privacy and security problem, though it certainly would demand that everyone remain on good terms with the person whose room allowed bathroom entry. Given these conditions, Council members wondered why some of these residents didn't opt to live in Seligman.

Spring of 2006 entertained the tri-annual coordination of the Five College Calendar for academic years 2006 - 07 through 2008 - 09. We learned that there is considerable desire among student to increase the length of the reading period before final exams at the end of both the fall and spring semesters. We asked Mr. Mager to suggest how we might accomplish this increase during the next three-year cycle, and he was able to do so, increasing the reading period in the fall semester from three to four days. However, various constraints that determine the beginning and end of the semester precluded his making a comparable change for the spring; the reading period in May will have to remain a meager two days. One Council member noted that for those many (though certainly this is not all) students who avoid Friday classes with the same fervor as those who abstain from classes before 10 a.m., the reading period is, in fact, three days.

During the spring and fall semesters of 2006, the College Council carried out the tri-annual review of the College's policy on fraternities. We met with a variety of students - resident counselors, fraternity members, residents of social dorms, student leaders in general. Feelings and opinions about membership in off campus fraternities were complicated, contradictory, and passionate; for some students, interactions with them constituted the very best of times or the worst. In the end, after a great deal of difficult discussion, we decided to reaffirm our support of the Trustees' original resolution, which forbids the use of any campus facilities by fraternities or sororities and denies College recognition of or affiliation with them, but which does not prohibit student membership in organizations that operate strictly and exclusively off campus. We believe that the principle of association that recognizes students' freedom of choice to affiliate themselves with whomever they wish when they are outside the purview of the College should

continue to govern our policy in this area.

We did learn, however, that there remain a number of misconceptions about and misunderstandings of the nature of the policy within the student body. As a result, we drafted and voted some additional explanatory language, to be included in the Student Handbook in the section devoted to fraternity policy and to be disseminated to students in other ways by the Dean of Students Office. This new language is intended to clarify and make explicit some of the specific behaviors which we understand the Trustees' resolution to prohibit. That new language is attached at the end of this report.

Finally, members of the College Council took part in the selection of the new Dean of Residential Life, Torin Moore, replacing Dean Charri Boykin-East who will now be an Associate Dean of Students. We welcome Dean Moore and look forward to working with him on the College Council. And we are pleased to learn that Dean Boykin-East will continue to attend Council meetings for the next year.

**Respectably submitted,
Michele Aina Barale**

Appendix: College Council Statement on the fraternity policy

(The following statement was voted by the College Council as a supplement to and explanation of the Trustees' resolution on fraternities. It does not have the status of legislation passed either by the Board of Trustees or by the full faculty of Amherst College.)

The Board of Trustees voted to abolish fraternities at Amherst College in 1984. In so doing, the Board took the position that it would not attempt to limit students' ability to associate freely with whomever they wish off campus, but would ensure that no college facilities could ever be used by fraternities or sororities. As a result, Amherst students are not prohibited from joining fraternal organizations whose activities take place entirely off the Amherst College campus. Such organizations which do conduct activities on campus, however, are in violation of the Trustees' resolution, and any student who participates in those activities is subject to disciplinary action. Examples of such activities include, but are not limited to:

- 1. Any activity that is required as part of the process of pledging or initiating new members.**
- 2. Meetings whose purpose is to recruit new members.**
- 3. Meetings of members to conduct fraternity business or to socialize with each other.**
- 4. Social events such as parties organized and/or funded by the membership of the organization, whether those events are restricted to the members themselves or are open to the entire campus.**
- 5. Use of College facilities such as bulletin boards or the internal campus mail system to promote or advertise events sponsored by the organization.**

Students who violate any of these restrictions imposed by the Trustees' resolution will be subject to the full range of disciplinary sanctions available to the College. The restrictions apply to the public and private areas of the dormitories of Amherst College, as well as to all other buildings and facilities, including the grounds, athletic fields, and other property of the College.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 12, 2007**

The twenty-fifth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006-2007 was called to order by the President in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, February 12, 2007. Present were Professors George, O'Hara, Parker, Schneider, Sinos, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Committee spent the first hour of the meeting reviewing proposals to the President's Initiative Fund for Interdisciplinary Curricular Projects (PIF). Professor O'Hara did not participate in the process, since she is part of a PIF group that was putting a proposal forward; she joined the meeting at 4:00 P.M.

The Committee turned to personnel matters. Discussion then returned to the proposal of the Faculty Committee on Financial Aid (FCAFA) to add to next year's first-year class by up to twenty additional students (half international students with academic reader ratings of one and two and financial need, and half "intellectually vibrant" students with academic reader ratings of two).

Professor Sinos commented that some faculty members have expressed to her their discomfort with the process by which the proposal from FCAFA has been brought forward, wondering why discussion took place between the FCAFA and the Board of Trustees before the Faculty had had an opportunity to deliberate on the proposal. Professor Parker agreed. Professors Sinos and George expressed the view that, during faculty deliberations on the Report of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) last year, the President reassured the Faculty that, if the principles of the report were endorsed, the details and implementation of individual recommendations would be considered by relevant faculty committees, which would bring specific proposals or reports back to the full Faculty for discussion.

Continuing the conversation, Professor George commented that only a limited number of faculty members spoke to particular recommendations during the process of considering the endorsement of the full CAP Report, and he said that many colleagues, in an act of good faith, had put aside their reservations about individual CAP recommendations when they endorsed the report's general principles. Professor Woglom noted that the Faculty will have the opportunity to express its views on the FCAFA proposal at the February 20 meeting of the Faculty and that the only action taken by the Board was to approve the funding for aid that would be necessary for any potential increase of students. The size and pace of any actual increase has not yet been decided, but any change to the incoming class would have to be decided before the next Trustee Meeting.

President Marx said that it is critical that there is a clear understanding of the process for considering CAP recommendations. He noted that the Committee of Six (this year and last year) had agreed on which bodies should be charged with considering each CAP recommendation (see list from the Committee of Six minutes of September 25, 2006, appended). Some recommendations of the report, such as requiring each student to take a writing attentive course, would require a faculty vote in order to be implemented and those were noted, the President said. Other matters—for instance, those relating primarily to finance and facilities—would be trustee decisions, it was agreed, although the Faculty will be consulted. It was noted that many decisions

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 12, 2007**

would require consensus between the Faculty and the Trustees (such as the degree to which the Faculty would be expanded through the addition of new FTE lines). President Marx noted that the recommendations of the CAP are interrelated and provide guidelines and recommendations that rest upon each other in various ways. He acknowledged that the implementation process could falter if recommendations are not coordinated when necessary. Such coordination is now emerging, he said.

In the context of the discussion about the FCAFA proposal, Professor Woglom said that, in accordance with the process that the President had just described, the committee had generated a proposal. It was his understanding that proposals such as the one at hand, which emerge from the committees that are considering CAP recommendations, may require additional faculty discussion and refinement, whether or not a formal faculty vote is needed. Professor George agreed, noting that, during the discussions of the CAP Report last year, only five colleagues spoke to the recommendation to increase the size of the student body, and two of them expressed reservations about the proposal. Clearly, additional faculty discussion is needed about this important issue, he said.

Dean Call agreed, while noting that the level of detail of discussion by the full Faculty of CAP proposals from faculty committees should depend on the issue at hand. He reminded the members that the FCAFA, for example, is charged by the Faculty to set admission policy for the College, and that it is important to be mindful that the consideration of CAP proposals should be in sync with the normal processes of faculty governance. President Marx concurred, noting the need to have both consultation with the Faculty at large and the normal committee mechanisms of faculty governance.

Professor Woglom said that faculty committees should certainly be allowed to do their work without becoming bogged down. However, he believes that the Faculty will be receptive toward coherent proposals that come before them as part of the CAP implementation process and said that it is important that the Faculty not be circumvented. Professor O'Hara agreed, noting as an example the matter at hand. She said that the proposed increase in the size of the student body, and the composition of the additional students, has profound implications for the Faculty that warrant discussion by the full Faculty. Such discussion should inform the FCAFA's consideration of this issue, she said.

President Marx explained that the FCAFA had needed to know from the Board what was financially possible in terms of aid for the Class of 2011, but was not precluding faculty discussion. He again noted that Dean Call and he had met with the FCAFA in mid-October to discuss possible ways of addressing the recommendations that were forwarded by the Committee of Six to the FCAFA for further deliberation. The President and the Dean raised faculty concerns about wanting to have space to admit all desired academic ones and twos, and the question of how and when to consider adding up to twenty spots in each class, as the CAP had proposed.

President Marx said that FCAFA then developed a proposal to add up to twenty students to next year's incoming class and noted the composition of those students. The President noted that he had informed the FCAFA that the Board would have to make a decision about the

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 12, 2007**

financing of any potential increase in student spots at its January meeting, if any action were to be taken involving the Class of 2011. At that meeting the Board responded positively, without setting the specific pace for adding students. No action has been taken, and this question is now in front of the Faculty.

Based on the Committee of Six's discussion, the President summarized what he understood to be the consensus of the members regarding the general principles that should guide the Committee of Six's resolution, which would be put before the Faculty at its meeting on February 20. He said that it is his understanding that the Committee feels that the issue of the growth of the student body should not be discussed in isolation from the other recommendations of the CAP. Further, the Committee seems to agree that the pace of the growth of the Faculty should be coordinated with the growth of the student body and the increase in faculty FTEs should be at least in proportion to the increase in the size of the student body. Professor Parker said that the resolution could suggest that next year's incoming class should be increased by between ten and twenty students, even if requests and allocations of new FTEs were still proceeding. Perhaps the Faculty might want to begin such an incremental increase in the size of the student body, he said.

Professor Woglom said that he wanted to return to the discussion of the process for considering the CAP's recommendations. He expressed the view that the faculty committees should articulate and implement the particular recommendations of the CAP report, as outlined in the "roadmap" developed by the Committee of Six. The committees, he said, should describe their proposals to the Faculty, before they are implemented, in order to get faculty input. It will be the responsibility of the Committee of Six to ensure that the process does not devolve into an exercise in "cherry-picking" by the Faculty, Professor Woglom said. Professor Schneider agreed, but he said that it will be important for the Faculty to have details, since colleagues voted for general principles when they endorsed the CAP Report. Professor O'Hara agreed and said that the Committee of Six "roadmap" clearly articulates which recommendations will require a faculty vote. Even if a faculty vote is not needed for a proposal to move forward, the Faculty should be kept in the loop through discussion at Faculty Meetings, she said, and the views of the Faculty should inform the proposals of its committees. Such a process should not result in micro-management of the implementation process by the Faculty, Professor Woglom noted.

Professor Woglom added that faculty discussion could result in the CAP proposals being considered in a broader and more integrated way. Professor Parker agreed, commenting that enough is happening at once that it is important to focus on how the parts of the CAP Report relate to the whole. While tricky, the process is exciting, he said, noting that faculty committees are talking with one another in ways that are unprecedented. President Marx said that it is indeed important for committees to interact with one another, and that there are substantive reasons for doing so. For example, it is clear that the FCAFA's consideration of the recommendation to increase the size of the student body is now, appropriately, being discussed in conjunction with increasing the size of the Faculty.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 12, 2007**

Professor O'Hara next suggested a number of possible ways of pacing and linking any increase in the size of the student body with an increase in the size of the full-time Faculty. After some discussion, the members agreed that maximum flexibility, coordination, and time for adjustment and assessment would be gained by moving slowly on the student and FTE fronts and coordinating the two initiatives. It was also agreed that it would be most desirable to have a multi-year plan of implementation. The Committee then spent considerable time refining the language of its resolution to reflect these views. The members then voted six in favor and none opposed to forward the resolution to the Faculty. The Committee voted five in favor and none opposed on the substance of the resolution. Professor George abstained, noting that he wishes to have additional information surrounding the proposal to increase the number of international students. The resolution reads as follows:

To implement CAP proposals to increase the size of the Faculty by eighteen FTEs and, separately, to increase the size of the student body by eighty students, the Faculty recommends that the College: (1) Distribute the increase in the size of the student body over the next six to eight years (approximately ten additional students per year); (2) Fill the additional admissions slots with excellent international students having financial need and "vibrant" academic twos in roughly equal numbers; (3) Increase the size of the full-time regular faculty at least in proportion to the increase in the size of the student body, as this plan unfolds. The Faculty asks the FCAFA to report back to the Faculty annually about the progress of proposals (1) and (2).

Turning to the agenda for the Faculty Meeting of February 20, the members noted Professor Olver's excellent suggestions (appended) for structuring the Faculty's consideration of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion and agreed to discuss these ideas further at the Committee's next meeting. The members said that it would be most desirable for the Faculty to begin its discussion of the report at the February 20 Faculty Meeting, since some members of the promotion committee will be away from campus during upcoming meetings this semester.

The members next voted unanimously to approve the Faculty Meeting agenda for the meeting of February 20.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Excerpt from Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 25, 2006

1. We recommend that talented students from less affluent backgrounds be more vigorously recruited and that the Trustees seek funds to meet the additional aid burden.

FCAFA works out the details and reports back to the Faculty periodically on how the initiative is progressing.

Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) may discuss financial implications. Trustees.

2. We recommend that the Trustees consider significant reductions in the loan burden of all our students, as has been done for our highest-need students, in particular to avoid the limit that loans may impose on future career aspirations.

FCAFA works out the details and reports back to the Faculty periodically on how the initiative is progressing.

CPR may discuss financial implications.

Trustees.

3. We recommend that the proportion of non-US students admitted be increased from about 6 to about 8 percent.

FCAFA works out the details and reports back to the Faculty periodically on how the initiative is progressing.

CPR may discuss financial implications.

Trustees.

4. We recommend that admission for non-US students be made need-blind.

FCAFA works out the details and reports back to the Faculty periodically on how the initiative is progressing.

CPR may discuss financial implications.

Trustees.

5. We recommend that entering classes be increased by between 15 and 25 students.

FCAFA works out the details and reports back to the Faculty periodically on how the initiative is progressing.

CPR may discuss financial implications.

Trustees.

6. We recommend that 5 new FTEs be devoted to new interdisciplinary ventures and the support of other forms of cross-departmental collaboration.

Academic departments initiate FTE requests.

CEP, with vote by the Faculty on any new programs or majors proposed.

Excerpt from Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 25, 2006

7. We recommend that 2.5 new FTEs be devoted to global comprehension, their distribution to be made by the CEP among departments that are willing to commit themselves to teaching courses with this focus.

Academic departments initiate FTE requests.

CEP, in consultation with the Special Committee on the Amherst Education (SCAE) Working Group on Global Comprehension.

8. We recommend that 4 new FTEs be reserved to meet existing departmental needs.

Academic departments initiate FTE requests.

CEP, in consultation with the Working Committee on the Arts. AD HOC ARTS GROUP.

9. We recommend that 2 FTEs be reserved to allow accelerated hiring to take advantage of targeted "opportunity" hires that invigorate or enrich the racial, cultural, gender, and/or intellectual diversity of the faculty.

Academic departments initiate FTE requests.

CEP.

10. We recommend that all assistant professors be assured of a year of sabbatical leave at full salary after reappointment.

CPR.

Administration.

Trustees.

11. We recommend that the existing program of Senior Sabbatical Fellowships be expanded to cover as much as two semesters of leave after six years and that the College make every effort to secure sufficient funds to support all qualified applicants.

CPR.

Administration.

Trustees.

12. We recommend that the College create a staff position to assist faculty in applying for grants to support their research and creative work.

CPR.

Administration.

13. We recommend that funding for the Amherst Academic Interns program and the Dean of the Faculty's resources to support student research across the disciplines be enhanced.

CPR.

Administration.

Trustees.

Discuss possible partnerships with relevant departments.

Excerpt from Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 25, 2006

14. We recommend significantly expanding opportunities for community service and for summer and January internships.

Administration.
College Council.
Trustees.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE CENTER FOR COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT.

15. We recommend that a visiting appointment be made to allow a faculty member to serve half-time as coordinator of community-based learning.

Administration.
CEP.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE CENTER FOR COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT.

16. We recommend that the College provide need-based support to encourage students to enroll in intensive summer language programs in the USA and abroad.

CPR.
Administration.

17. We recommend that 2 new FTEs be reserved to support the development and teaching of "intensive writing" courses, their distribution to be made by the CEP among departments willing to commit themselves to teaching additional courses for this purpose.

Academic departments initiate FTE requests.
CEP.

18. We recommend that all students be required to take at least one course designated as Writing Attentive, with pedagogical support to be provided for faculty engaged in such writing instruction.

Fleshed out by CEP, in consultation with the SCAE Working Group on Writing.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON WRITING.

Faculty vote.

19. We recommend that 2.5 new FTEs be reserved for improving students' quantitative literacy, their distribution to be made by the CEP among departments that are willing to commit themselves to teaching "intensive" sections or new courses for these purposes.

Academic departments initiate FTE requests.
CEP, in consultation with the SCAE Quantitative Working Group.

Excerpt from Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 25, 2006

20. We recommend that the Faculty adopt a policy that requires the soliciting of teaching evaluations from all students in all classes.

Fleshed out by Committee of Six.

**AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE EVALUATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF
TEACHING.**

Faculty vote.

21. We recommend that the administration devote more resources and staff time to supporting programs in pedagogy, including programs to help teachers at all ranks.

Committee of Six.

Administration.

Discussion by the Faculty.

TEACHING AND LEARNING PROJECT COMMITTEE.

22. We recommend that a faculty innovation fund be created to support pedagogical projects of faculty at all ranks and that eligibility for Senior Sabbatical Fellowships be expanded to include proposals for contributions to pedagogy in the broadest sense.

Administration.

Trustees.

-----Original Message-----

Appendix, p. 5

From: Rose Olver

Sent: Wednesday, February 07, 2007 4:19 PM

To: Gregory Call

Subject: a request for structure to guide the faculty's discussion

Dear Greg -- would you please bring this request to the attention of the Committee of Six?

Many thanks,

-Rose

Dear Colleagues,

I hope that in setting the agenda for the next faculty meeting you will be able to provide some structure for the faculty's initial consideration of the Report, of the Ad Hoc. Committee on Promotion. I assume that motions will guide our final deliberations but I believe that some organization of the faculty's initial discussions might benefit the gathering of information useful to the Committee of Six in formulating those motions.

It seems to me that the Report's structure might provide a useful way of organizing and focusing the faculty's discussion. For example, the following sequence might keep the conversation on track:

1. [based on cover letter and Part II] Would a more thorough procedure for the evaluation of candidates for promotion to full professor be beneficial to the institution and its faculty? What's wrong with the status quo? What are the positive and negative consequences of change?
2. [with attention to Part III A] What should be the criteria for promotion to full professor? What are the likely consequences of the criteria chosen? Relation between criteria for promotion to full professor and criteria for tenure?
3. [with attention to Part III B] What change from the existing promotion process would benefit the individual and the institution?
 - a) Timing of the promotion recommendation
 - b) The role of the candidate
 - c) The composition and role of the promotion committee
 - d) Opportunities for candidacy for promotion
4. [with attention to Part III C] What is the role of promotion in the continued development of the Faculty?
- .5. [based on Part IV] Specific Text for Faculty Handbook

There are probably many other ways of structuring the faculty's discussion. The important concern for me is that there be a structure to guide our consideration of the Report.

With thanks for your attention to my request.... Sincerely,

-Rose Olver

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 19, 2007**

The twenty-sixth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006-2007 was called to order by the President in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, February 19, 2007. Present were Professors George, O'Hara, Parker, Schneider, Sinos, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The members turned briefly to a personnel matter.

Under "Questions to the Administration," Professor George began a discussion of the expedited process used by the Committee to approve minutes the week before faculty meetings. He said that Committee of Six members were being asked to appear in Converse on short notice, at times when some were scheduled to be in classes or labs. When minutes are released following individual editing, he said, there is no genuine Committee approval of minutes, since the first members to read and comment on draft minutes do not see changes made by those who come later. He asked whether minutes from a Committee of Six meeting in the week prior to a Faculty meeting could be approved by the whole Committee of Six on the day before the Tuesday Faculty Meeting, and then read at the Faculty Meeting, as has sometimes happened in the past. It was agreed that, although the timing is very tight and the quick turnaround is a strain on everyone involved, it is important for the Faculty to be kept informed of the Committee's discussions in the most timely manner possible. The President offered, and the Committee agreed, to have the draft minutes delivered to the members so that the Committee would not be required to come to Converse to read the minutes, as has been the practice.

Professor Parker next asked about plans to attach to the Committee of Six notes taken at the January 17 lunch on science teaching, so as to inform the full Faculty about that meeting. The Dean said that he would seek the permission to do so from those who had been in attendance. Continuing with questions, Professor Schneider expressed concern about the add/drop period and students adding, as well as dropping, courses during this time. He asked whether faculty concerns about this period have been communicated broadly to students. The Dean noted that students are informed of faculty sentiments regarding the add/drop period during orientation and also said that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has been discussing possible improvements to the current system. Professor Parker commented that the student "shopping" appears to have gotten out of control. Some problems are caused when faculty members drop students from classes in the second week of add/drop, Professor Woglom noted, at which point some students need to add a course. Professor Sinos said that a portion of the student body does not register for classes by the third week. Professor Schneider said that it is his hope that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) or the Dean of Students would simply encourage all students to make plans and contingency plans to avoid, as much as possible, adding courses they had not attended in the first week.

Continuing the discussion, Professor Parker raised issues surrounding the scarcity of class meeting times. President Marx responded that the CEP had considered a proposal that each department be required to use all available time slots. Dean Call noted that the CEP instead asked departments to spread their classes across time slots voluntarily. The committee decided that class scheduling by department should be posted on the Web and that departments would be

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 19, 2007**

asked to consult those postings when formulating their schedules. This information is now available at <http://www.amherst.edu/~oir/>, and the CEP plans to see if the distribution of classes across time slots has changed since this information became available. President Marx said that he looks forward to learning about the results of the CEP's analysis and suggested that, perhaps, there could be a more effective flow of information to students about the add/drop period. He asked that the Committee of Six discuss issues relating to the add/drop period at a future meeting, and the members agreed. The President also said that it is his hope that an online system of registration and advising would be implemented by the College to aid students and faculty with the process of course selection. He believes that an electronic system that could offer the same options and level of human interaction as the current paper system would also provide additional information in a variety of formats and would be more efficient.

The members next considered how best to structure discussion at the upcoming Faculty Meeting. In addition to having a full discussion and vote on the faculty resolution proposed by the Committee of Six, the members agreed that it would be their hope that time would permit the members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion to offer a report on their work. The members discussed Professor Olver's suggestions (appended to the February 12 Committee of Six minutes) for organizing conversation about the report. Several members noted that the promotion committee probably had its own plan for how to convey its work, which should be respected. At the same time, other members pointed out that it will ultimately be the Committee of Six's role to organize faculty discussion. Professor Woglom suggested that any structure should not be too open-ended, so that faculty discussion is focused. The members agreed that the promotion committee's report to the Faculty and the Faculty's response should guide future faculty discussion of the report and the drafting of motions by the Committee. In regard to the Faculty's consideration of the resolution proposed by the Committee of Six, Professor Parker asked what the next steps would be should the resolution pass. The President said that, since the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) has already received approval from the Board regarding the financial portion of the proposal, the FCAFA would be able to move forward with implementing the proposal in the deliberate and coordinated manner outlined in the resolution.

The President next provided responses to a number of questions posed to him by Professor George about the effects of increasing the number of international students. The President noted that international students major in departments in the same proportions as U.S. students, with the exception of Economics, which has a higher international enrollment. Professor George expressed his hope that data could be provided on how international students distribute themselves by course enrollments in comparison to U.S. students. President Marx said that he would research that question. Professor Sinos commented that she also wonders whether international students distribute themselves across the curriculum. Dean Call noted that one indicator of academic breadth among international students is that they double major in approximately the same proportion as U.S. students. Continuing his responses, President Marx noted that 41 percent of international students have an academic reader rating of one, and 30

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 19, 2007**

percent have an academic reader rating of two. International students, the President commented, account for the highest proportion of academic ones of any category of students at Amherst and the highest proportion of academic ones and twos of any category of students at Amherst other than Asian students.

In response to Professor George's question about whether admitting more international students with financial need will lead to greater disappointment about their inability to enter U.S. medical schools, the President said that a minority of students are pre-med and some international students expect to attend medical schools in other countries. In terms of the cost of becoming need blind for international students and increasing the number of such students from approximately six percent to approximately eight percent of the student body, the cost would be about a \$1.6 million addition to the College's overall annual financial aid budget of more than \$20 million, the President said. Continuing with his responses, the President noted that MIT, Harvard, Yale, Williams, and Middlebury are among the peer institutions that offer need-blind admission for international students.

Professor George expressed concern about the proposed increase in international students, including the cost of the proposal to become need blind for international students. He said that, in his experience, many international students understandably do not know about liberal arts education and come to college in this country for vocational purposes. Professor George commented that many international students, again entirely understandably, appear to stay in the U.S. after graduation and do not bring their training and talents back to their countries of origin. Professor Parker suggested that Professor George's experience with international students might be discipline-specific and noted that his sample size is small, in any case. Expanding the number of international students does not seem to serve the College's primary mission, Professor George said. He found it remarkable that Amherst would increase its reliance on other countries to provide academically outstanding applicants, when less than half of one percent of all U.S. students who apply to college in a given year apply to Amherst College. Professor George wondered whether we are increasing our percentage of international students as an alternative to attracting top U.S. applicants. President Marx reiterated that educating the most talented students and transcending any barriers to such inclusion is a fundamental part of Amherst's mission. He noted that international students who would otherwise be accepted are currently being denied access to an Amherst education purely for financial reasons.

The members turned to personnel matters.

Dean Call next discussed with the Committee possible ways of selecting one or two Schupf Scholars from the current first-year class. It was agreed that the Dean should write to the Faculty to ask colleagues to nominate their most stellar first-year students and that he should also review nominees' transcripts.

The Committee turned to an email (appended) sent to the members by Professor Upton. The members considered Professor Upton's suggestions regarding "freeing up" FTEs. In regard to the idea of having "remedial teachers" on term contracts, the members agreed that the Faculty, in its discussions last year about needs surrounding quantitative skills and writing, expressed

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 19, 2007**

clearly that it would not delegate its teaching responsibilities in these or other areas. The President noted that the College is in the process of making a commitment to providing additional resources to support less well-prepared students, both through faculty FTEs and additional staffing. In response to Professor Upton's proposal that faculty who are administrators relinquish their tenured FTEs if they serve in administrative roles for more than three years, the Dean brought up questions of practicability and timing, while recognizing that the issue raised was an important one and that it might be discussed in the future. Finally in regard to Professor Upton's suggestion regarding faculty retirements, the Dean noted that, under the College's phased retirement system, the FTEs of participating colleagues who are age sixty-two or older are returned to the FTE pool. If they are age sixty or sixty-one, half of the FTE returns to the pool. The President asked about whether the College should be open to proposals from senior faculty members to retire by a date certain if the College would provide a bridge appointment in their department(s). Under this scenario, a new FTE would be allocated, and a search would be run, before the senior colleague retired. President Marx noted that such a system would be particularly beneficial for departments that are facing multiple retirements, and he commented on the value of having senior faculty members aid in building the future of their departments through their participation in the selection and mentoring of new tenure-track colleagues. Any retirements under this program would be entirely voluntary, and of course no one would be pressured to retire, President Marx emphasized. Professor O'Hara asked if such bridge appointments would represent an end run around the CEP. The President and the Dean said that any bridge appointment would go through the normal channels, meaning that a proposal would be made to the CEP.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

-----Original Message-----

Appendix

From: Joel Upton

Sent: Friday, February 02, 2007 2:08 PM

To: Stephen George; Patricia O'Hara; Andrew Parker; David Schneider; Rebecca Sinos; Geoffrey Woglom

Subject: thoughts

Dear Colleagues,

Please forgive me for adding even a minute to your already unbearable burden. As my only representatives to the Administration, I turn to you to relay some thoughts concerning the Faculty that may have general interest.

George Kateb used to say roughly, as I remember it, that the Curriculum is the Faculty and therefore the Faculty is the College. Given the vast changes occurring at the College, is it appropriate to ask the Committee of Six to consider the wisdom of a more organized conversation with the whole faculty concerning the composition and the character of the "Faculty?"

The composition of the Faculty is currently elusive, at least to me. There are FTE's, PIF's, short, medium and long term visitors, residents, fellows, and now intimations of colleagues with more elaborate term contracts. Some of these positions are clearly vetted by the CEP and others appear more informally. In a relatively small faculty (roughly 90 of us present in any given semester), the condition of such a multi-tiered faculty would alone seem worthy of careful reflection.

The current character of the faculty might also be worthy of some reflection. The review procedures for recruitment, promotion and continuing service are, in my opinion, problematic. As a general observation, it is my sense that a trusting, mutually supportive environment of growth and promise has evolved into one of fragmentation, competition and surveillance. David Hall's letter to you pointed to one aspect of this new ethos.

A second area of potential conversation concerns the frequent refrain about the severe limitation of available FTE's and the extraordinary demands on a most scarce resource. My own department is suffering extended torture for students and faculty because of an unarguable lack of FTE recognition and support. Is it possible that the Committee of Six might entertain several overlooked sources for those FTE's which have traditionally been and presumably will continue to be the vibrant independent core of the Faculty/College?

Three possibilities:

1. All remedial teachers employed to assist the College's laudable economic/social/diversity outreach program would hold term contracts, thereby freeing up several FTE's, even as we devote considerable resources to all existing remedial problems for all of our students.
2. All faculty occupying positions in the Administration after three years of service would either return to full-time teaching or relinquish their tenured FTE in favor of a term contract. Something similar to this possibility once existed for those faculty members who wished to leave the College for a trial period of three years to pursue a different line of work while retaining their tenured appointment at the College.
3. Senior faculty members approaching retirement might be incentivized to consider exchanging their tenured appointment for a fixed-term contract. This arrangement might be imagined as a variation on the existing phased retirement plans.

Although I am certain the Committee of Six and the Administration have discussed similar ideas, is it possible that these issues might benefit from a more publically focused conversation.

Best regards,
Joel

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 26, 2007**

The twenty-seventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006-2007 was called to order by the President in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, February 26, 2007. Present were Professors George, O'Hara, Parker, Schneider, Sinos, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Changes to the minutes of February 19 were given to the Dean.

President Marx began the meeting by suggesting that the Committee review once again the preliminary assessment (the so-called "roadmap") created by last year's Committee of Six, of which bodies should be charged with considering each recommendation of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP). The purpose would be to ensure that the assignments, as currently outlined, will facilitate the consideration of the pieces of the report as they may relate to one another, whenever such a coordinated review would be desirable. Dean Call asked the members to think about possible ways to facilitate having faculty committees work together when considering interrelated CAP recommendations. The members agreed that reviewing the preliminary assessment would be valuable.

Continuing his remarks, the President informed the members that Michael Kiefer, the College's Chief Advancement Officer, has decided to step down on June 30 of this year. President Marx explained that Mr. Kiefer would like to pursue his interest in international affairs, rather than direct a second capital campaign at Amherst. At the President's request, Mr. Kiefer will serve as Special Advisor to the President for an indefinite period beginning July 1, 2007, in order to ensure a smooth transition for the next person in his role. President Marx informed the members that he would chair the search committee for Mr. Kiefer's successor and asked the Committee for suggestions of faculty colleagues who might serve on the committee. He noted that the title of Chief Advancement Officer was an unusual one within the profession and asked the members for their thoughts about the possibility of changing it to Vice-President for Advancement or Vice-President for Development, in an effort to convey fully the level and range of responsibilities associated with the position. The Committee expressed the strong preference not to adopt the title of Vice-President because of the lack of clarity that might result in terms of the individual's position within the organizational hierarchy of the College—particularly since none of the other senior officers of the College are vice-presidents—and because of the more corporate tone of the title. The President thanked the members for their advice.

Under his announcements, Dean Call informed the Committee that Professor Yarbrough has brought to his attention difficulties that she is encountering when colleagues regularly run over their assigned class times, thereby making it impossible for even the most conscientious students to arrive at the next class on time. She has communicated that she and many other faculty members often give short quizzes or other timed in-class assignments at the beginning of class. So when a student arrives late, it causes both inconvenience and potential grade consequences for the student. The members agreed that extending lectures should be avoided and asked that faculty colleagues end their classes on time.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Parker asked about how the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) imagines shifting its focus from considering FTE

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 26, 2007**

allocation on an annual basis to planning for the allocation, in a coordinated way, of the anticipated new FTEs over a period of six to eight years. He noted that, while departments undertake long-range planning when formulating FTE requests, the CEP, whose membership changes from year to year, has only considered the requests that come before it during a given year. Professor O'Hara said that conversations about longer-range planning for FTE allocation should occur as the "roadmap" for implementation of CAP recommendations is considered and faculty committees continue their deliberations. Professor Woglom commented that it may be difficult for the CEP to plan, in some cases, before it receives the reports of committees, in particular those of the groups considering recommendations surrounding writing and quantitative skills. Professor Parker said that, perhaps, appointments should be conceived in ways that are atypical, suggesting that there might be division-wide consideration of FTE allocation over the six- to eight-year period. President Marx and Dean Call agreed and asked the Committee to consider ways of bringing departments together to facilitate conversation. Professor Woglom said that he did not see the need for imposing a formal structure on the Faculty, since he believes that such conversation would arise organically. He cited the examples of faculty members in the sciences and the arts, who have had division-wide discussions that were prompted by the CAP Report. Professor George responded that the science faculty, at least, had come together at the invitation of Deans Call and Griffiths.

Other members agreed that faculty members are busy, and that it would be useful to organize ways for interested groups to come together to discuss fleshing out and implementing College-wide priorities. Professor O'Hara noted that Professor Cox, as part of his role as Thalheimer Professor (a three-year appointment that rotates among tenured faculty members across the divisions), has helped to facilitate such discussions about quantitative areas. Thalheimer Professors are selected for their dedication to teaching and to academic support in the liberal arts and at Amherst. The Thalheimer Professor is given a small fund to support a regular seminar or lunch for faculty members who are thinking about pedagogy. Professor O'Hara suggested making additional appointments following the Thalheimer model across divisions, and that such colleagues could organize and lead the type of discussions under consideration. President Marx and Dean Call expressed interest in such a plan.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee members," Professor Woglom expressed concern about the volume of general College mail that he is receiving that is not relevant to him and which he routinely throws out. He wondered if there might be a way to opt out of receiving categories of mail in order to save time and paper. Dean Call noted that the adoption of the new content management system over the course of the next year or so will allow users to choose which categories of communications they wish to focus on in the College's electronic environment. While agreeing that it is important for the College to streamline communications, the President said that care should be taken so that the spirit of the liberal arts is respected. Receiving a notice of an interesting lecture about a subject far afield from one's own might prompt someone to attend, for example. A notice of a vacancy in a department outside one's own might prompt someone to tell a friend or colleague about the position, potentially

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 26, 2007**

broadening the pool of applicants. He suggested that Professor Woglom, over the next week or more, put in a box all general College mail of a type that he would hope never to see again. The contents could then be reviewed and solutions for this problem could be considered, the President said.

Professor Woglom next brought to the attention of the Dean and the President concern about the procedures for authorizing students to participate in study-abroad programs that have not been approved by the College. At present, he spends a great deal of time vetting such programs at the request of economics majors who wish to participate in them and determining questions relating to whether credit will be granted on a College-wide or departmental level. Given that he has a large number of advisees, these deliberations have become quite time-consuming, he said, and he does not think that this is an effective use of his time. Professors Sinos and O'Hara and Dean Call said that their departments are eager to play a key role in this process. They agreed that faculty members in departments, such as Economics, that have a larger number of majors studying abroad could become unduly burdened if they are frequently asked to evaluate study-abroad programs that have not been approved by the College.

Dean Call noted that in the spring of 2005, the Committee of Six created the Ad Hoc Committee on Study Abroad (three members of the Faculty, each from a different department, and the Study-Abroad Advisor and the Registrar, ex officio). The committee's charge includes shaping policies and procedures for evaluating and approving study-abroad programs for Amherst students and assisting the Registrar and the Study-Abroad Advisor (this part-time position has now been expanded to a full-time position and has been re-named the Director of International Experience) when questions regarding the appropriateness and academic rigor of programs arise. Noting that in 2003-2004, 85 percent of Amherst students who studied abroad did so in Europe, Australia, or New Zealand, President Marx said that the committee has also been asked to work to expand the range of countries and cultural areas and linguistic opportunities offered to Amherst students who wish to study abroad. The committee was asked to make particular efforts to identify established and emerging programs in Asia, Latin America, South Asia, and Africa and to encourage study also in these areas, the President said. Dean Call noted that in the fall of 2007, the Ad Hoc Committee will report on its experience and the Committee of Six will evaluate whether the committee should become a standing committee of the Faculty. At the time that the committee was established, the Committee of Six agreed that departments should continue to make decisions about which courses receive credit toward their majors. Dean Call said that he would contact the committee and the new Director of International Experience, Janna Behrens, to ask for suggestions about how to provide additional support for departments with a large number of majors studying abroad, particularly when they wish to do so through programs that are not currently approved by the College.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee members," Professor O'Hara asked the President if he would provide information about the recently announced gift of \$6 million to the College. President Marx said that Arthur W. Koenig '66 has generously pledged \$1 million annually over at least the next six years to create the Koenig Scholarship Fund, which will bring

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 26, 2007**

talented low-income students from Latin America and Africa to Amherst, provide academic support for them, and sponsor annual recruitment trips from the College to those regions. The Koenig Scholarship Fund will designate up to five Koenig Scholars each year, focusing particular attention on the most talented and needy students from Latin America and Africa, President Marx said. Admissions decisions would be made according to the regular process, and where aid is merited on the basis of need, a Koenig Scholarship might be awarded. The President noted that the College often provides aid to students from Africa and Latin America and that the Koenig Scholarships would provide support for this effort. In the event that Amherst does not recruit five talented, low-income students from Latin America and Africa in any entering cohort, the College will consult with the donor to establish whether program funds may be carried forward to support Koenig Scholars or may be expended in support of financial aid for other needy international students.

Professor Sinos next asked about how plans for the future of the Frost Library were proceeding. Dean Call noted that a small Library Planning Group, composed of Amherst faculty members and administrators, structured and led a campus conversation last year about the long-range future of the Amherst College Library. That group's report was reviewed by the CAP. At present, the Dean is awaiting a recommendation regarding the next stage of the planning process from Sherre Harrington, Librarian of the College, and Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services. President Marx noted that the library is tentatively included in the budget for the upcoming campaign, but that money cannot be raised until a clear vision emerges for the library. Answering the question of what the library will need to be ten years from now is critical and challenging, he said, while noting that the library should be the intellectual center of the campus and that he is eager to raise money for the transformation of Frost once a plan is in place. The Committee then turned to personnel matters.

Professor Parker next asked if he could convey concerns that have been shared with him by faculty colleagues about the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion. He said that, while he does not defend the status quo and believes that there are difficulties with promotion as it is now carried out, he views the report as a response to problems faced by the Committee of Six with respect to the gap between *Faculty Handbook* language and actual practice. The criteria for promotion are understandably of concern to a Committee that needs to know what it's doing when it evaluates the work of tenured associate professors, but the issue faced by the Faculty more generally has to do with sustaining the intellectual and creative life of its members over the longer haul from tenuring to retirement. Does the promotion report serve that latter goal, he asked.

Professor Parker continued, noting that the promotion report itself acknowledges that "there is a limit to how much a one-time event such as promotion can do to support faculty growth or serve institutional needs" (page four). He added that there is only one sentence in the report under "The role of promotion in the continued development of the Faculty" (page eleven). The report, he contends, seeks to make the moment of promotion more meaningful by increasing the level of evaluation. However, the recommendations of the report on pages five through seven

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 26, 2007**

seem to make the criteria of promotion—the basis for the evaluation—no clearer to him than what exists at present. Professor Parker reported that he has heard some faculty say that, if we're going to have to change our promotion procedures, this report is less draconian than it might have been, which is hardly an endorsement of its principles. Many responses that have been shared with him are more strongly negative and have been along the lines of the following: Why is this the moment for a new policy and practice when so much else is changing for faculty in the wake of the CAP Report? Many colleagues, he said, view the proposed changes in promotion practice as more far-reaching than the many recent changes in the faculty culture of Amherst. For newly tenured associate professors, the recommendations seem to be more of a stick than a carrot, he said. There is nothing mentioned about expanded research money, or course relief for chairs, onerous committee work, and editorships—all of which are customary at research universities—and some colleagues question whether faculty are now to be judged by university standards of productivity but without comparable kinds of support. He said that many fear that the report's recommendations would increase Amherst's already-formidable bureaucracy. They wonder whether associate professors will pull back from institutional commitments in order to concentrate on research and teaching. They wonder whether research and teaching during this newly expanded probationary period will be less experimental and more disciplinary in orientation. They wonder whether competition among associate professors will be fostered at the expense of community. They wonder whether self-surveillance, anxiety, and enforced timidity will continue past tenure, with those who have postponed having families experiencing the hardest hit. Finally, Professor Parker said, they wonder if these recommendations are the start down a slippery slope that will lead to regular post-tenure review and merit pay.

The President suggested that all members think about Professor Parker's comments and respond at the next Committee of Six meeting.

With little time remaining, the members agreed to discuss at their next meeting how best to structure the consideration of the promotion report at the next Faculty Meeting. Professor Schneider said that he got the sense from the last faculty meeting that there should be more discussion, perhaps in a committee-of-the-whole format, before motions are formulated. Professor Woglom suggested that it might be best to take a straw vote to determine whether the Faculty feels that promotion procedures should be reviewed, without getting into the specifics of the promotion report. President Marx suggested that the Faculty should consider this important issue fully. Professor O'Hara said that she thinks that it would be useful to consider promotion before the issue of teaching evaluations for tenured professors comes before the Faculty.

The President noted that some faculty members have argued that if the promotion process has become a rubber stamp, we should call it what it is and view it as such. In his view, this approach risks raising concerns about the long-term health of the institution. Just as serious reviews for reappointment and for tenure help to ensure the continued high quality of the Faculty, the same should be true for promotion. Formalizing promotion as a moment without substance makes the College vulnerable to the charge of insularity and does not allow for the recognition of distinction. While remaining cognizant of the values of the College and its sense of community,

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, February 26, 2007**

President Marx said that reappointment, tenure, and promotion are critical opportunities for advising, feedback, and signaling, and for recognizing accomplishment, and should be used as such.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, March 5, 2007**

The twenty-eighth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006-2007 was called to order by the President in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, March 5, 2007. Present were Professors George, Parker, Schneider, Sinos, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor O'Hara was absent by prior arrangement. The minutes of February 19 were approved. Changes to the minutes of February 26 were given to the Dean.

As the President had suggested, Professor Woglom presented the President Marx with a box of general College mail received during the past week via campus mail. The President said that the contents would be reviewed.

Discussion turned briefly to the possible mechanisms that might be put in place to provide more flexibility for the Committee when minutes need to be approved on an accelerated schedule during the week before faculty meetings. The members agreed that the Dean should explore a viable option suggested by the Department of Information Technology.

In regard to the Committee's recent discussions about FTE allocation, some members of the Committee wondered whether the following language from the February 12, 2007, letter from the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) to department chairs might imply that there could be rewards (in the form of FTEs) given to departments for having large enrollments: "Since enrollment pressures are one consideration in CEP deliberations over FTEs, please give us your view of the demands on your department in terms of number of majors, average number of advisees, class sizes, and number of honors candidates and the extent to which the new hire would affect those numbers."

President Marx said that large enrollments are a relevant factor but should not be the lone incentive for allocating FTEs. Professor Woglom noted that some departments may seek large enrollments to "game" the CEP system, but that some departments face large enrollments due to student demand. He said that his department, Economics, and the Department of Psychology, among others, have been teaching overloads and bearing an unfair burden for twenty years and certainly did not create their enrollment pressures. If the CEP ignores enrollments in their deliberations, he said, it will ill serve the students who choose to elect these departments.

Continuing the conversation, President Marx agreed that, while the College should endeavor to provide resources to ensure that courses are not overwhelmed by enrollments, some courses are well suited to larger formats. For others, limiting class enrollments and increasing rigor might be appropriate. Professor Woglom responded that perhaps the admission office should accept students with a broader range of academic interests to avoid the bunching up of student interests. He said that it seems wrong to limit the size of classes, which amounts, essentially, to closing down areas of opportunity for students. President Marx noted that, in recognition of the need to support departments, the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) decided that about one-fourth of the anticipated new FTEs will be allocated to meeting existing department needs.

Professor Schneider said that the CEP should be able to tell the difference between "gaming" the system through enrollments and departmental enrollment pressures that arise based on student interest. For this reason, he feels that language about enrollments should not disappear from the CEP's annual letter. Professor Parker remembered that previous letters acknowledged that departments that had concerns about being short staffed should include this

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, March 5, 2007**

information in their FTE requests, but noted that enrollment pressures alone was not a sufficient rationale for an FTE award. The Dean commented that it is his recollection that the CEP states each year that, while enrollments are relevant to the discussion of FTEs, they should not drive the discussion by themselves. He said that he did not recall exactly how this idea has been articulated in previous letters from the CEP, but informed the members that he is confident, from the CEP's discussion in the drafting of their letter this year, that the committee did not intend to make (or signal) any change in the relevance of enrollments to their deliberations.

Continuing the discussion, Professor Parker reiterated the desirability of having long-term curricular planning inform the FTE allocation process, while at the same time noting the difficulties that are inherent in the lack of continuity of membership of the CEP from year to year. Professor Sinos asked if the presence of the Dean on the CEP has helped provide this more extended view of curricular needs. Dean Call responded that he believes that a number of factors, including, he hopes, his presence on the committee, are allowing the CEP to gain a greater understanding of departmental curricular needs on a longer-term basis. He cited the regular conversations and planning documents of departments that informed the CAP planning process, the addition of a researcher to support the committee and serve as its librarian, and the ongoing conversations between the CEP and departments that are considering FTE proposals.

On a different subject, the President asked the members whether they thought it would be valuable to consider including on Amherst transcripts the median grade for each course taken, as suggested by a faculty colleague. Professor Sinos asked if the proposal would cover all courses, even small ones. She questioned the value of such information for small advanced seminars. Professor Schneider asked who would be served under such a system. Professor George said that information about median grades in pre-medical courses is already provided as part of Amherst students' medical school recommendations. Medical schools find this information to be very valuable in making judgements about students' academic record, he said. President Marx suggested that sample transcripts be gathered from other institutions that include information of this kind on their transcripts. He asked the members which would be the appropriate body to consider this questions, and the Committee agreed that the College Council should be consulted on this issue.

The Dean next noted some upcoming agenda items and said that it is his hope that the Committee will return to its discussion of tenure procedures for creative and performing artists once all personnel business for the semester is completed. The Committee then considered sixty-seven course proposals and voted to forward them, after a few questions are resolved, to the Faculty for approval.

Turning to a different subject, Professor Parker asked if it might be informative for the Dean to gather those constituencies interested in film and media studies at the College to have more College-wide input into a proposal for an FTE in the study of film. The Dean recalled that, in the fall, the Committee had been concerned about privileging the study of film in the FTE allocation process when he and Professor Parker had suggested the formation of an Ad Hoc Committee on the Study of Film. Hearing no objection to this proposal, the Dean agreed to work with Professor Parker on gathering interested colleagues.

The Committee then turned to personnel matters.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, March 5, 2007**

Conversation turned next to whether to have a Faculty Meeting on March 13. In considering the issues that might be future subjects of discussion this semester, Professor Woglom asked about the progress of the deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Evaluation and Improvement of Teaching and the Ad Hoc Committee on Writing. Dean Call said that the writing committee is in the process of putting together a draft report and plans to speak with the CEP. The Ad Hoc Committee on the Evaluation and Improvement of Teaching has met with the CEP and plans to meet with the Committee of Six in April.

President Marx wondered if it would be informative to put a resolution before the Faculty to see if the Faculty is in favor of changing promotion procedures, allowing for debate on that resolution—to include discussion of the promotion committee's proposal, if not specifics of *Faculty Handbook* language. Professor Woglom, who had suggested a similar plan which he felt the President had not supported, asked President Marx if he had changed his mind about using such an approach. President Marx said that it might be productive to get a general sense, through such a resolution, of whether colleagues feel that changes should be made to the promotion system, including whether the Faculty wants to make the timing of the promotion decision more flexible, in accordance with existing *Faculty Handbook* language, and the review more substantive. Professor Sinos pointed out that the *Faculty Handbook's* current language provides for just such flexibility. Some members suggested that the sentiment of the room at the last Faculty Meeting (February 20) suggested that colleagues would like to have more preliminary discussion of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion.

Professor Sinos expressed the view that the Committee of Six should not move in a particular direction until more is known about the sense of the Faculty. Professor Woglom noted that, at the last Faculty Meeting, the Faculty seemed to be divided on the promotion question—individuals either said that they were embarrassed by the pro forma nature of the current promotion process or expressed the view that the proposals of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion would create another hurdle for the Faculty. Professor Parker noted that Professor Olver has offered the Faculty (in her email attached to the Committee of Six minutes of February 12) excellent guidance about how to structure the Faculty's consideration of the promotion report. Professor Woglom suggested that the Faculty could vote after discussion of the first part of Professor Olver's sequence (based on the cover letter and part II of the report), that is after the consideration of the following: "Would a more thorough procedure for the evaluation of candidates for promotion to full professor be beneficial to the institution and its faculty? What's wrong with the status quo? What are the positive and negative consequences of change?"

Dean Call noted that Professor O'Hara, knowing that the Committee would be discussing this issue and that she would be absent from the meeting, wrote to him to share her thoughts about how the Committee might best shape discussion at the next Faculty Meeting. She expressed her view that the report is a reasonable and measured one and said that it is her hope that the Faculty would adopt some of its recommendations. Faculty need to discuss the "should we" question before the "how should we" question, Professor O'Hara noted. She feels that a discussion of how the new system will explicitly allow the flexibility that Professor Sanchez-Eppler has said is necessary for faculty with families or other life issues should take place. Professor O'Hara said that it would be important to also acknowledge the "administrative

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, March 5, 2007**

burden” that is often placed on newly tenured faculty, but also to point out how those factors are explicitly mentioned as part of a successful promotion to full professor.

President Marx, referring to Professor Parker’s remarks at the Committee’s meeting on February 26, said that he was eager to hear more about the potential pros and cons of any changes, and how the recommendations would increase what Professor Parker had characterized as Amherst’s “already formidable bureaucracy.” Professor Sinos said that, under the proposals, departments would have to solicit student evaluations and evaluate the scholarship of candidates for promotion with at least as much care as at the time of tenure. Professor Parker noted that his department does so already. Several members said that there are clearly different norms in different departments. President Marx found this lack of standardization troubling, and several members agreed that having different procedures, depending on the department, was unfair. Professor Woglom said that he is not comfortable with the current process because it ignores accomplishment. Professor George suggested that, if departments and the Committee of Six are going to evaluate scholarship at the time of promotion, consideration should be given to having outside reviewers.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Parker asked why promotion should be one of only three moments during a faculty member’s career during which merit and accomplishment is recognized and wondered whether it would be valuable to have many such moments to sustain colleagues during their time at Amherst. Professor Woglom said that it would be best to have many other moments during which the community would recognize accomplishment, but noted that he fears that adding “moments” would be difficult and that he would be pleased, for now, if the review at the time of promotion was more substantive. Professor Sinos said that, in her experience on the Committee of Six, promotion review at the Committee of Six level was not an automatic process; the Committee had always scrutinized candidates carefully and felt there was good reason to promote those who were successful. Other members, the Dean, and the President asked how long it has been since the Committee of Six has turned down a colleague for promotion to full professor. The Dean said that he would research this question. Professor Woglom asked the Dean if it would be possible for the Committee to have additional history about promotion, and Dean Call said that he would provide some information.

Continuing the discussion, Professors Woglom and Schneider commented that having a greater communal understanding of what warrants promotion would be beneficial. Professor Woglom said that the proposals’s plan to include members from other departments on promotion committees might encourage this. Professor Sinos questioned whether, in most cases, someone outside the department would be able to join in discussion on an equal basis with department members. Such a system would increase the work involved in promotion by involving more faculty in it, with no clear benefit, she said.

Responding to remarks about the value of “many moments to recognize faculty accomplishment,” Professor Sinos expressed the view that campuses on which faculty members must devote constant attention to their vitae promote the appearance of industry rather than serious scholarship; she believes that Amherst is a better community for not encouraging faculty members to toot their own horns. Under the current system, faculty are free to undertake long-term projects, she said, and that she worries about any change that might encourage the faculty to work on smaller less substantive projects in order to be able to check off a series of

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, March 5, 2007**

accomplishments. Professor George said that he worries that, if promotion becomes more of a hurdle, there will be a decrease in the current high level of involvement of associate professors in the life of the College, since they would not feel able to take time away from their scholarship after tenure.

Professor Parker next asked whether the system is really broken. He wondered whether colleagues stop working after tenure. The Dean responded that he sees great variation in individual faculty member's priorities. When asked whether faculty salaries are adjusted based on accomplishment, the Dean said that salaries are only adjusted modestly and that it is not possible to make too large a distinction without having a process for the evaluation of accomplishment.

President Marx noted that it is useful not to look at this issue in isolation. He asked the Dean to outline CAP recommendations that would support faculty development. Dean Call said that the CAP recommended that faculty research be supported through 100 percent sabbatic leaves, encouraging year-long periods in which to concentrate on research. He noted that he has been discussing with the President the possibility of making leave clocks more flexible, allowing for the possibility of more frequent leaves with proportional salaries. He noted that, in recent years, the College has provided full-year leaves at 90 or 100 percent salary for tenure-track faculty upon reappointment, and the CAP has proposed that every tenure-track faculty member be entitled to a full year's leave at 100 percent salary after reappointment. Continuing his outline of enhanced research-related support, the Dean said that the CAP recommended increased support for the Faculty Research Award Program (FRAP) and having FRAP-type support for pedagogy as well as research. In addition, the committee recommended doubling support for the Amherst Academic Interns and student research funding, which has already increased substantially in recent years. In addition, the CAP recommended that a teaching and learning center be established, and plans are already moving forward for a center to support teaching, advising, and pedagogy that will provide, among other things, funding for faculty to host conferences and workshops. The Dean noted that the Copeland program has been expanded and now has a budget that is roughly two-and-a-half times greater than it has been in the past. The program is now organized around a theme put forward by the Faculty, and scholars will come to campus for a year, rather than for a semester, with the intent of scholarly collaboration among Copeland Fellows and Amherst faculty members. Finally, Dean Call said that the search for the new Director of Sponsored Research, a position that the CAP recommended in support of faculty research, is now well under way, and he anticipates that finalists will be brought to campus this spring.

Professor Woglom noted that, with all the support possible, faculty members have to be accountable at some level and should expose themselves to evaluation. He asked the Dean how many colleagues typically submit their CVs each year, in response to the Dean's request that they do so. Dean Call said that he thinks perhaps 50 percent of the Faculty does so.

President Marx asked whether the tenure-track faculty has felt free to participate in the promotion discussion so far. He asked the members for their advice about how to encourage assistant professors to make their voices heard and wondered whether it would be useful for the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion or the Dean to meet with the tenure-track faculty, as he and the Committee of Six have done in the past. Professor Sinos said that she was told by some assistant

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, March 5, 2007**

professors that they did not feel free to express themselves in such a format and that some have felt that their views were not represented in what was reported to the Faculty as “consensus” of the junior faculty. Professor Schneider said that he feels that Associate Professors will be most invested in the issue of promotion to full professor.

Discussion returned to the question of whether to have a Faculty Meeting on March 13. Professor Sinos expressed her dismay that such a meeting would conflict with a Music at Amherst series concert. She worried that faculty members who have tickets for the series would face a difficult choice of whether to attend the concert or the meeting. She suggested that such conflicts should be avoided as much as possible and if, in the future, Faculty Meetings are to be scheduled at other than the typical times (the first and third Tuesdays of the month) the dates should be announced at the beginning of the academic year. The Dean and the President agreed that should be the goal. The Dean wondered if starting a Faculty Meeting on March 13 earlier than is usual and having a shorter meeting might allow for conversation and concert attendance. The members did not think that this would be a viable solution. Some members of the Committee expressed the view that a discussion of the promotion report alone was insufficient business for a Faculty Meeting and suggested that having a meeting in which the draft mission statement is discussed, as well as the report, would be best. After further discussion, the Committee decided not to have a meeting on March 13. The members agreed that it would be essential to have a meeting on March 27.

Discussion then turned to a departmental matter.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

The twenty-ninth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006-2007 was called to order by the President in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, March 12, 2007. Present were Professors George, O'Hara, Parker, Schneider, Sinos, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The minutes of February 26 were approved. Changes to the minutes of March 5 were given to the Dean.

Professor George asked to make a comment on the minutes of February 19, which had been approved previously. At that meeting, the Committee of Six discussed the proposal to increase the size of the student body by eighty students, prior to the February 20 Faculty Meeting vote on that issue. Professor George had made critical comments, accurately reported in the February 19 minutes, about allocating half of the proposed new places to international students. Based on those comments, some colleagues later inferred that Professor George disapproved of admitting any international students to Amherst. Professor George said he could understand how his remarks could have been interpreted that way, and he wanted to make clear that he was questioning only the increase, i.e., the allocation of 50 percent of the increased places to a group that now makes up only about 6 percent of the student body. He said he strongly supports having some international students at Amherst.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Marx asked the members to consider several possible ways to bolster some of the structures of faculty governance, with the aim of ensuring the most robust consideration of complex issues. He said that he feels that it might be useful, in the interest of continuity and institutional memory, to have the chairs of some committees (particularly, the Committee on Educational Policy) serve for two years. He also suggested, for the same reasons, that department chairs might serve for more than one year.

Professor Parker noted that he had served for two consecutive years as the chair of the College Council and of the Copeland Committee, due to unusual circumstances, and that he feels that having some committee chairs have greater longevity could be useful. Several members commented that, when serving on some committees (the example of the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid was offered) it can take at least a year to understand the workings of a committee and the issues being considered. Professor Sinos said that chairing committees can be onerous and that extending the duty might make it more so. She also wondered whether leave patterns might narrow the pool of potential chairs who could serve for more than one year in that role. Professor George agreed. Professor Woglom said that he feels that having chairs of departments and some committees serve for longer periods is an idea that is worth considering, but that he was unsure of what the best process would be to decide this question and whether now was the best time to consider this question.

Continuing the conversation, President Marx suggested that departments and committees might be contacted and asked for their views on this question. Perhaps the committees could be asked to report back at the Commencement Faculty Meeting on their consideration of whether having chairs serve for more than one year would be preferable. In terms of departments, it was noted that there is great variation regarding how many years a chair serves. Some departments have them serve for one year, while others have them serve for extended periods. The President asked Assistant Dean Tobin to provide information to the Committee on the number of years that each department has its chair serve, and she agreed to do so.

Professor Schneider commented that he feels that it is important to enhance the amount of institutional memory within committees and that longer terms for chairs could accomplish this. President Marx said that he feels that having longer terms for committee chairs might facilitate the consideration of issues. In terms of department chairs, Professor Parker said that, because of practices at other institutions, there seems to be a phobia at Amherst of having chairs who wield a great deal of power and control serving for many years. Professor Woglom commented that there should be a middle ground between having a chair who serves for only a year and is merely a paper-pusher—with no authority and no continuity—and having chairs who control everything.

Turning to another question, the President informed the members that he often receives suggestions and funding requests for speakers in the sciences who might engage our students. He typically forwards such requests to department chairs. The President believes that a more efficient and coordinated process should be put in place. He said that he is considering isolating monies from his discretionary funds to support such speakers and having the chairs of the Departments of Biology, Chemistry, Physics, and Geology consider requests for speakers and make decisions about which ones to fund and bring to campus. He asked the members for their views about this idea.

Professor Sinos expressed concern that funds overseen by the Faculty Lecture Committee might be used for this purpose. President Marx said that it was not his intention that those funds be used; he had been alluding to Presidential discretionary funds, he said. Professor Schneider commented that there are so many events that it is easy to become saturated and to ignore them all. He wondered if there might be some way of elevating the most important events so that they would stand out. Professor Parker responded that he did not think that the administration should prioritize events in this way and that having a wide range of events is part of the mission of colleges and universities. Professor O'Hara, who felt that the sciences would be privileged under the plan outlined by the President, suggested that each department be asked to organize one lecture a year, funded by the President, that would be accessible to a general audience and would focus on an interdisciplinary topic. Professor Woglom commented that it is disheartening when audiences are very small for lectures. The President and the Dean thanked the members for their thoughts.

The Dean next discussed with the members upcoming items for the Committee's agenda, including the College Council's calendar report, proposals to revise the charges of the Faculty Computer Committee and the Committee on Education and Athletics, and tenure procedures for creative and performing artists. The Dean asked the members if they would like to meet on March 26, even though the President would be traveling on College business. The Committee decided to meet on that date. Dean Call next asked the members whether the dates of April 10 and 17 should still be held for Faculty Meetings, and the Committee agreed there may be a need to hold meetings on one or both of those dates. The Dean next noted that, as the Committee had requested, he had asked those colleagues who attended the January 17 lunch on science teaching whether they would be willing to give their permission for the notes (see attached) of their meeting to be appended to the Committee of Six minutes. They said that they would be pleased to have the notes appended.

Reminding the Committee that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Evaluation and Improvement of Teaching has asked to meet with the Committee of Six in April, the Dean asked the members if they felt that it would also be informative to meet with the Ad Hoc Committee on Writing. As the Dean recently informed the members, the writing committee is in the process of putting together a draft report and plans to speak with the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). Professor Woglom said that he thought that it would be useful to meet with the writing committee if that group would be bringing a proposal forward during the spring semester. The other members agreed, and the Dean said that he would speak with the writing committee to get a sense of their plans.

Dean Call informed the members that the Faculty Computer Committee soon plans to propose adding a fourth faculty member to the committee on a permanent basis. The Dean informed the members that, in the interim, Professor Morse had been asked by the committee to join it for the semester and that he had agreed. The members next reviewed statistical information (with the names of candidates removed) about past promotion decisions by year.

The Dean next announced that he planned to write to the Faculty in the next several days to inform them of a series of initiatives designed to support faculty scholarship and teaching, among them increased professional travel support for the Faculty, a pilot version of the Faculty Innovation Fund (FIF) (curricular and pedagogical innovation), and an enhancement to the Faculty Research Award Program (FRAP) program (work-in-progress seminars). He said that, while some programs await further consultation by faculty committees and/or the raising of funds, he wanted to inform the Faculty about new opportunities and changes in policy that would go into effect immediately. To encourage faculty to develop and share their research interests within the Amherst community, the FRAP will be extended to support work-in-progress seminars over the course of a semester or a year. A seminar will consist of six to eight faculty members, each of whom will present a paper that he or she is preparing for publication. Ideally, groups of faculty who would like to work together would apply jointly for these funds. Up to half of the participants could be Five-College colleagues. Up to three faculty seminars will be funded for the fall and spring semester next year, the Dean said. Each Amherst participant will receive an honorarium of \$1,000, with the exception of a designated facilitator who would receive an honorarium of \$1,500. Proposals for work-in-progress seminars will be evaluated by the FRAP committee. To support innovation in new and underrepresented areas of the curriculum, the Dean said that he plans to announce a pilot version of the Faculty Innovation Fund (FIF). As recommended in the Report of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP), the Faculty Innovation Fund will support a broad range of curricular and pedagogical initiatives, including both departmental and interdisciplinary projects.

Professor Sinos asked if FIF would support faculty who might want to innovate within an existing course in order to introduce students to new developments or debates in the field. The Dean said that FIF could indeed support such work. Other examples of projects that could be supported by FIF would include having two or more faculty members undertake a critical examination of a department to which they are appointed and then propose curricular revisions based on their appraisal of the relationship between disciplinary trends and the particular composition, interests, and strengths of their department, the Dean said. Their assessment might

result in the development of new courses and possibly in refashioning the major. Faculty who apply for these grants would discuss their projects in advance with their department chair and share the results of the study with the department.

In addition, Dean Call said that grants will also be offered to develop courses that explicitly compare disciplinary and interdisciplinary perspectives on a given issue. Courses that add to the curriculum greater understanding of the world and engage in comparative cross-cultural analysis represent another important priority. Grants will also be available for faculty to develop experiential learning courses, the Dean said. Faculty may request an honorarium of \$1,000 and a budget of up to \$1,500 for course related expenses, which may include funds for purchasing materials, hiring research assistants, or attending summer training institutes. Faculty who teach collaboratively or develop a collaborative department assessment will also receive \$1,000 honoraria and additional research funds in amounts to be determined on the basis of their requests. Proposals to the FIF will be evaluated by the CEP the Dean said.

President Marx said that he worried about the CEP having yet another responsibility placed on the committee. The members of the Committee of Six felt that the CEP was the appropriate committee to consider these proposals, which represent innovation within the curriculum. This review would overlap with the CEP's charges in the area of FTE allocation and course proposal review, the Committee agreed. President Marx concurred, but said that he would be open to considering that another group review proposals if the CEP becomes overwhelmed. Professor O'Hara wondered if a committee such as the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching and Learning, which has overseen the Mellon Faculty Enhancement Program, might review proposals. Professor George commented that it would be unusual for an ad hoc committee to take on such a role. The members agreed that, for the time being, the review should be done by the CEP. The members next reviewed two course proposals and, after some discussion, voted six to zero in favor of forwarding them to the Faculty.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Sinos asked the Dean and the President whether the administration has a policy on how discord within a department is handled. She wondered whether the administration would insist on departments coming to consensus or would respect majority votes, when decision-making is necessary. She asked, for example, if normal hiring procedures would be suspended if there was extreme dissension within a department. She wondered if the administration would be protective of junior faculty at the expense of a department, holding it hostage. Professor Sinos suggested that insisting on having a consensus is a poor strategy and could lead to destroying a department.

Professor Woglom argued that Professor Sinos had raised important questions about faculty governance, and he felt the Faculty would benefit from hearing the administration's view. In particular he noted that the *Faculty Handbook* (section II.C. The Faculty, Academic Departments) states the following: "Departments are expected to reach decisions in a collegial fashion." What is the administration's interpretation of "collegial"; does it mean consensus or is it consistent with majority votes? How should department business be conducted when decisions cannot be achieved collegially? Professor Parker commented that every case of departmental discord is different and for reasons that are difficult to generalize from. The Dean noted that last year, both the Committee of Six and the CEP considered general questions, as well as specifics,

about these issues. The Committee of Six also played a consultative role in a specific case, he said. The President and the Dean said that they would consider Professor Sinos's question and would respond at a future meeting.

The Committee then turned to personnel matters.

Dean Griffiths joined the meeting at 5:15 to discuss with the members the work of the Ad Hoc Faculty Group on Reaccreditation and the process of adopting a mission statement. Dean Griffiths noted that, after broad on-campus consultation about the first draft (November 28, 2006), all on- and off-campus constituencies were asked to comment on a second draft (January 28, 2007). A revision of that statement was then done. Dean Griffiths said that it is the hope of the ad hoc group to discuss the statement at the Faculty Meeting of March 27 and to report on that discussion to the Board of Trustees at their meeting of April 23-24. After that conversation, the statement would be brought back to the Faculty for a vote, he said. The final draft would be brought to the Board for approval at their meeting of May 25-26.

The Committee discussed how best to get a sense of the Faculty's view of the mission statement. Dean Griffiths said that it would be important to avoid radical changes in the statement, since doing so would result in another round of consultations with all on- and off-campus constituencies and would delay an initial review by the Board. He noted that revising in the Faculty Meeting is also risky, since the statement is tightly woven. Professor Woglom said that the Faculty should not be committed to final language if amendments are not allowed. The members agreed that a committee-of-the-whole format would allow for straw votes on issues that emerge within the discussion to guide the ad hoc committee in revising the statement, as well as for a general vote to affirm that the statement expresses the Faculty's sense of the College's mission. Professor Parker said that he believes that the statement should not be controversial because of the fine job that the ad hoc committee had done in crafting the statement and in soliciting and incorporating input. He feels that the statement is both quotable and memorable. Professor Parker said that he would substitute "learning" for "knowledge" in the first sentence. After some discussion, it was agreed that such wordsmithing should be avoided at this point of the process, if at all possible. The Committee agreed that the ad hoc group had done an excellent job and thanked Dean Griffiths for the group's hard work. He left the meeting at 5:35.

The Committee next voted six in favor and zero opposed on content and six in favor and zero opposed to place the following resolution before the Faculty for consideration in the committee of the whole and by straw vote:

The attached draft of the mission statement broadly reflects the Faculty's understanding of the mission of the College.

The members next returned to a discussion of the topic of promotion to full professor. Professor Woglom noted that for the past nineteen years, no candidate has been denied promotion to full professor. Before that time, it seems that there was a substantive process. Professor Schneider commented that it certainly seems as though there is some agreement that the current system is not serving us well, but there is less agreement about how to change the

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, March 12, 2007**

106

system. Most members of the Committee agreed that the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion feels strongly that changes should be made.

Discussion turned to how best to structure the Faculty's consideration of the promotion issue at the March 27 Faculty Meeting. The Committee decided to put the following motion before the Faculty:

The Faculty asks the Committee of Six to produce, for a Faculty Meeting this spring, resolutions to revise current policies and practices regarding promotion to the rank of Professor.

The Committee voted four in favor and two opposed on the content of this motion and six in favor and zero opposed to forward it to the Faculty. Professor Parker suggested that it would be useful to append to the Faculty Meeting Agenda the *Faculty Handbook* language on promotion, and the members agreed that doing so would be informative.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amherst College

Meeting on Science Instruction
January 17, 2007

Attending: Carolyn Bassett, Charri Boykin-East, Greg Call, Ethan Clotfelter, David Cox, Peter Crowley, Steve George, Caroline Goutte, David Hall, David Hansen, Jennifer Innes, Jagu Jagannathan, Joe Kushick, Tanya Leise, Ben Lieber, Ron Lembo, Tony Marx, Billy McBride, Pat O'Hara, Tom Parker, David Ratner, Nancy Ratner, Steve Rivkin, and Rick Griffiths (recorder).

Are we ready to move to institution-wide solutions to bringing less well prepared students into the sciences? (With the Q Center and the oversight of the Committee on Academic Support we have some already.)

In particular:

Do we need a Science Executive Committee (or such) to coordinate curricula, instructional technology, facilities, liaison with Admission, and other common concerns? (Such a committee has worked well at Williams.) **What should be the duties of the administrator (Dean of Instruction?) in charge?** (E.g., recruitment of faculty to teach courses, providing support for pedagogy, supervising selection and counseling of students into science.)

Should we have non-departmental "gateway courses" for less well-prepared students to prepare them for the current entry-level science and Economics courses? (The Dean is willing to pay for staffing; the President is willing to take the political heat. Departments can decide on the criteria for entry into current courses. We already have information from reader ratings and other admission information to counsel students, as we do into Math 5 and the intensive sections. With current admission directions, the pool of students in these courses will be increasingly heterogeneous. With tact and assurance that their goals are attainable, such conversations can convince students without demoralizing them. Students would need to know about the mechanisms for placement in advance; such transparency would also be helpful also the high-school guidance community. These courses might be topic-centered [e.g, HIV, global warming]. A single generalized course in quantitative reasoning is unlikely to prepare for sciences and Economics.)

How deep into course-ladders and major programs should multiple entry points lead? (Is there a risk of a soft start with the gateways and a hard landing with existing courses? To what extent will departments want to redesign their programs?)

What would we consider success? (Is survival with C's sufficient? How do we reckon with the reality that those with weaker preparations rarely catch-up with the forward advance of their better prepared peers? We will probably want to include early and frequent consultation with the Office of Institutional Research for any assessment.)

In May we are planning a workshop to bring together representatives of Wellesley, Williams, Bowdoin, and perhaps Harvard to talk about these issues. We have a budget for outside consultants and speakers; suggestions welcome, as well as for speakers during the semester.

Other options and concerns were mentioned.

Should students be allowed to take course more than once?

Should we be willing to offer a fully subsidized post-bac fifth year so that students on a slower track can complete premed requirements?

Small experiments have the risks of blocking large solutions and broad, meaningful feedback. It was also argued that in scheduling Math 5 and Chem I 1 simultaneously we have already started the experiment of adjusting tracking, and therefore need science courses to meet the needs of Math 5 students.

The presence of less-well-prepared students holds down the level of instruction for stronger students.

Changes in courses may not get at the full pattern of students' adjustment to college, including dorm life, their summers, and their experience in non quantitative courses. We need more evidence about students' experience (e.g., from focus groups).

Indignation may have subsided, perhaps because the cohort of sufferers has expanded, with more support provided, but the problems may be as acute as 20 years ago, and involving more students.

As ever, the disadvantage of less-well-prepared students cannot be reduced to a skill set: not being able to think like a scientist/economist, difficulty integrating concepts and adapting to new contexts, lack of critical thinking.

There was discussion of the famous success of the University of Maryland, Baltimore County, which gets minority science students into labs early, allows students to repeat courses (C or lower), requires study groups, and provides ample mentoring (and where a designated cohort of minority students are the stars). Wellesley is adopting this model. See (thanks to David Ratner): <http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/311/5769/1870?eaf>
<http://www.umbc.edu/meyerhoff/prospective.html>

Steve George forwarded this site from Wendy Raymond (Biology, Williams) which compiles action plans of peer institutions (including Amherst) re diversity in the sciences.
<http://www.williams.edu/biology/divsciences/?n=Action+Plans>

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, March 26, 2007**

The thirtieth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006-2007 was called to order by the Dean in the President's office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, March 26, 2007. Present were Professors George, O'Hara, Parker, Schneider, Sinos, and Woglom, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The President did not attend because he was traveling on College business.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," the Dean and the members discussed upcoming meeting dates for the Committee. Dean Call next asked the members for permission for Bill Barlow, Director of Development, to attend Faculty Meetings until a new Chief Advancement Officer is hired, and the members agreed to grant permission. He also informed the members that a meeting with the Committee of Six and the Ad Hoc Committee on the Evaluation and Improvement of Teaching has now been set for April 16. Professor Woglom commented that having this meeting so late in the semester would make it difficult to bring the ad hoc committee's report before the Faculty for consideration this semester. The Dean said that he shares this concern, but was aware that the ad hoc committee wants to have discussions with the Faculty prior to its meeting with the Committee of Six. He noted that other scheduling considerations made it impossible to have the meeting any earlier than April 16.

Dean Call next shared with the members information gathered by Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research, about possible ways to assess faculty productivity. She undertook this research at the request of the President and the Dean, in response to comments made at the Faculty Meeting of February 20 about the scholarly productivity of the Amherst Faculty at different ranks in relation to that of peers at other institutions. Those remarks prompted a colleague at the meeting to request the opportunity to consider additional data regarding the productivity of Amherst professors in comparison to their peers. Professors Schneider, Sinos, O'Hara, and Parker expressed the view that it appears from Ms. Matheson's research that there is no effective, sensitive protocol to assess the productivity of liberal arts faculty individually, although there may be some methods available to assess research productivity by department across institutions. Professor Woglom said that he would be interested in learning more about how research productivity might be assessed by departments. Most members agreed that the methods used by other institutions that Ms. Matheson's research uncovered would not get at the question at hand—which is whether the Amherst Faculty's productivity is enhanced, at least partially, from the renewal made possible under the current promotion system, with resulting changes in direction or experimentation with teaching in the years following tenure. Professor Sinos noted that the faculty member who commented on faculty members' productivity as associate professors was drawing on her personal experience, rather than on a more formal methodology, and was extrapolating from her experiences. Professor Woglom disagreed, noting that the question of comparisons among faculty at other institutions was raised. After further discussion, the Committee agreed that measures of faculty productivity were difficult to design and might not be worth the effort to develop.

Continuing his announcements, the Dean noted that a course that has already been approved by the Faculty for next year will not be offered because the colleague who would have been teaching it has asked for and been granted a leave next spring. He also informed the members that the Committee would consider the "roadmap" for the implementation of the recommendations of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) at its next meeting and asked

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, March 26, 2007**

the members if they would review the report to determine if there are any items—beyond the twenty-two recommendations—that might require consultation by faculty committees.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Sinos asked whether Five-College faculty members who participate in the new work-in-progress seminars, which will soon be piloted as an enhancement to the Faculty Research Award Program (FRAP) program, will receive an honorarium of \$1,000, as the Amherst participants will. The Dean said that Amherst, at least during the pilot stage of the program will provide honoraria, which will be drawn from faculty research funds, only to Amherst faculty members. He said that he plans to suggest to the Five-College deans that they compensate faculty members who participate from their institutions.

Professor Sinos said that she would feel uncomfortable being paid to present a paper when a Five-College colleague was not being paid for doing the same work. Professor Schneider commented that he views the compensation to be an incentive for colleagues to form work-in-progress groups, rather than payment for presenting a paper. He noted that faculty are not typically compensated when they give presentations in Five-College classes. Several members commented that individuals are not compensated for participating in Five-College seminars, unless they are from outside the area. Professor Schneider said that he nonetheless shares Professor Sinos’s concern about the awkwardness of not providing honoraria for Five-College colleagues. He wondered whether the College might establish a discretionary fund for the work-in-progress seminars that could be used to provide support for Five-College participants. Obviously, not every seminar would have Five-College members, he noted.

Professor Sinos asked the Dean if the other Five-College institutions have research funds, as Amherst does, that would support faculty participation in the work-in-progress groups. Dean Call said it would be up to the individual institutions to decide whether they would provide funding for their participating faculty members. Professor O’Hara wondered whether Five-College colleagues might be considered consultants in this instance and whether they might be compensated as such. The Dean said that it is not envisioned that Five-College faculty members would be serving as consultants. He noted that, under current FRAP guidelines, support is available for bringing small groups of scholars to Amherst for two to three days to share research findings, to criticize one another’s work, and to otherwise stimulate a faculty member’s research, writing, artistic, or performance development.

Professor O’Hara noted that the seminars will probably be most appealing to Amherst colleagues in disciplines that don’t have a large number of faculty on campus and who would be most desirous of reaching out to others in the area who are working on similar research topics. The inequity issue surrounding compensation could stunt the very conversations that the work-in-progress seminars are designed to encourage, she said. Professor Sinos agreed and suggested that it might be best not to provide honoraria at all, rather than providing them only to Amherst participants. Dean Call noted that, in the pilot phase of this program, funds to support the seminars are being drawn from his office’s regular budget, so resources are limited. He said that, at this stage, Amherst will only be able to support its own faculty members, but he agreed to share the Committee’s views with the Faculty Research Award Program (FRAP) Committee, which will be evaluating the seminar proposals. Professor Schneider asked if it would be possible for each funded participant in a seminar group to share a portion of his or her

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, March 26, 2007**

honorarium with a Five-College colleague. The Dean said that he would have no objection to such a practice.

Discussion turned to the Faculty's consideration, at the March 27 Faculty Meeting, of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion's report and the related motion put forward by the Committee of Six. Professor Schneider said that he had voted "no" on the substance of that motion because he believes that changing how promotion procedures are carried out in practice could be done less formally, at the Committee of Six level, for example. Professor Woglom said that he envisions that someone with the view expressed by Professor Schneider might vote "yes" to the motion, which asks the Committee of Six to produce resolutions to "revise current policies and *practices* regarding promotion to the rank of Professor." Professor Schneider said that he feels that it is rather odd to vote to take seriously procedures that are already in the *Faculty Handbook*. Professor Woglom responded that it would be important to clarify the interpretation of "yes" and "no" votes for the Faculty before the motion is considered. In his opinion, voting "no" on the motion could be viewed as a vote to continue the current practice regarding promotion, in essence to make promotion pro forma and, thus, automatic six years after the tenure decision.

Other members expressed the view that policy and practice are different things and that a "no" vote could be interpreted as a vote to take the current *Faculty Handbook* language more seriously. Professor O'Hara said that consideration of the report and faculty conversation regarding this issue might be sufficient in and of itself to prompt a cultural shift to take the moment of promotion more seriously. She feels that a "no" vote would express the sense that one was not happy with the recommendations of the promotion report; that the current language of the *Faculty Handbook* should stand; that practices regarding promotion have not been codified but are evolving; and that the Faculty and the Committee of Six should be more mindful of how the promotion process should be carried out. Chairs, for example, could advise candidates that it is premature for them to come up for promotion. Trust could be placed in the Committee of Six to exercise "no" votes when appropriate in promotion cases.

Professor George said that he feels strongly that the language of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion should be brought before the Faculty in the form of motions. He noted the hard work and time that the ad hoc committee put into the report. Professor George suggested that the vote on the current motion should be viewed as a vote on whether the report should be parsed into motions by the Committee of Six for the Faculty's consideration. Professor Woglom expressed the view that the discussion at the March 27 Faculty Meeting should inform, depending on the sense of the Faculty, the Committee of Six's consideration of which, if any, parts of the report should be brought before the Faculty as motions.

Dean Call concurred that it would be important for the Committee to get a sense, based on discussion at the Faculty Meeting, of the Faculty's views on the discrete pieces of the report, which would inform decisions regarding future motions. Professor Sinos agreed that it would be best to consider the report in pieces, rather than as a whole. The Committee agreed that decisions about formulating future motions regarding promotion should be informed by the faculty discussion at the Faculty Meeting and the vote on the current motion.

The Committee turned to personnel matters.

The members next discussed the College Council Report on Changes to the Academic Calendar (appended). The Committee praised and thanked the Council for its excellent

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, March 26, 2007**

consideration of this issue and for the fine quality of its report. Professor Parker began the discussion by asking Dean Call for his sense of how the Council's recommendation that Amherst keep its current calendar would be received by the other three colleges and the University of Massachusetts. Dean Call said that it is the view of the presidents, the deans, and Five-Colleges, Inc. that there should not be more than two versions of the academic calendar, but that the consortium can survive having two calendar options. He has observed that some colleagues at other institutions appear interested in the calendar proposed by the university, while most clearly want to keep the present calendar, but are willing (as Amherst might be) to make a change in the timing of spring break (making it a week earlier than it is at present, to align it with the university's calendar). He noted that Professors Barale and K. Sweeney would be part of a four-college group that would inform the university, before its faculty votes on the calendar question, of the views of the other members of the consortium regarding the calendar issue. Dean Call said that most colleagues at the university with whom he has spoken believe that it is likely the university will decide, beginning in the spring of 2009-2010 academic year, to begin classes two weeks earlier in January and to end two weeks earlier in May. Spring break would then fall during a different week.

Professors Sinos and O'Hara expressed concern that changing the timing of spring break might have a negative impact on student-athletes because of the effect on scheduling within NESCAC and conflicts with mid-term exams. Professor Woglom also wondered about the effects on the seasons of some athletic teams and their training schedules. Dean Call noted that the Council had done some research on the possible effects on athletics of changing the timing of spring break and that this issue is discussed in the report. He noted that there is already variation among schools within NESCAC as to the timing of their spring breaks. He also said that the College Council had considered whether Amherst should consider a change to the length of the spring semester, in order to make the fall and spring semesters an equal number of weeks. It was agreed that this was not the time to consider such a change.

The Committee asked about next steps. It was agreed that the College Council Report should be distributed to the Faculty with these minutes and that the Council should be asked to keep the Faculty informed about the ongoing conversations with the university.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

College Council Report
5 March, 2007

College Council members: faculty and administration: Michele Barale (chair), Charri BoykinEast, Ethan Clotfelter, Samuel Haynes, Ben Lieber, Torin Moore, Kevin Sweeney; students: Jonathan Borowsky, Channel Maynard, Michael White, Selena Xie

College Council Report on Changes to the Academic Calendar

I

Early this past Fall, the University of Massachusetts announced that it intends to alter the present academic calendar, beginning with the spring semester of 2009 - 2010. Five College Cooperation has mandated that we all begin classes within three days of one another, and that we co-ordinate Spring Break. The University proposes to begin classes two weeks earlier in January, and end two weeks earlier in May. Spring Break would necessarily fall in a different week.

Since September, College Council has been examining the impact on Amherst of the University's proposal. In order to assess the significance of a change, College Council spoke with a number of people: Gerald Mager (Registrar); Lorna Peterson (Five Colleges Inc.); Caroline Basset (Career Center); Michelle Morgan (Physical Education); Dan Campbell (Physical Plant); Peter Shea (Treasurer); and with Dean of Faculty Gregory Call. The student members of College Council were extremely helpful in our discussions, as well, articulating a wide variety of views and concerns.

We ultimately arrived at five possible responses to the university's proposal, and on 23 February voted on those options. By far, the College Council voted to keep our present calendar - while recognizing that this might necessitate a change in the date of Spring Break.' One other option placed a close second: that we begin and end our classes one week early. Nearly tied with this second place option was the possibility of beginning classes one week early, taking a two week spring break, and then ending classes at the normal time.

' Pressure for Spring Break alignment with the University might involve moving our Spring Break a week earlier - to the seventh week. The University, in turn, would move theirs one week later - to their ninth week.

Below, we outline the five options we considered and our reasons for rejecting or considering them with varying degrees of favor.

II

1. Follow UMass' lead and coincide with their calendar.

Although the University has made a strong case for its students' financial advantage in ending classes earlier in the Spring term (extra weeks of summer income), virtually all of us agreed that their advantages were outweighed by our difficulties in making such a change. Students and faculty alike saw the loss of the January term as greatly affecting senior theses; faculty wondered when second semester courses would be prepared; the Career Center saw the depletion of their January internships and workshops; athletics noted that spring sports regularly need rescheduling because of inclement weather; a shorter spring competitive season would put even more pressure on April, and an earlier Commencement would virtually assure that some athletes would be out of town the week of graduation, if not the very day. Moreover, changing Spring Break, even by a week, would affect the Conference schedule of NESCAC competitors, and might necessitate reshaping its schedule. Neither Physical Plant nor the Treasurer foresaw any economic advantages to the calendar change.

2. Continue our present calendar.

It works for us, despite our chronic lack of a real Reading Period in the spring semester.

The drawbacks would not be particular to our own campus but would result across the Five College Consortium if two calendars are in operation:

a) UMass students who take classes on our campus would find themselves in a difficult situation (it should be noted that Hampshire is the biggest importer of UMass students).

At present, UMass has said that it would allow its students who are enrolled on other campuses to remain on campus for those final two weeks, but it would not allow them to remain in their own rooms.

b) Approximately 50 plus faculty each Spring -joint appointments and borrows - would find themselves negotiating two calendars. This is especially difficult if Spring Breaks do not coincide. These faculty could teach a 16 week semester without any break.

3. Begin one week early, but end when we usually do, thereby extending the spring Reading Period by one week.

No one thought this was a particularly good solution, and even the students felt that partying rather than reading would be the result.

4. Begin one week early, end at our usual time, but increase Spring Break to two weeks.

This was the third most popular option. The two week break would restore time lost in January to thesis writers, and some felt that the loss of January internships and workshops could be made up at this time. Some faculty felt that it would allow them both to catch up with the semester and better prepare for its conclusion.

5. Begin and end one week early.

This was the second most popular option. It would better coincide with UMass - a one week calendrical disparity seems easier to manage than two - and would not greatly re-arrange our present way of doing things.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 2, 2007**

The thirty-first meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006-2007 was called to order by the Dean in the President's office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, April 2, 2007. Present were Professors George, O'Hara, Parker, Schneider, Sinos, and Woglom, President Marx, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call noted that he would be contacting the Ad Hoc Committee on Writing to ask if the committee would be prepared to offer a report to the Faculty this spring. He said, with the Committee's permission, that he would schedule a time for the writing committee to meet with the Committee of Six to apprise the members of the progress made in fulfillment of the committee's charge. The Dean reported that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Evaluation and Improvement of Teaching (CEIT) has now distributed a preliminary report to the Faculty and plans to have open meetings March 30 through April 5 to solicit feedback. Informed by the responses of colleagues, the ad hoc committee will meet with the Committee of Six on April 16. In light of what he had just reported about the progress of these committees, Dean Call asked the members to consider the possible substance and schedule for the remaining Faculty Meetings of the semester.

Professor Parker said that he had been under the impression that some of the committees that are considering the implementation of Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) recommendations were further along in the process. However, given what the Dean had just reported about the readiness of these committees to bring recommendations to the Faculty, he suggested that the issue of promotion to the rank of Professor should be the subject of the next Faculty Meeting. Professor O'Hara agreed, noting that it would be important not to delay the promotion discussion, in any case, because the resolution before the Faculty (to be carried forward from the Faculty Meeting of March 27) requests only that the Committee of Six develop resolutions to revise current policies and practices regarding promotion to the rank of Professor. Developing such resolutions, which would later be brought to the Faculty for a vote, would take some time. After further discussion, the Committee agreed that the next Faculty Meeting should focus on the issue of promotion and should be held on April 17. If the Faculty decides that the Committee should develop resolutions regarding promotion, the hope would be to do so for a Faculty Meeting in May.

To inform faculty discussion before the Faculty Meeting, President Marx wondered if it would be helpful for the Committee to have a conversation about the substance of possible resolutions. Professor George reiterated his view that the job of the Committee of Six is to organize the business of the Faculty, not to modify the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion. He noted the time and effort that the ad hoc committee had put into its research and report and argued that its recommendations should be brought before the Faculty. Dean Call also praised the work of the ad hoc committee, while expressing the view that the resolutions developed by the Committee could be informed by the Faculty's discussions of the promotion issue.

He noted, for example, that at the March 27 meeting, concern was expressed that, if the College should move to a more vigorous process for promotion and to certain procedures outlined in the report, some colleagues might remain at the rank of Associate Professor for many years, or permanently. The report recommends that, if a candidate fails to meet the College's criteria for promotion by the eighth year after the tenure decision, he or she could initiate the

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 2, 2007**

promotion process during the tenth year and, if necessary, at four-year intervals after that. In response to expressed faculty concern about long-term associate professors, the Committee, in structuring resolutions, might consider guaranteeing promotion by the tenth year after the tenure decision, the Dean said

President Marx suggested that the Committee of Six consult with the ad hoc committee during the process of translating the promotion report into motions. It appears to him that a central proposal of the report is to make greater use of the currently articulated range of years (six to eight and, occasionally, five years) following tenure and to make the promotion decision more meaningful and substantive. The report did not require or recommend any change to the consideration given, when making promotion decisions, to the full mix of scholarship, teaching, and service that the College values.

Professor Sinos pointed out that the ad hoc committee has also recommended that retrospective letters be sought, which represents a substantial change to the current process, and that colleagues from outside the candidate's department participate in the process—another change. Professor Parker noted that, in the ad hoc committee's view, the involvement of colleagues in other disciplines would be particularly valuable in cases in which the candidate's scholarship is interdisciplinary. He believes that the report recommended the inclusion of colleagues outside the department of the promotion candidate in part as a check on possible rubber-stamping by the department. Professors Parker and Sinos felt that it would be important for the Committee of Six to wait to formulate motions until the Faculty has had a fuller discussion of the promotion issue.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Sinos, who said that she was inspired by the coming of spring, asked if the committee that was established to oversee the College's wildlife sanctuary had issued a report that could be shared with the Faculty. The Dean replied that the Amherst College Wildlife Sanctuary Stewardship Committee, which was formed in September of 2006, has not issued a report and has not been asked to do so. The Dean noted that, in March 2005, Conservation Works, LLC, was engaged to work with the Sanctuary Advisory Committee to facilitate a preliminary study of Amherst's wildlife sanctuary. The advisory committee was charged with making general recommendations regarding the long-term oversight of the sanctuary. Conservation Works issued a report to the advisory committee in August 2005. A summary of Conservation Works' findings and recommendations was included in the Committee of Six minutes of September 11, 2006.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Schneider noted that, while he is pleased that Professor Sarat acknowledged the recent successes of several of Amherst's athletic teams and coaches at the March 27 Faculty Meeting, he felt that similar recognition should also be given to students' achievements in the arts and to their faculty and staff mentors.

The Committee turned to personnel matters.

The members next reviewed the "roadmap" for the implementation of the recommendations of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) with an eye toward ensuring that the bodies (as currently outlined) charged with considering each recommendation of the CAP would facilitate the consideration of the pieces of the report as they may relate to one another, whenever such a coordinated review would be desirable. In relation to

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 2, 2007**

recommendations fourteen and fifteen, which focus on community-based learning and expanding opportunities for community service and for summer and January internships, Professor Parker asked if the advisory committee to the Center for Community Engagement (CCE) had been formed.

Dean Call noted first that the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) has already discussed some of the plans and draft budgets for the CCE. The CPR also met with representatives of the search committee during the recent search for the center's director. In terms of the advisory committee, he responded that it had been agreed that such a committee would be formed after the appointment of the CCE's director. On that note, President Marx said that he was pleased to announce that Molly Mead, who is currently Lincoln Filene Professor, University College of Citizenship and Public Service, and adjunct professor of urban and environmental policy and planning at Tufts, has just recently accepted the position. He noted that Ms. Mead had worked to found the Jonathan M. Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service, and that she directs the Tisch College Faculty Fellows program, a two-year fellowship for Tufts faculty working on curriculum development and research into important questions of civic engagement. Professor O'Hara expressed great pleasure with the appointment and said how impressed she had been with Ms. Mead when she had met her during her campus visit and with her qualifications and experience. Professor O'Hara noted that the Committee of Six had discussed the formation of the advisory committee during the summer (see the minutes of July 27, 2006).

President Marx said that he imagined that the process of developing a membership structure for the advisory committee and for selecting its members would follow normal processes for a standing committee of the Faculty. In keeping with regular practice, he said that proposals for structures and individual members would be brought to the Committee of Six. Structures under consideration might include an on-campus committee of faculty, students, and administrators and an alumni advisory group, he said.

Continuing the discussion about the CAP recommendations, Professor Sinos asked, in relation to recommendation thirteen and to recommendation sixteen when funding might be available. These recommendations focus on providing or expanding funding for student research and the Amherst Academic Intern Program and need-based support to encourage students to enroll in intensive summer language programs in the USA and abroad. The Dean noted that the CPR has been discussing this issue and is supportive of making these recommendations a priority. After examining preliminary estimates from the Treasurer for the funding needed for each of the CAP's recommendations, the CPR agreed to identify particular priorities for "emphasis." Dean Call said that, while he continues to enhance funding for student research and Amherst Academic Interns every year, the CPR is planning to recommend that finding additional funds for recommendations thirteen and sixteen, among others, be emphasized. The Dean noted that support for faculty and student research is a broad area of emphasis identified by the CPR. He informed the members that his office has tripled the amount of funding for student summer research in the past three years, and that additional funding is still necessary to meet student needs.

Professor O'Hara suggested that, in her reading of the minutes of the CPR and her sense of the committee's discussion with Trustees, there appear to be questions from the committee

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 2, 2007**

itself about the role of the CPR in the CAP implementation process. She wondered if having the CPR meet with the Committee of Six might be helpful in alleviating any sense that the CPR is working in isolation. Dean Call responded that the CPR has indeed been asked to take on roles that are beyond its regular annual duties. The committee has now been charged to think more broadly about College priorities and to make comparisons among them and is gaining an understanding of the most effective ways to advocate for the Faculty and the entire College community in their interactions with the Trustees. For example, while the Trustees might prefer that the CPR prioritize among the CAP's twenty-two recommendations, the CPR has elected to convey that all of the twenty-two recommendations are important and that the best approach would be to inform the Board about where to increase emphases, in terms of prioritizing fundraising, among the recommendations. Professor O'Hara noted that the CPR, of which she was a member at the time, was asked to weigh in in a similar way during the Priorities Planning Committee (PPC) process in 1994.

Professor Sinos asked the purpose of a meeting between the CPR and the Committee of Six. Professor O'Hara replied that it could be useful for the CPR to bring the Committee of Six up to speed on their thinking regarding particular issues. Professor George wondered if the CPR should instead make a report at the Commencement faculty meeting. It might be useful for the Committee of Six to get a preliminary sense of what the CPR will be reporting later in the process, Professor Parker commented. Dean Call said that, in addition to considering the CAP recommendations, the committee has been writing a report that recommends increasing the grant-in-aid benefit, is continuing to explore the issue of childcare, and has discussed how best to advocate for placing more emphasis on support for student and faculty research. Professor O'Hara noted that many colleagues might not read the CPR minutes, particularly because they are not mailed and are posted online at irregular intervals. She asked the Dean whether he thought that having a meeting between the CPR and the Committee of Six regarding CAP initiatives could be helpful. He responded that he would be happy to ask the members of the CPR if they would like to meet with the Committee of Six.

Professor Parker once again raised the issue of the need for continuity in long-term curricular planning to inform the FTE allocation process, while noting the difficulties that are inherent in the lack of continuity of membership of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) from year to year. How would the CEP be able to consider and prioritize departmental curricular needs over a six- to eight-year period and to develop a coordinated way of imagining a sequence of faculty appointments, in light of constantly changing membership during that period, he wondered. The Dean said that he anticipates that the CEP, in its annual report to the Faculty, will give a progress report about the phasing in of positions. President Marx noted that, when the Board meets in April, the Trustees will probably focus on two areas—financial aid (he noted that the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid has already proposed to the Board that the College should become need blind for international students. The Board will also consider whether to reduce or eliminate loans for students whose families meet annual income requirements) and FTE addition and allocation, in general terms.

Continuing the conversation, the President said that it will be useful for the Faculty to flesh out for itself and for the Board the justifications for certain categories of FTEs. While he envisions that the Trustees will have a good sense of the needs surrounding writing and

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 2, 2007**

quantitative initiatives as they develop and of the needs of existing departments, he said that the Board may need to learn more about global and interdisciplinary initiatives. Now that the CEP has a sense of how FTE requests are taking shape, it would be helpful for the Board to be informed to the extent possible. Professor O'Hara asked how many FTE requests have been made. Dean Call said that there were twenty-six requests.

Professor Schneider asked if there would be a process for offering departments feedback when FTE requests are rejected and for considering requests in the context of an eight-year span and an eight-year dialogue. Dean Call responded that departments will continue to receive comments on their proposals from the CEP, in addition to the priority rankings utilized by the committee in recent years. He noted that it has been the practice that the "high priority" ranking is given to more proposals than there are available positions. He noted that Professor Schneider's point about temporal priorities is well taken. Dean Call also commented that, if there are compelling requests for FTEs that respond to CAP recommendations (he offered the example of environmental studies), the Board might be willing to authorize them before the entire "package" of FTEs is approved. President Marx agreed, but said that there is a limit to how much of a "pre-down payment" is imaginable. The Board, he believes, will not want to pre-commit to too many allocations, and before fundraising can commence, the Trustees will presumably need to know from the Faculty the full package of what they intend and hope to do.

Professor Parker asked if the CEP will inform the Board about how this year's and future FTE proposals are responding to CAP initiatives. The President said that the Board is aware that it is impossible to know in specific terms how each of the envisioned eighteen FTEs would be allocated, but the Trustees would like to understand parameters and the larger categories. Professor Parker asked if the CEP plans to assign FTE proposals to different numeric CAP boxes. The Dean responded that the CEP is cognizant that if we wish to move forward with FTE allocations, it would be helpful to offer information about the ways that FTE requests are responding to the recommendations of the CAP.

Dean Call said that it would be useful and informative for the CEP and the administration to keep a tally of the allocated new FTEs by CAP category. He anticipates that proportions set by the CAP may be adjusted, depending on the proposals that come forward and expressed needs. The proportions outlined in the CAP report were meant to be rough and flexible estimates, he said. Professor Sinos asked if a new academic building would be needed to provide offices as a result of the expansion of the Faculty. Dean Call responded that conversations about how best to accommodate the growth of the Faculty will be part of a larger dialogue about campus space and the efficient use of current facilities and scheduling issues. He said that he could imagine converting some buildings for different uses than they have now and doing some shifting around of spaces, depending on usage and need.

President Marx said that, while it is possible that the College might need a new academic building at some point, it feels that it would be a mistake to use funds for new classrooms if the classrooms that we have could be used more efficiently. If funds are used to build an academic building, they would not be available to support new FTEs, curricular programs, or other projects. Professor George expressed concern that, in shifting class times to use classrooms effectively, attendance might be affected by having science classes early in the morning; students for whom classroom attendance is most important may be the ones who don't attend, he said.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 2, 2007**

Professor O'Hara commented that science departments already coordinate scheduling and have required labs early in the morning. Professor George agreed that students would attend required early-morning labs, but he felt that attendance at lectures would be affected. President Marx, who said that he appreciated the scheduling efforts of the science faculty, commented that it is important to take on the class scheduling question since the current system of classes bunched at the same time effectively limits the curricular choices of students.

Continuing the conversation, Dean Call informed the members that Professor Cathy McGeoch has offered to tackle classroom scheduling as a research project with her students. They would investigate two questions. First, given the current template, how might classes be optimally scheduled? Second, a more open-ended project, how might the current scheduling template be re-designed to better facilitate the faculty's and students' curricular options? Professor Schneider expressed some concern that tenure-track faculty members might end up teaching in early-morning slots and that student enrollments and responses to classes might be influenced by time slots that might be unpopular.

The President next asked the members if they could anticipate any interactions among CAP recommendations that might affect how governance processes should be used to work through these issues. He noted in this vein, as an example, that the chairs of the CEP, CPR, and FCAFA have met together to gain a shared sense of how the implementation of CAP recommendations is taking shape and to address overlapping issues.

Professor O'Hara suggested that, when committees make their reports at the Commencement Faculty Meeting, perhaps the relevant committees should include reports on the progress of their consideration of CAP recommendations. She wondered if it might be informative to create a synopsis of all such reports and to post such a summary online. Professor Parker asked if committees are aware that they should be making such reports. Dean Call said that the Committee of Six can certainly recommend that the handful of relevant committees report on their progress, and he said that he would be happy to contact committee chairs to extend an invitation to do so.

The Committee then turned to personnel matters

The members next discussed the preliminary report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluations and the Improvement of Teaching (CEIT). Professor George expressed the view that the committee's recommendation that each full professor (other than those in phased retirement) request one or more colleagues (also full professors) to serve as a Teaching Instruction Partner (TIP) was a constructive suggestion for improving teaching, but he questioned requiring it and mandating that the arrangements be reported to the Dean of the Faculty. The Committee's conversation also focused on the CEIT's proposal that all full professors evaluate three courses during each three-year period and that they notify the Dean during each year that they evaluate a course. Professor George said that having a TIP goes beyond the vote of the Faculty, which occurred during the consideration of the twenty-two recommendations of the CAP last spring. Professor Sinos pointed out that the vote at that time had been non-binding in any case.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Parker said that he finds teaching evaluations to be of limited usefulness in the improvement of teaching. He would prefer adopting some of the avenues (workshops, visiting other schools to discuss curriculum and course development, participating in reading groups to discuss papers on pedagogy, etc.) mentioned in Professor C.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 2, 2007**

McGeoch's letter of May 4, 2006 (appended to the minutes of May 8, 2006). Professor Schneider commented that he liked much about the report, including its spirit, although he thought that having course evaluations three times during a three-year period would place too much of an administrative burden on faculty members, particularly chairs, and he favored having evaluations with slightly less frequency, perhaps one course every two years. Professor O'Hara wondered if faculty members who are co-teaching a course might form natural TIP teams. Professor Schneider said that there might be inherent difficulties if colleagues who were co-teaching formed a TIP relationship. He said that he would prefer to use as a sounding board a colleague with whom he was not teaching, who might be more objective because he or she did not have a stake in a shared teaching enterprise.

Professor Sinos agreed that many of the ideas that the CEIT had developed were intriguing, but she questioned the advisability of forcing the Faculty to adhere to the committee's recommendations. She wondered if two motions regarding the CEIT's recommendations—one requiring that the Faculty adhere to the procedures and the other making participation voluntary—should be brought to the Faculty for a vote. Professor O'Hara said that she was in favor of adopting the proposals of the CEIT and commented that she views the recommendations as fairly modest and as quite creative. She noted that she would particularly enjoy having more opportunities to engage in conversations about her teaching with colleagues. President Marx suggested that the members consider crafting motions that might address the expressed concerns and to offer suggestions for evaluating and improving teaching that might not be included in the report. Professor George said that the Faculty should discuss the report and that the Committee should formulate motions based on the CEIT's recommendations.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Friday, April 6, 2007**

The thirty-second meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006-2007 was called to order by the Dean in the President's office at 3:10 P.M. on Friday, April 6, 2007. Present were Professors O'Hara, Parker, Schneider, Sinos, and Woglom, President Marx, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor George was absent due to illness.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call reported that the members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Writing have informed him that they would be open to an invitation to meet with the Committee of Six, and the Dean said that he would schedule a meeting. He noted next that the Committee of Six's meeting with the Committee on the Evaluation and Improvement of Teaching (CEIT) would be on April 16 and said that some members of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) also plan to attend. Dean Call said that it is his hope that the Committee would be able to take up this semester a review of the issue of attendance and voting at Faculty Meetings (see the *Faculty Handbook*, section IV; R., Faculty Meetings; 1., "Attendance and Voting"; 2., "Attendance without Vote."). He noted that, since the Faculty voted to add the relevant language to the *Handbook* in 1990, a number of administrative titles and/or positions have been revised and that a few new positions might be considered for inclusion, while other positions could be eliminated. The members agreed to review the matter after the Dean's office assembles background information.

Dean Call next responded to Professor Sinos's question, posed at a previous meeting, about the administration's policies regarding troubled departments. She had inquired as to whether the administration allows such departments to decide matters by a simple majority vote or whether the administration insists that consensus must be reached. Could a majority within the department determine departmental curriculum without having the minority on board? Could a majority make personnel decisions? Dean Call said that, generally, "majority rules" would be the standard procedure; however, in some cases of very troubled departments other ways of decision-making must sometimes be found, particularly when a department's own decisions cannot be realized. Dean Call said that the goal when working with departments that are in a state of sustained discord is to reach lasting consensus and that the approach used varies, depending on the success of interventions. In such cases, finding solutions can often be a difficult, complex, and multi-faceted process, he noted.

Professor Sinos asked whether troubled departments are prohibited from hiring faculty unless there is a consensus to do so. Dean Call noted that splits within departments sometimes prevent a department from creating an environment that is hospitable to faculty development. If there is significant departmental dissent over hiring and other personnel decisions, questions are often raised at various levels, including that of the CEP and the Committee of Six, he said. In addition, when competing for scant resources, including FTEs, the strength of the department's endorsement may be relevant to the level of success achieved. The Dean said that he would also worry about putting a new colleague into a contentious situation. It is desirable to find a way to stabilize a department before hiring takes place, he believes.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Friday, April 6, 2007**

Professor Sinos said that she fears that such a policy will tend to result in splitting departments rather than working with departments to keep them together. Dean Call said that the administration's view is that, through consultation with the department, the Committee of Six, and the CEP, or through mediation or other means, departments should be kept together and assistance given to remove the roadblocks that they face. The current administration has received two proposals for splitting a department, he noted, and in each case worked with the requesting department to keep it intact.

Professor Woglom said that he understands that, in general, majority rules but the aim is consensus. He asked what the consequences are when the view of the majority prevails and the minority within a department creates roadblocks and misbehaves in other ways. In his experience, the departmental curriculum is more often being held hostage by the minority now than it has been in the past. Dean Call said that such situations are addressed on a case-by-case basis. Professor Schneider asked, under what circumstances departments are put in receivership. Dean Call responded that, if a department is having difficulty, many approaches are tried—discussions with the department, mediation by colleagues within the College, and, sometimes, outside Amherst. The decision to appoint an outside chair (receivorship) is always made in consultation with the department, he said.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Schneider raised questions surrounding the special academic needs of transfer students. He said that transfer students have enriched his classroom and that, in his experience, they are excellent students and an asset to the College. It seems that in many cases, however, they need more time to navigate Amherst's curriculum. Like many first-year students, transfer students may, for example, change their minds about an envisioned major after a semester or two, he has noted. Such a change can mean that there will not be enough time for students to meet major requirements. Professor Schneider said that he knows that there are procedures, such as the option of petitioning for a ninth semester, for assisting transfer students, but he thinks that they may not be widely publicized or known.

President Marx asked if the difficulties described by Professor Schneider represent a new problem. Professor Schneider said that he does not think that the situation is new, but he anticipates that, as the College embarks on efforts to recruit additional transfer students from community colleges, the problem may become more common. Professor O'Hara added that the implications of this dilemma extend to less well-prepared students. As the College encourages such students to navigate the science and math curricula at a different pace, she noted, some students end up not having enough time to complete a major in the sciences in eight semesters. Professor Parker said that a current student he works with who transferred to Amherst petitioned for and received an additional year to complete her studies.

President Marx said that the College expects that students, with only very rare exceptions, should graduate in eight semesters. In particular, this regulation came up when he and others were exploring the idea of offering a fifth year of study for students who are less well-prepared for medical school. Dean Call commented that students are sometimes, although rarely, allowed

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Friday, April 6, 2007**

to take a three-course-per-semester load (and that there is information about this provision in the catalog, see p. 60 in the 2006-2007 Catalog), which implies that they would need more time to graduate. He said that he is also aware that a very small number of students have been granted a ninth semester by successfully petitioning the Dean of Students. Some members also wondered about the implications for financial aid when students stay at Amherst beyond eight semesters. President Marx said that he and the Dean would consult with Ben Lieber, Dean of Students, and Joe Paul Case, Dean/Director of Financial Aid, about the questions raised and would report back to the Committee.

The Committee turned to the upcoming discussion of promotion at the Faculty Meeting of April 17. Professor O'Hara said that she is looking forward to learning more about what colleagues are thinking about this issue and the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion. Professor Parker noted that the Faculty should remember that, as Professor Zajonc mentioned at the last Faculty Meeting, it is possible to make amendments to motions, and he commented that colleagues have not been doing so lately. Dean Call said that he has this sense as well, and he wondered if concerns raised during discussions by the Committee of Six and at Faculty Meetings about legislating on the fly and the need to craft motions carefully might account for the reluctance to propose amendments at Faculty Meetings.

Professor Woglom asked Professor Parker how he would amend the Committee of Six's motion (The Faculty asks the Committee of Six to produce, for a faculty meeting this spring, resolutions to revise current policies and practices regarding promotion to the rank of Professor). Professor Parker said that he might propose to alter it in such a way that the language signals the direction of future motions that might be drafted by the Committee. President Marx asked whether the structure of asking the Faculty to consider whether the Committee of Six should make motions, rather than considering how those motions might take shape, has generated the type of conversation that the Committee had envisioned.

Professor Schneider said that he thinks that making use of an approach that resembles the series of non-binding votes taken during the March 27 Faculty Meeting for the purpose of getting a sense of the Faculty's views on the draft mission statement could be a more productive strategy. Professor Sinos commented that taking straw votes as questions arose during the mission statement discussion worked well because policy change was not involved. Professor O'Hara agreed, noting that the straw-vote approach was workable because a number of constituencies are responsible for the mission statement, while promotion is an issue of faculty governance. She said that discussion about whether the Committee of Six should develop motions would inform how the Committee of Six would go about drafting motions.

In light of the conversation, Professor Woglom raised concerns about how a "yes" or "no" vote on the promotion motion would be interpreted. After some discussion, most members agreed that it might be best, for purposes of clarity and to inform with greater precision the Committee's deliberations, to create a series of new motions, the first a substitute motion for the motion brought before the Faculty at the Faculty Meeting of March 27. The Committee then crafted motions and discussed possible outcomes.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Friday, April 6, 2007**

The members voted (5 yes, 0 no, 1 member absent) to substitute the following motion (Substitute Motion #1) for the motion (Motion #1) that the Committee brought to the Faculty at the Faculty Meeting of March 27, 2007. The Committee also voted (5 yes, 0 no, 1 member absent) to forward three additional motions (Motion #2, Motion #3a, and Motion #3b) to the Faculty. The members envisioned that, if Substitute Motion #1 passes, there will be no need to proceed to the other motions. If Motion #2 passes, the Faculty will be asked to consider Motion #3a. If Motion #2 does not pass, the Faculty will be asked to consider Motion #3b. The motions and votes are as follows:

Motion #1:

The Faculty asks the Committee of Six to produce, for a Faculty Meeting this spring, resolutions to revise current policies and practices regarding promotion to the rank of Professor.

(On 3-12-07 the Committee of Six voted 6 yes, 0 no, to forward to the Faculty;
4 yes, 2 no, on content)

Substitute Motion #1:

Should promotion occur almost automatically in the sixth year post-tenure (to take effect at the beginning of the seventh)?

(The Committee voted 0 yes, 5 no, 1 member absent, on content)

Motion #2:

Should practice regarding promotion conform to the current language of the *Faculty Handbook* (attached) and to the Dean's letter (attached) about promotion?

(Assuming that Motion #1 does not pass, the Committee voted 3 yes, 2 no, 1 member absent, on the content of Motion #2.)

Motion #3a:

Do you favor making any additions to the *Faculty Handbook* language regarding promotion?

(Assuming that Motion #2 passes, the Committee voted 2 yes, 3 no,

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Friday, April 6, 2007**

1 member absent, on the content of Motion #3a.)

Motion #3b:

Do you favor changing the current language of the *Faculty Handbook* regarding promotion (attached) and the language of the Dean's letter regarding promotion?

(Assuming that Motion #2 does not pass, on 4-6-07 the Committee voted 2 yes, 3 no, 1 member absent, on the content of Motion #3b.)

The members then voted five in favor of forwarding the Faculty Meeting agenda to the Faculty.
The meeting adjourned at 5 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

G. Promotion

A member of the Faculty appointed initially as an Assistant Professor and subsequently granted tenure will be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, effective the start of the academic year following the tenure decision.

A member of the Faculty appointed initially as an Associate Professor without tenure and subsequently granted tenure will continue as an Associate Professor with tenure until a recommendation is made by his or her department(s) for promotion to the rank of Professor.

Promotion to the rank of Professor usually originates with the department and usually occurs between six and eight years after the tenure decision, although a department may present a candidate in the fifth year. A letter from the department Chair, and signed by all full Professors in the department, discussing the candidate's scholarly or artistic achievement, teaching performance, and College and professional service should accompany all recommendations for promotion to the rank of professor. In cases where there are fewer than two tenured full Professors in the candidate's department, the Dean of the Faculty and the Committee of Six will appoint an ad hoc committee of tenured full Professors from related departments to serve as the review committee. Should the department have one member at the tenured rank, he or she will also serve. The Committee of Six reviews all candidates for promotion. The President formulates the various recommendations and presents them to the Board of Trustees, together with his or her own views. All promotions must be voted by the Board of Trustees.

SAMPLE LETTER CONCERNING PROMOTION

May 2, 2006

Dear ,

Early in the second semester of the academic year 2006-2007, the Committee of Six will consider departmental recommendations for promotion to the rank of full professor. According to our records, is eligible for recommendation for promotion. Although our procedures are not legislated or rigidly established, most promotions from associate to full professor have occurred in or after the sixth year of service in rank as associate professor. I am writing to ask if you would please meet with the other full professors of your department in a timely fashion, and send to this office by noon on February 15, 2007, ten copies of your departmental recommendation, signed by all full professors in your department.

As you may recall, the Ad Hoc Promotion Committee will report to the Committee of Six and the Faculty at the end of the fall semester. Any changes that the ad hoc committee proposes will be discussed with the Faculty, so promotion procedures for spring 2007 are unchanged.

Promotion is not automatic. The Committee of Six will review each recommendation on its merits. A department's recommendation for promotion should affirm that the individual's achievements and qualifications have progressed beyond those noted at the time of the tenure decision (or beyond first hire as tenured associate professor). The bases for promotion to professor are essentially the same as those used for the tenure decision: teaching effectiveness, sustained scholarly growth, and contribution to the general life of the College community. With the department's letter of recommendation to the Committee, please include an up-to-date curriculum vitae (ten copies), and describe the evidence that leads you to affirm the individual's continued effectiveness and growth, both as a teacher and as a scholar. In the case of teaching, if the individual generated new courses or helped strengthen your department's curriculum, this should be addressed in the evaluation.

Promotion consideration is an occasion for a genuine review, in which all full professors of the department are expected to participate. Please give assurance in your letter that all have done so. If there are significant doubts about your colleague's progress in rank, you should discuss them candidly with the individual. If you have questions about these procedures, please let me know before submitting your recommendation.

Sincerely,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty and Professor of Mathematics

cc: Academic Department Coordinator

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 16, 2007**

The thirty-third meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006-2007 was called to order by the Dean in the President's office at 3:05 P.M. on Monday, April 16, 2007. Present were Professors George, O'Hara, Parker, Schneider, Sinos, and Woglom, President Marx, Dean Call, and Associate Dean Griffiths, Recorder.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call reported that Assistant Dean Tobin was unable to serve as recorder because of service on a re-accreditation committee for another institution. He informed the members that a faculty member has announced the intention to call for a quorum at the faculty meeting of April 17. A quorum is half the number of faculty teaching during the semester (whose primary affiliation is Amherst) plus one. Dean Call reported that the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) has declined for the time being the invitation to discuss with the Committee the initiatives recommended by the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP). In answer to a question raised at the last meeting about transfer and other students who require an extra semester to fulfill the requirements of a major, the Dean reported that such cases are rare but that such students do receive financial aid. He informed the Committee that a new professorship, the William McCall Vickery 1957 Professorship, has been established recently and will be announced publicly in the next couple of weeks.

The Dean noted that Professor Dennerline has submitted a letter on behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee on Study Abroad to respond to questions about the burden on faculty advisors that had been raised in the Committee's discussion of February 26 in the context of members' differing estimates of the cumulative burden on departments and on advisors both in approving of foreign-study courses for credit toward major programs and in making recommendations about previously unapproved foreign-study programs. President Marx noted that the recent hiring of a full-time study abroad advisor, Janna Behrens, was intended to address such concerns. The Committee expressed the hope that the burdens of foreign-study approval and advising could be addressed by the ad hoc committee's report next fall.

Dean Call reported that the College Council has discussed the Committee's inquiries about the possibility of noting grade distributions on transcripts and has requested some clarifications: Were transcript notations such as the median course grade or percentage of "A" grades intended to curtail grade inflation or to provide added information to readers of the transcripts, such as graduate schools and employers? Several members of the Committee agreed that the objective would be to accomplish both purposes. Professor Woglom pointed out that the problem is not merely grade inflation, but grade compression, which makes all grades less meaningful. Members noted that for colleagues to re-evaluate and modify their grading practices, they would need more information about grade distributions. Professor Woglom said that the data would need to be broken down by departments and individual courses and that both medians and inter-quartile spreads should be included. Members agreed that making grade distributions public might well serve to stem or reverse such compression, but found the question of what information to release thorny, even if courses were not identified by name. Professor O'Hara advised caution in addressing this matter without a thorough consideration of the consequences, such as the unease that might be felt by faculty members facing decisions about reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Professor Parker suggested that grade inflation, at Amherst and elsewhere, may not be among the most serious issues facing the Academy today. The majority believed that it might be difficult to give the matter due care at this point because of

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 16, 2007**

the press of other business, but hoped that the College Council could investigate the matter now that these clarifications had been made. The Committee decided that the College Council should receive a longitudinal profile of all grades given and should be asked to consider what more specific data might be helpful to its evaluation. The President noted that the format of transcripts is an administrative practice formulated in consultation with the appropriate faculty committees.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Sinos asked about an invitation from Lorna Peterson, Executive Director of Five Colleges, Inc., to all classicists in the five institutions to meet to begin a conversation about collaboration. Ms. Peterson had indicated that she was acting at the behest of the Five College Deans and Directors and that she has no specific agenda, but simply wants to begin a conversation about collaboration. Professor Sinos noted that it is a very busy time of year for faculty members, and asked if the administrators know how much the classicists already collaborate and if there are other agenda in the invitation that could be clarified. She noted that the classicists already collaborate actively on all levels, including in planning courses, lectures, conferences, and hiring searches. Dean Call noted that the initiative entailed no assumptions about classicists' level of collaboration, but was intended to begin conversation about opportunities for summer research programs for classics students and for possible shared appointments in the future. Given the number of retirements that can be anticipated in the next few years, cooperation among institutions in hiring would be highly beneficial, he said. The President noted that, with knowledge expanding faster than faculties can conceivably grow, more effective use of the Five Colleges will become increasingly essential. Professor Sinos responded that it would be helpful if the Dean could circulate the proposals for summer research programs. She said that the members of the Classics departments talk together regularly about their programs, but perhaps there is need for more communication between the administration and faculty. Dean Call said the Five College Deans and Directors were not putting forward a specific proposal, rather trying to encourage conversation, but he hoped that their colleagues in Classics would develop a model most appropriate to their field.

The Committee next approved one course proposal and voted to forward it to the Faculty.

The members turned to the agenda for a possible Faculty Meeting on May 1. The Faculty's discussion of the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion on April 17 might lead the Committee of Six to frame motions for the May 1 meeting, but the Committee's next meeting, April 26, would leave too little time to notify Faculty of those motions. The College's longstanding convention, known as "Romer's Rule," stipulates that motions be distributed to Faculty at least a week in advance of a vote. Members agreed that it was hard to craft a procedure in detail without knowing the outcome of the Faculty Meeting of April 17 and agreed to meet on April 23, without the President and the Dean, who would be attending a meeting of the Trustees in Washington. They also felt that there might be some flexibility in giving advance notice, since the Faculty would know as of April 17 that motions were to be anticipated and would know the intent, if not the exact language, of those motions.

At 4:05, the Committee was joined by the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluation and the Improvement of Teaching (CEIT), comprised of Professors Alex George, Jagannathan, Parham, and Sanderson, and by members of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP): Professors Himmelstein, Niditch, Robert Sweeney, Umphrey, and Nancy Ratner, Researcher for Academic Programs in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty. The members of the CEP and the

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 16, 2007**

Committee of Six thanked the CEIT for the creativity and good sense of their recommendation. Speaking on behalf of the CEIT, Professor Jagannathan reported on their conversations with colleagues in three open meetings, on the basis of which they dropped in their final report (appended) the requirement in their preliminary proposal that student evaluations be signed. All members of the CEIT were uncomfortable with the proposal in the report of the CAP, as affirmed in principle by the Faculty, that students' written evaluations of courses be seen only by the individual instructor. The CEIT had replaced this arguably "solipsistic" practice with a conversation among colleagues, the most valuable medium for learning about pedagogy and one that can compensate for the limitations of student letters. The members of the CEIT felt that, given the centrality of teaching to the mission of the College, it was important to send a strong signal about this value. Professor Sanderson noted that the CEIT was charged with proposing ways of implementing a requirement for teaching evaluation, not with finding ways to improve teaching, concerning which they had not investigated all possibilities. Professor Jagannathan noted that such needs were being addressed by the emerging Teaching and Advising Project (TAP) in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty.

Raising a procedural matter, Professor S. George asked whether the CEIT feels that the Faculty should feel bound by its close vote in principle on a requirement last spring or whether opponents of any such requirement could reasonably persist in this view. Professor A. George replied that the CEIT is bringing a specific proposal, which should be adopted or not on its merits, not organizing a referendum on the general desirability of requiring evaluation of teaching. Professor Sinos asked if the proposal for full professors to have Teaching Instruction Partners might retain its value on a voluntary basis. The CEIT indicated that for the program to have an institutional presence it would need to be mandatory. Professor Sanderson said that, given the other pressures on Faculty, relatively few colleagues might adopt a voluntary program and community-wide norms would never emerge, nor would the Faculty signal the importance that is placed on teaching at the College. To the question of whether any required program might inspire cynicism, Professor A. George said that such cynicism was likely to be diminished by embedding conversations about teaching within the strong collegial relationships.

Asked how the CEIT had determined the frequency of three courses in a three-year period, Professor Parham said that stipulating once a year or so, with considerable flexibility, would allow the practice to become routine and habitual. In the view of the members of the CEIT, soliciting responses from a class and discussing them with a colleague was a small task. Professor Parker asked how the members of the CEIT estimated colleagues' unease about creeping bureaucratization and intrusion into the functioning of faculty members. Professor A. George replied that the Committee was well aware of such feelings, but that the current proposal was for a process not controlled by the administration and involved unsigned student letters usable for no other purpose, which would be destroyed after the review. Professor Niditch asked how substantial the benefits would be, especially given the difficulty of eliciting feedback from students. Professor Jagannathan replied that one could not be sure that the yield on student letters would be so low, especially if responses should be solicited in class and, in any case, he noted the program would be thoroughly reviewed after five years. Professor Sinos said that she questions the assumption that student evaluations are of such value in improving teaching, and noted her concern that soliciting ever more feedback from students sends them the signal that

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 16, 2007**

learning is the responsibility of the instructor, not of the students themselves. Professor A. George emphasized that the key to the program is the conversation with a colleague who is aware of the limits of student feedback. The workings of this or any system cannot be known before it is tried, and no amount of speculation will get us closer to knowing. This modest experiment is worth a trial, he said. Professor Niditch wondered about the value of the student letters if the TIP does not have a larger role, such as attending classes. Professor Jagannathan replied that the CEIT's proposal does not limit the role of the TIP. He said that the program was meant to be flexible, such that colleagues could visit each other's classes or discuss syllabi or course materials. Professor Niditch said that she understood that the TIP could always play a larger role, but that this could present other problems. (Would a few class visits give a genuine sense of the class? Would the TIP have the time for a larger commitment? Does the presence of an observer actually alter the rhythm and atmosphere of the class?) Professor Umphrey asked if "teaching evaluation" might be a misnomer for what sounds more like course evaluation.

Professor S. George asked the members of the CEIT whether they would like the Committee of Six to frame motions about the proposal to bring before the Faculty, and whether those motions should be unitary or, alternatively, should address the various steps in the proposal. The members of the CEIT said that the proposal should go forward as a whole and that they would be willing to frame a motion. Professor Jagannathan asked if a simple majority should be sufficient for adoption or perhaps a majority of 60 percent or two-thirds. Professor Woglom said that the consequences of a slim majority would need to be explored once the vote was taken. The members of the CEIT noted that their proposal included only full professors, but that they would consider whether to include associate professors if no changes are made in promotion procedures.

At 5:05 the members of the CEP and the CEIT departed and the Committee turned to personnel business.

The Committee reviewed and approved with slight emendation the text of a letter to faculty members concerning departmental recommendations for the award of graduation honors *summa cum laude*. The letter requests that departments submit recommendations on the Thursday before the end of classes rather than the following day, a small change that in effect allows the Committee to have a week more to review honors projects. The letter also announces the Committee's policy that the recommendation for *summa* for interdisciplinary theses should be unanimous.

The meeting adjourned at 6 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluation and the Improvement of Teaching

I. Our Charge and Its Background

On May 2, 2006, the Faculty, constituting itself as The Committee of the Whole, voted (61 in favor, 50 opposed, and 4 abstaining) the following motion: *The Faculty endorses the larger CAP Report goal to improve teaching throughout the College. In order to help achieve this goal, student teaching evaluations of all Faculty should be required. The evaluations solicited for senior faculty will be made available only to the faculty member in question.* The subsequent deliberation of the Faculty resulted in a formal vote on May 25, 2006 (84 in favor, 24 opposed, and 4 abstaining) endorsing "the priorities and goals of the Report on the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP), as modified and clarified by the Sum and Substance [that quoted, *inter alia*, the italicized language above], ... as a strategy for moving forward." This Committee was implicitly charged with exploring specific schemes for the improvement of teaching at all ranks, including proposals for evaluation of tenured faculty by students.

II. Our Procedure

We started meeting in the fall semester of 2006. We began by reading the relevant sections of the CAP report, the Faculty Minutes, and the Committee of Six Minutes to learn about the range and depth of views colleagues had expressed on the matter of required student evaluations for tenured faculty. This review was very helpful in understanding the benefits and costs of evaluations themselves as well as of various schemes for soliciting these evaluations.

Colleagues who support teaching evaluations made several arguments about the merits of this form of evaluation. Some thought that providing senior members of the Faculty with more information about the nature of student evaluations might prove useful when evaluating junior members' teaching at their times of reappointment and tenure, while others suggested that such evaluations might send a (worthy) message to our students that Amherst values their opinions and takes seriously its commitment to excellence in teaching, a message that might also be important to Trustees and others (for instance accreditors). Still others hoped the process might dim the distinction between junior and senior members of the Faculty, since currently only junior members are required to solicit evaluations. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, many claimed that reading, and reflecting on, student evaluations could only help professors improve their teaching.

We also recognized several commonly occurring concerns about student evaluation of tenured colleagues. One concern was that requiring evaluations for Associate Professors might be problematic, since this issue is already being addressed by the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion. Another concern was that student evaluations might provide biased assessments of teaching, given that such evaluations can be influenced by the age or gender of the professor, grading or workload expectations, or by the nature of the material being taught. Still other concerns were raised about "evaluation fatigue," which could occur if students were regularly required to complete four evaluations each semester, and about the loss of class time to complete evaluations. Yet others noted that many tenured colleagues already use, and pay attention to, teaching evaluations from students.

Most colleagues seemed to recognize the worth of attending to the quality of teaching, but differed in their judgment of the role of student evaluations in that process. We agree wholeheartedly that student evaluations are simply one way of assessing teaching, and reflecting on them is certainly not the only or perhaps even the best way of improving one's teaching. We strongly support the development of other methods for the improvement of teaching, including making workshops on curriculum and course development available, creating opportunities for members of the Faculty to participate in discussion groups on pedagogy, and so on.

We gathered information on the practices of a dozen or so other colleges with which we often compare ourselves. Carleton, Haverford, and Swarthmore, we learned, do not have any mandatory system in place and are not currently contemplating creating such a system. All of the other schools (Bates, Bowdoin, Colby, Hamilton, Macalester, Mount Holyoke, Oberlin, Pomona, Wellesley, and Williams) either have a long-standing practice of mandatory evaluation or are in the process of instituting such a practice. In almost all cases, the required evaluations are shared with deans, department chairs, or receive some other form of administrative scrutiny. Some colleges use standardized forms; in the cases where we could obtain copies, we looked at the forms as well to get a sense of the questions asked. Finally, we met with the Committee on Educational Policy and also held several open meetings with members of the Faculty.

III. Our Proposal

We propose that each Full Professor (other than those on phased retirement) request one or more colleagues, also at the rank Full Professor, to serve as his or her "Teaching Instruction Partner" (hereafter, TIP(s)). We expect that in some cases colleagues will choose to serve as one another's TIP(s), but in other cases the relationship will not be reciprocal. In some cases TIP(s) will belong to one's own department, but in other cases not. We imagine that a colleague's choice of TIP(s) will be guided by their common pedagogical strategies, by shared research interest, or by other pertinent shared reference points. The relationship is meant to last a period of several years, but may be shorter if leaves or other considerations intrude.

We propose that, at the beginning of each academic year, all teaching Full Professors will communicate to the Dean whether they intend to evaluate any of their courses that year and, if so, who their TIP(s) will be. We do not propose or encourage that any additional information be transmitted to the Dean's Office.

We propose that during each three-year period, a Full Professor will have students evaluate three courses, using evaluation forms that he or she has created, perhaps in consultation with his or her TIP(s). (Those holding half-time FTE appointments will evaluate one course every two years.) We encourage colleagues to choose different types of courses for evaluation when appropriate. We also encourage the creation of a bank of templates posted on a Web site that colleagues could consult in designing their questionnaires. Of course, different evaluation forms could be designed for different kinds of courses.

We propose that the evaluation forms be unsigned. This will reduce the administrative burdens associated with the scheme: no one need spend time or effort to render evaluation forms anonymous. In addition, the anonymity of the letters/forms in effect guarantees that they will be of no possible use beyond the informing of a reflective conversation about pedagogy. We encourage the destruction of all evaluations (whether on the Web or on paper) at the end of the following semester.

We propose that, during the semester following the one in which a course is evaluated, the Full Professor and his or her TIP(s) meet to discuss the comments received from the students. Perhaps additional interactions might take place between the Full Professor and his or her TIP(s), such as class room visits or consultation on the development of syllabi; however, such additional measures are not part of this proposal. We know that such conversations about pedagogy are common among colleagues and friends. In many cases, the TIP arrangements will simply highlight and accord some institutional recognition to these laudable ongoing practices.

Should this scheme be adopted, we propose that the Faculty assesses its success six years after implementation. It is not our place to prescribe in fine detail how an evaluation of the system might be conducted. However, just for purposes of illustration, we can imagine that an ad hoc committee might be constituted in the fifth year of the program. This committee might solicit views from participating senior colleagues (but not, of course, the details of anyone's evaluations or conversations with TIPs). The questions might pertain to the relevance of the program, its usefulness to pedagogy, the ease of carrying out its provisions, and ways the program might be improved. This committee might also consider whether the program is on balance worth continuing.

IV. Our Rationale

In proposing that senior colleagues share student evaluations with his or her TIP(s), we diverge from the motion of the Committee of the Whole of May 2, 2006. We believe that a mandated system in which student evaluations are read only by the Faculty member in question, is likely to generate skepticism, even cynicism, on all sides, and might disintegrate over time. On the other hand, we are reluctant to promote a system that is insensitive to the concern that evaluations, once collected by a department or the Administration, will end up playing an unintended and undesirable role. Our proposal preserves the autonomy and control of our tenured colleagues. Furthermore, because the proposed system builds on structures of collegiality that are already part of the fabric of the College, it is our hope that Full Professors will not find it alien and indeed will take to it naturally.

In designing this system, we paid careful attention to the concerns raised by colleagues last spring about the use of student evaluations of teaching, and we believe that our proposal minimizes potential negative consequences in several ways. First, we are restricting our proposal to Full Professors to preserve the right of the Faculty to determine on its own, in a separate way, how teaching evaluations might or might not be used in promotion. Second, we are proposing that colleagues create their own forms for evaluations, which should allow each of us to determine the most appropriate and useful questions to ask given the nature of our courses. Third, to avoid "evaluation fatigue," we are proposing that senior colleagues arrange to evaluate on average only one of their courses each year. Fourth, to avoid problems associated with the use of class time for evaluation, we are proposing that colleagues be given the option of choosing whether students complete the evaluation during class or outside of class. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, to avoid problems associated with "slippery slope" concerns, we believe that only senior colleagues and their TIPs should have access to these evaluations: student evaluations should not be given to Chairs or to members of the Administration, and they should not be used to decide matters of salary, research awards, or other benefits. In order to cement this last "firewall," we have proposed that evaluation forms be unsigned.

This procedure yields a system which accords greater respect to the students who go to

the trouble of offering their responses and which also is more conducive to the kinds of conversations and exchanges of information and ideas that are likely to prove beneficial to our teaching. Our focus is on improvement and critical self-examination of pedagogy, rather than on administrative scrutiny. The involvement of colleagues is an affirmation of the best in Amherst's tradition of collaborative teaching. While we believe that the evaluations of students might have some direct role to play in the improvement of teaching, we are more confident that the collegial conversations arising from reflection on such evaluations are likely to be more beneficial. In any case, we conclude by stressing that the provisions of the current proposal are just some important steps, and not necessarily the most important ones, in our continuing efforts at improvement of teaching.

Alexander George
Jagu Jagannathan (Chair)
Marisa Parham
Catherine Sanderson

April 6, 2007

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 23, 2007**

The thirty-fourth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006-2007 was called to order by Professor S. George in Merrill 507 at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, April 23, 2007. Present were Professors S. George, O'Hara, Parker, Schneider, Sinos, and Woglom and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The President and the Dean were absent because they were attending meetings of the Board of Trustees in Washington.

The members reflected on the proceedings of the Faculty Meeting of April 17 and expressed regret that the motions that they had forwarded to the Faculty had generated confusion and a lack of clarity for many colleagues. The Committee discussed the possible interpretations of the Faculty's vote (seventy in favor and twenty-three opposed, with seven abstentions) on an amended version of Motion Two, which read as follows: "The Faculty wishes to retain the current language of the *Faculty Handbook* and the Dean's letter about promotion."

Professor George said that his interpretation is that, with its vote, the Faculty has indicated that there should not be any change to the current *Handbook* language. Professor Sinos noted that, even if the current *Handbook* language remains, thanks to the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion's report and the Faculty's discussion, many colleagues now have a better idea of what is entailed in the promotion process. She also expressed regret, as did Professor Schneider, that the Committee of Six had acted as a buffer of sorts to the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion. Several members commented that the Faculty Meeting discussions about promotion would have benefited from early and direct consideration of the ad hoc committee's proposals.

Professor O'Hara, Professor Schneider, and Professor Parker disagreed that the vote at the Faculty Meeting necessarily means that the Faculty is not interested in considering small changes in the language of the *Handbook*. While acknowledging that it is difficult to interpret the vote because the Faculty did not have time to consider motion 3A, these members interpreted the implication of the passage of Motion 2 to be possible support (in the form of the "yes" votes) for having promotion practice more closely aligned with promotion policy. (Motion 3A read as follows: "Do you favor making any additions to the *Faculty Handbook* language regarding promotion?") Professor O'Hara said that, in her view, some of the "yes" voters might be indicating that they would like to see small changes in *Handbook* language to accomplish this goal. Professor Schneider agreed, offering as examples the possible inclusion of language that would allow for having colleagues outside the candidate's department serve on his or her promotion committee, the option for the candidate to initiate the promotion process, and the opportunity for the candidate to submit a letter on his or her behalf. He noted that both of these proposals were included in the ad hoc committee's report. Professor Sinos wondered if the current language would provide for maximum flexibility and that, by putting all possibilities in black and white, limitations might be set. She said that she fears that continuing the promotion discussion at the next Faculty Meeting could defer other important business before the Faculty. She worried that too much of the Faculty's time has been taken up with this issue already.

Professor Schneider expressed the view that it would be disingenuous for the Committee not to bring a proposal before the Faculty, particularly since the Committee of Six was at fault for the lack of clarity that resulted from voting on the motions thus far. Professor George said that

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 23, 2007**

the vote on Motion 2 was a vote against change, but said that any new motions should be tied to the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion. Professor Woglom wondered if the minutes of the Committee's discussion would be sufficient to inform the Faculty that the Committee of Six had considered whether to propose small changes to the *Handbook* language. Most other members felt strongly that the Committee should craft a motion. Professor O'Hara said that she was particularly interested in putting before the Faculty for a vote the proposal that colleagues from outside the candidate's department could serve on his or her promotion committee. She noted that this would be a good change now and for the future, as departmental structures become more porous and faculty research becomes more interdisciplinary. After further discussion, the Committee voted five in favor and one opposed (Professor George) to forward the following motion to the Faculty:

Proposed new language (changes in bold) to become effective in the academic year 2007-2008 at *Faculty Handbook* III., G., Promotion.

G. Promotion

A member of the Faculty appointed initially as an Assistant Professor and subsequently granted tenure will be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, effective the start of the academic year following the tenure decision.

A member of the Faculty appointed initially as an Associate Professor without tenure and subsequently granted tenure will continue as an Associate Professor with tenure until ~~a recommendation is made by his or her department(s) for promotion~~ **promoted** to the rank of Professor.

Promotion to the rank of Professor ~~usually may originate~~ **with the candidate** and usually occurs between six and eight years after the tenure decision, ~~although a department may present a candidate in the fifth year.~~ **A candidate's promotion committee consists of all full professors in his or her department(s) and may include up to two other full professors from the College Faculty, chosen by the candidate in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty. The chair of the promotion committee is selected by the Dean.** A letter from the ~~department chair of the promotion committee~~ **members of the committee**, ~~full Professors in the department~~, discussing the candidate's scholarly or artistic **growth and** achievement, teaching performance, and College and professional service, should accompany all recommendations for promotion to the rank of professor. **The candidate may also submit a letter on his or her behalf.**

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 23, 2007**

In cases where there are fewer than two tenured full Professors in the candidate's department, the Dean of the Faculty and the Committee of Six will appoint an ad hoc committee of tenured full Professors from related departments to serve as the **review promotion** committee. Should the department have one member at the tenured rank, he or she will also serve. **The promotion committee may include up to two full Professors chosen by the candidate, in consultation with the Dean.** The Committee of Six reviews all candidates for promotion. The President formulates the various recommendations and presents them to the Board of Trustees, together with his or her own views. All promotions must be voted by the Board of Trustees.

The members then voted five in favor, none opposed, with one abstention (Professor Woglom) on the substance of the motion.

The Committee next turned to a consideration of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluation and the Improvement of Teaching (CEIT) and the motion put forward by the committee. Professor Woglom commented that it might be advisable for the Faculty to consider the CEIT's report before it takes up the issue of promotion, thereby ensuring that a discussion of the report is not displaced by a lengthy consideration of the promotion issue. Professors Parker and Schneider favored putting the promotion motion first on the agenda, in an effort to resolve the promotion issue. Professor Woglom suggested that, if promotion were to be discussed first, a thirty-minute time limit should be recommended to ensure that there is sufficient time to begin consideration of the CEIT report.

The Committee agreed (by a vote of six to zero) that the motion forwarded to them by the CEIT should be forwarded to the Faculty. Professor O'Hara said that, since it now appears that retrospective letters would not be part of the process of promotion to full professor, she wondered whether the CEIT's proposals should apply to associate as well as full professors. It was agreed that Professor George would inquire whether the CEIT would agree with this change and that the Committee would include the term "tenured faculty members" in the motion unless the CEIT had a strong objection. The Committee also agreed that, if the Faculty votes to include retrospective letters as a part of procedures for promotion to full professor, the language of the CEIT motion should be changed, so that associate professors are not subject to two different forms of teaching evaluation. Professor Parker left the meeting at 4:00 to attend a thesis defense.

Professor George raised concerns about the provision in the motion that requires faculty members to inform the Dean of the Faculty when they decide to evaluate their courses and of the identity of their Teaching Instruction Partner(s). Although the Faculty, with its vote on the report of the Committee on Academic Priorities, did narrowly endorse some form of required evaluations, he said that he remains skeptical about whether it is necessary or even beneficial to increase administrative involvement in teaching evaluation of tenured faculty. Professor Sinos agreed, viewing the CEIT's proposals as steps in the direction of greater bureaucracy at the College. She said that measures to evaluate the teaching of full professors will create a false

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 23, 2007**

sense of equality because teaching would be evaluated for different purposes, depending on whether a faculty member was at a point before or after tenure. Professor Woglom disagreed, noting that while he does not favor these proposals per se, he supports peer review and would therefore vote for this motion. Professor O'Hara said that she supports the CEIT's proposals and feels that it is important to have a sound set of guidelines for evaluating the teaching of faculty members post-tenure. While some aspects of the proposal may need to be changed, she is reassured by the fact that the procedures will be reviewed and amended.

The Committee then voted two yes (Professors O'Hara and Woglom), two no (Professors Sinos and George), one abstention (Professor Schneider) on the content of the following motion:

Proposed new language (in bold) to become effective in the academic year 2007-2008 at *Faculty Handbook IV.*, B., Teaching and Advising, to follow 1. and replace the current number 2. The current language of the subsequent paragraphs under B would remain, but the numbering would change as indicated in bold. It is agreed that the Faculty will assess the value of this program six years after its implementation.

B. Teaching and Advising

1. Teaching Load. Amherst tries to keep the teaching load at a level that permits the Faculty to devote considerable time outside of class to students and to scholarly or creative work. Generally, Faculty teach two courses each semester. Departments have historically adapted this norm to their individual circumstances. Faculty are encouraged to teach outside their own departments through participation in interdisciplinary and interdepartmental courses and seminars.

2. Teaching Evaluations of Tenured Faculty Members

Each tenured faculty member (other than those on phased retirement) evaluates his or her teaching in three courses every three years. (Those holding half-time FTE appointments evaluate one course every two years.)

At the beginning of each year, tenured faculty members decide which, if any, courses to evaluate that year. If they do choose to evaluate, they decide who their Teaching Instruction Partner(s), also a tenured faculty member, will be. These decisions, and only these decisions, are communicated to the Dean of the Faculty. (Teaching Instruction Partners may be drawn from departments other than a tenured faculty member's own. A tenured faculty member may choose one or more Teaching Instruction Partners for each course to be evaluated, and a tenured faculty member may select different

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 23, 2007**

Teaching Instruction Partners for different courses. Finally, a tenured faculty member's relationship with his or her Teaching Instruction Partner(s) need not be reciprocal or enduring.)

Evaluation forms, whose content is to be determined by the tenured faculty member, are unsigned and may be administered over the Web or on paper. Evaluation forms are normally destroyed after the following semester.

During the semester following the one in which a course is evaluated, the tenured faculty member and his or her Teaching Instruction Partner(s) have a conversation, informed by student evaluations, about the pedagogical issues raised by the course.

3. Advising. All members of the regular Faculty, except first-year faculty, participate in College advising for underclassmen and in advising students majoring in their departments.

4. College Advising. The Dean of ~~Freshmen~~ **New Students** assigns all entering students to a member of the Faculty who serves as that student's College advisor for his or her freshman and sophomore years whenever practicable. College advisors are responsible for discussing their advisees' programs of study with them, paying attention to the advising guidelines published annually in the *Catalog*. They are also asked to consult with their advisees' class deans, especially, but not only, if one of their advisees appears to be experiencing academic difficulty. A number of academic support services are available through the Dean of Students Office.

5. Major Advising. All faculty members, except first-year faculty, have the responsibility for advising students majoring in their departments about general curricular matters, matters related to the major and senior honors work.

The members then voted five in favor and zero opposed to forward the Faculty Meeting agenda to the Faculty.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet S. Tobin for
the Committee of Six

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Thursday, April 26, 2007**

The thirty-fifth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006-2007 was called to order by the Dean at 4:00 P.M. on Thursday, April 26, 2007. Present were Professors S. George, O'Hara, Parker, Schneider, Sinos, and Woglom, President Marx, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Committee turned first to personnel matters.

The Dean next distributed to the members a letter (appended) from Professors Damon and Ratner, on behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion. Their purpose, they wrote, was to raise concerns about the process that the Committee of Six had used in evaluating and framing the debate on their committee's report. Agreeing with some of its criticisms and suggestions, the Committee agreed to discuss the letter at its next meeting.

The Dean informed the members that the College has been invited to nominate two Amherst emeriti faculty members for Mellon Foundation Emeritus Fellowships, and that he had solicited proposals from emeriti faculty members who met the criteria for the fellowship. These fellowships support the research activities of outstanding scholars in the humanities and humanistic social sciences who, at the time of taking up the fellowships, are retired but remain active and productive scholars. Emeritus Fellows receive funds for a year for research and other related expenses. The Mellon Foundation stipulates that the nominees be selected through an internal competition. Noting that Mellon Emeritus Fellowships require that the institution provide an office, Professor Schneider emphasized the need for more offices on campus.

The members then returned to personnel matters.

At the Committee's request, the President reported on the Trustee meetings of April 23 and 24, which he described as productive and informative. The meetings were held in Washington, D.C., in celebration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Folger Shakespeare Library. President Marx said that the Trustees focused on issues related to student debt burden and on other topics relating to the recommendations of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP). The Trustees, according to the President, were impressed with the ways in which a number of FTE proposals made by the Faculty have been tied to College-wide priorities such as interdisciplinarity, strengthening existing departments, and global comprehension.

In the brief time remaining, the Committee discussed a motion from the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) to establish a major in Environmental Studies at the College and a description of that major (CEP letter of April 9, 2007, to the Committee of Six and supporting materials, appended). The President, the Dean, and the members considered how best to move forward with the establishment of such a major. The Dean said that, in order to present the strongest case to the Board for the allocation of new FTEs, it would be his hope that the Committee of Six would issue a statement of support and, in May, the CEP would recommend that new FTEs be allocated, if the Board approves an addition to the FTE cap. He anticipates that the proposal for the major would come before the Faculty this fall. He noted that the proposal is not to create a department, but that faculty in current departments, and new faculty, also appointed to existing departments, would be affiliated with the program.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Thursday, April 26, 2007**

AMHERST COLLEGE
Department of Biology - McGuire Life Sciences Building

April 24, 2007

Dean Greg Call
Secretary, Committee of Six

Dear Colleagues:

We write to bring attention to aspects of the of the process you followed in evaluating the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion, a process which strikes us as ill advised.

As you know well, it was the Committee of Six that charged four of us faculty with examining current promotion practice and considering whether changes in practice or statute were advisable. Our report was submitted to the Committee of Six in December, as required. It would appear, from comments in the minutes of the Committee of Six, that members of your committee took exception to the changes we proposed. Certainly Committee of Six members, both as individuals and collectively if you so decide, have every right to disagree with the conclusions of our report; and that is not the concern here. Rather, we note that, despite the passing of three months during which the report, at least nominally, was subject to consideration at four faculty meetings, at no point did the Committee of Six invite our participation in your deliberations. (At the same time we read of your consultations with other faculty committees including the CEP, CPR, CEIT, and the Committee on Writing.) Had you ever discussed the report with us, we might have been able to avoid misinterpretations of our analysis, suggested changes, and presumed motives. We would also have been given the opportunity to present our point of view as part of the Committee of Six minutes distributed to faculty colleagues, countering the opinions and conclusions reached therein by your members in our absence. Was the subject not sufficiently important to be worthy of a conversation? We suggest that, especially if a significant fraction of the Committee of Six disagrees with a faculty committee report that the Committee of Six commissioned, collegiality and common courtesy require a meeting between that committee and yourselves.

Our second concern is with the procedure you fashioned for the faculty's discussion of our proposal. While it is not unreasonable to attempt to get a sense of the Faculty's overall desire (stay put, or change?) before trying to craft detailed changes to the Handbook, so as not to waste the valuable time of hard-pressed members of the Committee of Six, we suggest that the procedure at which you arrived wasted not only the time of us ad hoc committee members but, of far greater importance, much time of the Faculty as a whole. That is, despite the many minutes spent over several meetings, it was evident from various professors' comments that they would have preferred a simple discussion of the components of the changes we proposed. Should the candidate initiate the promotion evaluation, thus affording more flexibility to the timing of the affair? If teaching is to be part of the evaluation, should there be an opportunity for student input in the form of retrospective student letters? Might it ever be helpful to have senior colleagues not in the candidates' department participate in the evaluation? Importantly, would the proposed

requirement for self-evaluation by the candidate lead to reflection and conversations that encourage continued growth in both teaching and scholarship? Instead of focusing debate on these issues, the Committee of Six presented the Faculty with a withering phalanx of "Substitute Motions" and "Alternative Motions" that made it virtually impossible for colleagues to discuss the merits and shortcomings of our proposal. "Straw motions" put forward by the Committee of Six, but of which the Committee unanimously disapproves, are unlikely to be helpful; neither was the choice offered by your Motion #2, in response to which one colleague observed that either vote, "yes" or "no," could be construed as an attempt to discuss the ad hoc committee report. Moreover, the focus of the discussion was almost exclusively on the question of whether or not there are problems in the current system, although our charge asked us to consider whether changes might improve that system. One can improve a system even if its problems are not crippling. By one assessment, it was 9:10 pm of the final meeting before any of the changes we had proposed finally were discussed. Clearly the Faculty expressed their sense in the end, and by a wide margin, that modest or no change to the Handbook was preferable to the changes we'd suggested. That may well have been the outcome had our proposed changes been discussed, but, at least to our way of thinking, the Faculty decision would have been better informed.

Consideration of our ad hoc committee's report is concluded, and we have no intention of reopening that debate. But as the Committee of Six examines the reports of future faculty committees, we urge you to give those committees the opportunity to examine the issues with you, in person; and to give the Faculty as a whole full opportunity to discuss the particular concerns their appointed colleagues have raised. There is no need to formulate motions to preserve the status quo.

Please share this letter with members of the Committee and append it to the relevant minutes.

Sincerely yours,

Cynthia Damon
Department of Classics

David Ratner
Department of Biology

AMHERST COLLEGE
Department of Anthropology and Sociology

April 9, 2007

The Committee of Six
Greg Call, Dean of the Faculty
Tony Marx, President

Dear Colleagues:

The Committee on Educational Policy is forwarding to you with our unanimous support a motion to establish a major in Environmental Studies along with a description of that major. We urge you to put this motion on the agenda for consideration by the Faculty as soon as feasible.

Rationale for the Major

The rationale for a major in environmental studies is clear.

First, knowledge of environmental issues is important for the full and thoughtful engage in civic life for which we educate our students.

Second, Environmental Studies is an established area of inquiry in a number of disciplines with its own journals and professional associations.

Third, Amherst College now has a critical mass of faculty committed to the major. They have provided the CEP with a clear set of requirements for the major and a list of courses that would fulfill those requirements.

Fourth, an Environmental Studies major would have an exceptionally broad interdisciplinary reach. In particular, it would build bridges between the sciences and the rest of the curriculum. As such, we believe that it should be a priority among the new interdisciplinary ventures recommended by the CAP Report.

The Motion

The motion that Jan Dizard and his colleagues in Environmental Studies submitted to the CEP and which we now forward to you reads as follows:

THE FACULTY ENDORSES THE CREATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES MAJOR, A WORKING DRAFT OF WHICH IS APPENDED, TO BE PHASED IN AS FTEs BECOME AVAILABLE AND SPECIFIC FTE REQUESTS RELEVANT TO ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES ARE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENTS TO AND APPROVED BY, THE CEP.

This motion does two things. First it establishes the major. Second, it specifies the conditions under which the major will start. Those conditions are left somewhat vague, for good reason. Providing a specific date for starting the major and/or enumerating specific positions that need to be filled would place unacceptable constraints on the CEP. We need the freedom to evaluate the relative merits of each proposal for an FTE. Instructing the CEP to recommend a specific FTE by a specific date would set a bad precedent.

The CEP understands from our colleagues in Environmental Studies that an environmental historian and an environmental economist would provide the additional staffing necessary for a major. We will take this into account as one factor among many in assessing the FiE proposals in front of us.

We also assume that our colleagues in Environmental Studies will decide when the major is ready to start and will make a recommendation accordingly to the CEP and the Committee of Six.

Finally, we recommend removing from the motion the phrase "a working draft of which is appended" and simply forwarding the relevant materials to the Faculty.

Sincerely,

Jerome L. Himmelstein
For the Committee on Educational Policy

AMHERST COLLEGE
American Studies - Sociology

JAN E. DIZARD, Charles Hamilton Houston Professor of American Culture

3 April 2007

Professor Jerome Himmelstein, Chair
The Committee on Educational Policy
c/o Nancy Ratner
Campus Box 2231

Dear Jerry and Colleagues on the CEP:

The faculty who have been working for the past four years toward the goal of establishing a major in Environmental Studies are very near being able to come before the CEP and, then, before the Faculty with a detailed proposal for an Environmental Studies major.

It would help us move forward if the CEP would be willing to bring to the Faculty, hopefully this spring but no later than the fall of 2007, a motion asking the faculty to endorse establishing a major in environmental studies.

The motion we have in mind is:

THE FACULTY ENDORSES THE CREATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES MAJOR, A WORKING DRAFT OF WHICH IS APPENDED, TO BE PHASED IN AS FTEs BECOME AVAILABLE AND SPECIFIC FTE REQUESTS RELEVANT TO ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES ARE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENTS TO, AND APPROVED BY, THE CEP.

Needless to say, we will happily consult with you to modify this draft motion as your committee thinks best.

I am including here a brief "background" and the proposed catalog copy/course list (the latter you have already seen). We anticipate including these with the motion so that the faculty will have a clear sense of what they are being asked to approve.

Sincerely,

Jan

Background. For the past four years, sixteen faculty members have been meeting, drawn together by a shared sense that the College has an obligation to its students to prepare them for a world in which environmental issues will loom large. In order for students to sort through the claims and counter-claims that have dogged discussions of climate change and threats to biodiversity, students will need a strong interdisciplinary grounding in the sciences, social sciences and humanities.

Many of the elements for a major in ES are already in place. Faculty in several departments are already teaching courses that focus on environmental issues. For the past two years, some members of our group have collaborated in teaching a colloquium that could readily serve as an introductory course in the new major. In addition, both the economics and history departments are seeking approval for appointments in fields (environmental economics and environmental history) that would fill important gaps in our coverage. With the addition of the courses that these new appointments would bring to the College, we would be able to offer students a robust major, as sketched below.

Proposed catalog copy for an Environmental Studies Major.

Advisory Committee: Professors Clotfelter, Cox, Crowley, Delaney, Demorest, Dizard, Hagadorn, Harms, Lopez, Martini, McKinney, Miller, J. Moore, Reyes, Servos, and Temeles.

For thousands of years, our ancestors were more shaped by than they were shapers of the environment. This began to change, first by hunting and then, roughly ten thousand years ago, with the invention of agriculture. Since then, humans have had a steadily increasing impact on the natural world. Environmental Studies is a major program that explores the complex interactions between humans and nature. This exploration will necessarily require taking courses in the sciences, humanities, and social sciences. The six required courses reflect this interdisciplinary commitment. Beyond these required core courses, majors will take at least four electives. The required capstone seminar will be taken in the fall of the senior year, the successful completion of which will constitute passing the comprehensive requirement. For those seniors who wish to write a senior honors essay, the required seminar will be an opportunity to turn seminar-work into an honors essay to be completed in the second semester of the senior year.

Required Courses.

1. A team-taught intro (presently taught as Colloquium 22)
2. Biology 23 ("Ecology")
3. Math 9 or 17 (statistics)
4. Environmental Economics
5. Environmental History (a survey course)
6. Capstone Seminar (to be taken in the first semester, senior year) Team-taught

Electives: (In alphabetical order)

1. Biology 18 (Adaptation and the Organism)
2. Biology 32 (Evolutionary Biology)
3. Biology 39 (Animal Behavior)
4. Biology 48 (Conservation Biology)
5. Chemistry 3 8 (Atmospheric Chemistry)
6. Environmental Economics (different from the required course stipulated above)
7. Geology 9 (Environmental Science: Case Studies)
8. Geology 21 (Surface Earth Dynamics)
9. Geology 28 (Hydrogeology)
10. Geology 45 (Seminar in Biogeochemistry)
11. History 54 (Environmental History of Latin America)
12. History (one or two additional courses depending upon new hire)
13. UST 35' (Law's Nature: Humans, the Environment, and the Predicament of Law)
14. Philosophy 24 (Environmental Philosophy) To be introduced by Professor Moore
15. Pick Colloquia (one each semester-topics change from year to year)
16. Psychology 46 (Environmental Psychology)
17. Sociology 40 (The Social Construction of Nature)

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 30, 2007**

The thirty-sixth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006-2007 was called to order by the Dean at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, April 30, 2007. Present were Professors George, O'Hara, Parker, Schneider, Sinos, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with "Announcements from the President." President Marx informed the members that he had met with the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Parking to discuss parking on the Quad and other parking issues. For the past four years, construction has necessitated that parking be eliminated on part of the Quad. After discussing various proposals and considering issues of access, the ad hoc committee and the President agreed that the forty-two current parking spaces should remain on the Quad once current construction is complete and before any future construction, rather than increasing or decreasing that number. Professor O'Hara noted the shortage of parking spaces within walking distance of College buildings and the need for visitor parking. Professor Schneider reiterated that this is a particular problem for events at the Mead. The President acknowledged that these are serious issues that should be addressed, while noting that the number of students parking on campus is decreasing, which might alleviate the problem to some degree.

The President next informed the members that, as recommended by the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR), the Trustees are considering an increase to the grant-in-aid benefit, which provides aid for employees with children in college. Professor Schneider, noting that the benefit seems inefficient, said that the effect of grant-in-aid is often to reduce a student's financial aid award (by reducing his or her demonstrated need by the amount of the grant) from the college to which they are applying. In essence, with this benefit, Amherst subsidizes the financial aid programs of other institutions, he said. Professor Schneider wondered whether offering other options, such as using funding to increase employees' contributions to retirement plans during the time that a child is in college, might be a better idea. The President agreed that the grant-in-aid benefit has some inefficiencies, but said that there are a number of reasons for continuing the program and raising the amount of assistance provided. He and the Dean noted that so-called "cafeteria plans," which allow employees to choose where their benefit dollars are spent, have been discussed in the past but have not proved to be practical to implement because of tax implications. Further, the President said, Amherst is an outlier among its peers in the amount of grant-in-aid that it offers to its employees. He noted that the amount of the benefit has been unchanged for about twenty years. The President said that Amherst should offer competitive grant-in-aid because the benefit has an effect on faculty and staff recruitment. Professor Woglom noted that there is inequity inherent in the benefit. Those who have the highest salaries, who might not qualify for financial aid, benefit most. Those at lower income levels, who would probably qualify for financial aid, would have their awards reduced, unless the school to which a child is applying does not make an offer of aid. The President noted that most of higher education cannot meet full need and that grant-in-aid is a direct benefit to many faculty and staff. Of the eighty-five faculty and staff using the benefit at present, 20 percent have children at institutions that meet full need, with 80 percent enjoying the full effect of the benefit. The Dean suggested that it might be informative to read the CPR discussions of this topic and its report on grant-in-aid, all of which are posted online.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 30, 2007**

The Committee then reviewed five course proposals and voted unanimously to forward them to the Faculty.

At 3:30, the Committee was joined by the members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Writing, comprised of Professors Barale, chair; Bosman, Brandes, Lopez, and Greenstein. The Dean thanked the ad hoc committee for all of their efforts since last July, when the committee was charged by the Committee of Six with developing a proposal to implement the recommendation of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) that a writing requirement be adopted.

Professor Barale explained that the ad hoc committee had been purposeful in their decision to take a broad and organic approach to the consideration of writing instruction at the College. She and her colleagues believe that it would be premature to recommend the implementation of a College-wide writing requirement at this time. Instead, they focused their efforts on considering faculty-driven ways of building flexible-but-rigorous structures to support writing instruction and to integrate it within the curriculum. Professor Brandes noted that the ad hoc committee's work had been informed greatly by conversations with colleagues.

Noting that the ad hoc committee had reduced an initial seven-page draft of their report down to the current three-and-a-half-page version (appended), Professor Barale discussed the range of initiatives recommended by the ad hoc committee, a time line for implementation, and the need for outside evaluation at the conclusion of what is meant to be a three-year pilot program. Some members of the ad hoc committee suggested that the Faculty might return to the question of whether to implement a writing requirement in three years. Professor Greenstein commented that the ad hoc committee had decided that the best way to proceed at this time was to find ways of giving greater attention to the teaching of writing across the College—within departments and disciplines—and to furthering conversation about writing instruction, rather than proposing a single requirement. He feels that, once additional support structures are in place, greater attention will be paid to writing, and that will act as seeding for a future writing requirement.

Professor Parker, who said that he admired the writing program at Bryn Mawr, in particular, and found similarities between it and the ad hoc committee's recommendations, asked the members of the ad hoc committee if they had researched writing programs at other institutions. Professor Barale noted that the Working Group for Writing Instruction at Amherst College had done a good deal of this sort of work to inform their report (2005) and that the ad hoc committee had reviewed this information.

Professor Woglom expressed disappointment that the ad hoc committee had not put forward a plan for implementing a writing requirement. Professor Barale said that she does not believe that the Faculty would support a writing requirement at this point. Some Committee of Six members said that they found much to admire in the ad hoc committee's report and approach, in particular the committee's recommendations to create a named, rotating professorship devoted to writing and a standing faculty committee to oversee the pilot program. Professors Sinos and Schneider noted that faculty conversation thus far has already resulted in greater attention being given to writing at the College and an increase in the number of courses being offered that are attentive to writing. They anticipate that further progress would be made if the ad hoc committee's recommendations are implemented.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 30, 2007**

Professor Bosman noted that the ad hoc committee's recommendation that the Faculty take ownership of writing instruction—apart from the Writing Center—is not as modest as it might seem and represents a development of the view of the Working Group for Writing Instruction. It was noted that the ad hoc committee has recommended enlarging the Writing Center. Professor Bosman responded that this is the fifth recommendation out of five, and that the emphasis of the report is that the Amherst Faculty should be responsible, in a central way, for teaching students writing throughout students' time at the College.

Professor O'Hara suggested that it would be beneficial for the Writing Center (as well as the Quantitative Center) to report to the Dean of the Faculty, in addition to the Dean of Students. Such a structure might strengthen the relationship between the centers and the Faculty, she noted. Professor Parker agreed, noting that such a restructuring of the reporting structure of the Writing Center would signal that the teaching of writing is an intellectual issue that concerns the entire curriculum. Professor Bosman also expressed his support for having the centers report to the Dean.

Professor Parker asked if the ad hoc committee envisions reserving future FTE faculty positions for so-called "compositionalists," who, as the name implies, are trained in the teaching of writing. The Dean wondered if the ad hoc committee was suggesting that the rotating professorship be filled by colleagues from the Amherst Faculty or by faculty who would be brought in from outside the College. Professor Barale responded that it would be essential for the rotating professorship to be filled by a senior member of the Amherst Faculty, since part of the purpose would be for the person in this position to explore how the College understands its own pedagogy. She feared that relying too heavily on compositionalists would create a two-tier faculty system, while not being opposed to having a compositionalist permanently on staff at the Writing Center to work with faculty and students.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Parker emphasized that composition has become a serious academic field, and that graduate education in many disciplines now includes instruction in writing pedagogy. Professor Barale suggested that, perhaps, one individual could provide both ESL services and writing instruction. She noted that Susan Snively, Associate Dean of Students and Director of the Writing Center, does not have the resources to provide assistance to students who are writing honors theses. While praising the Writing Center, Professor Bosman reiterated that trust should be put in the Amherst Faculty to teach writing across the College. Professor O'Hara, who said that she supports having a "compositionalist" to provide training to the Faculty on writing instruction, noted that if the College wants students to gain writing competency, it is essential that the Faculty be competent at teaching writing.

Professor Sinos raised the question of how to develop a common language among the Faculty for teaching writing. The College has already brought experts on writing to campus to offer seminars on grading and ways to set up assignments, Professor Barale said. She envisions that such opportunities would continue to be offered. Faculty conversations about how to teach writing will help to develop a common language, she believes, although such a language will vary somewhat by discipline. Professor Schneider agreed that providing resources for training and conversation, and flexibility in how writing instruction is fostered, will facilitate greater attention to the teaching of writing at the College. Professor Lopez emphasized the importance of teaching writing across departments and across a student's four years at Amherst, rather than

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 30, 2007**

just at a limited number of isolated moments—such as during the first semester of the first year. Writing should become integral to students' entire education, he said.

The President asked about the governance implications of the ad hoc committee's decision not to develop a concrete proposal for implementing a writing requirement, given the Faculty's request for a proposal to debate, as a means of expressing the collective view. He said that, since he arrived at the College and before, the Faculty has been engaged in vigorous conversation about writing instruction. He asked for further explication of how the process proposed by the ad hoc committee would move the College toward meeting the goals for improving the writing of the following categories of students, as identified by the Faculty: that portion of students in each class who lack basic writing skills, those who avoid classes that require substantial writing, and the student body as a whole. He asked the ad hoc committee to help him understand how concerns for these constituencies would be addressed under the ad hoc committee's plan. He noted that, when the College identified students who were most in need of instruction in writing and encouraged them to enroll in writing intensive courses, only about one-half did so. He asked whether the College should feel satisfied that it is meeting the educational needs of those students who are most in need of intensive instruction, if they choose not to take advantage of the intensive courses that are being offered, or if students can and do graduate without any courses that include or improve writing.

Professor Greenstein said that the ad hoc committee's aim was to propose ways to meet the needs of all three constituencies. Professor Barale noted that the ad hoc committee was attempting to find solutions to writing problems that are intrinsically complex and multifaceted. Professor Parker said that having students take one writing-attentive course should not be confused with the goal of writing proficiency. The President agreed and wondered whether students would receive writing instruction before declaring their majors, if writing-attentive courses were situated within majors. Professor Greenstein said that in many fields students are required to take courses in the discipline during their first year, before they formally declare a major. Professor Brandes responded that the ad hoc committee is recommending that some percentage of First-Year Seminars be writing attentive. Professor Schneider noted that the advisor should also be responsible for helping to ensure that students focus on writing through their courses.

Professor O'Hara expressed strong support for the ad hoc committee's recommendation of a rotating professorship devoted to writing, coupled with a standing faculty committee on writing. She noted that the Thalheimer Professorship, which rotates among the Faculty every three years, could serve as an excellent model for the new professorship. The role of the Thalheimer Professor is to foster conversation and innovation in regard to teaching, and it has been very effective, Professor O'Hara said. Several members of the Committee agreed that the concept of a rotating professorship and faculty committee devoted to writing was an excellent one. Members of the ad hoc committee likened the committee on writing to the First-Year Seminar Committee. They envision that such a committee would monitor curricular developments and make curricular judgements.

The Dean noted the importance of defining the attributes of writing attentive and writing intensive courses. He also asked how progress could be assessed without taking this step. Some members of the Committee of Six suggested that the new writing committee might play a role in

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 30, 2007**

developing such criteria; the ad hoc committee emphasized that a College-wide process that encourages interdisciplinary debate should be employed. Professor Greenstein emphasized that writing is a fluid skill and that changes in students' writing might be subtle and difficult to quantify. Professor Bosman said that the ad hoc committee suggested beginning the three-year pilot in 2008-2009 in order to allow time for faculty discussion and for developing definitions for writing intensive and attentive courses. He emphasized that this should be a careful, slow, and deliberate process and that the criteria that are developed should not be too narrow.

Professor Brandes suggested that Faculty should self-identify courses that are writing attentive or writing intensive. Perhaps a meeting could be organized of faculty teaching such courses, she said. Dean Call said that, in order to move the conversation forward, it would be useful for the Faculty to reach a consensus on the broad criteria and/or guidelines for these courses in the near term. Professor Lopez agreed that there should be guidelines, but noted that there should be flexibility to allow for variation among disciplines and departments. President Marx said that, while the process of developing guidelines might be difficult, and it might be tempting to lean toward the least intrusive possibilities, he is confident that the Faculty will engage in this process.

Professor Parker noted that there are FTE issues intertwined with the teaching of writing attentive and intensive courses. Such courses are offered at the behest and cost of faculty members, who do not teach other courses within the departmental curriculum as a result. He asked how the allocation of FTEs would be implemented in relation to departmental commitments to offer writing attentive and/or intensive courses. This subject was not addressed by the ad hoc committee in its report. The President said that the CAP had recommended that two FTEs be devoted to writing, but noted that, the CAP process suggests that only when a common and tangible understanding of writing initiatives that are moving the College forward emerges can FTEs be allocated. The Dean noted that, ultimately, the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) would decide, based on the criteria that the Faculty establishes for writing attentive and intensive courses, whether a particular course would be "counted" as a writing attentive or intensive course.

Professor Bosman noted that the ad hoc committee had considered whether all First-Year Seminars should become writing intensive, but that the CEP had strongly discouraged this approach. The CEP's view is that some First-Year Seminars are focused on substance other than writing. Professor Woglom pointed out that First-Year Seminars could be writing attentive and accomplish other goals. It appears to him that the seminars present an excellent opportunity to introduce the seriousness of writing and to identify students who might be in need of extra help with their writing. Professor O'Hara noted that, in their responses to an inventory given to First-Year Seminar students in the fall of 2005, students indicated that their highest expectation of the seminars was that attention would be given to their writing. Professor Bosman reiterated that the ad hoc committee had been told that the First-Year Seminar program would be in upheaval if all of the seminars were required to be writing attentive. Professor Barale said that she worries, that, if First-Year Seminars were required to be writing attentive, there would be a conceptual shift at the College toward viewing the teaching of writing as taking place only at this one moment.

The Committee of Six, the Dean, and the President thanked the members of the ad hoc committee for their work, and the members departed at 4:50.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 30, 2007**

The members discussed ways in which proposals regarding writing might move forward. The Dean said that the CEP, at the direction of the Faculty, will consider College-wide priorities when making recommendations for FTEs, while other forms of support and resources could and would also be added. He understood that any FTE requests made in regard to writing would require agreement on proposals that advance writing instruction, not just a further process for continuing such deliberation. Professor Schneider noted that majors in his department are required to take courses that could be categorized as writing attentive and that he believes that many other departments probably have similar requirements. Professor George suggested that the ad hoc committee might be asked to propose guidelines for writing attentive and intensive courses. Professor O'Hara wondered if the ad hoc committee, which expressed a preference to disband after much hard work, might be asked instead for suggestions about how to move this question forward.

The Committee next returned to its discussion of the proposal, forwarded by the CEP, for a major in Environmental Studies. Professor Parker asked how the major would be phased in. Professors Sinos and Woglom wondered whether the Faculty could vote on a major before FTEs have been hired. The Dean said that he envisions, following regular processes, that resource requests resulting from the proposal for the major would be evaluated by the CEP, and recommendations would be made to the administration. If new FTEs are allocated to Environmental Studies this spring, searches would be conducted in 2007-2008, and the major could be brought to the Faculty for a vote in fall 2007. Such a step would indicate to the Faculty and to the Board that a major is coming. He noted that the CEP has indicated that it is strongly supportive of creating a major. Curricular proposals are reviewed by the CEP and acted on by the Faculty, the Dean said. Professor George pointed out that the proposal is to create a program, so there would only be a need for the Faculty to vote on the proposed major. The Committee asked the Dean to research the history of faculty votes relating to the creation of the Department of Women's and Gender Studies and its major to learn if the Faculty had voted on the sequence of courses that would be part of the major.

The Committee expressed overall support for establishing a major in environmental studies, but some members raised specific questions about the make-up of courses within the major. It was agreed that those members should contact Professor Dizard to discuss their concerns. Professor George raised a question about the prospect that students, particularly those majoring in Biology and Geology, might use the Environmental Studies major, as currently described, as a second major of convenience. Because many of the required courses would overlap among these majors, he worried that "double-counting" of courses toward two majors might occur. The Dean said that he would check with Mr. Mager, the Registrar, to learn if double-counting has been a problem and what the regulations are in regard to this practice and would report back.

In the brief time remaining, the Committee discussed the letter (appended to the minutes of April 26) from Professors Damon and Ratner, on behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion, in which concerns were raised about the process that the Committee of Six had used in evaluating and framing the debate on their committee's report. The Committee expressed regret that they had not met with the ad hoc committee and noted that the Committee's actions did not represent any sort of negative intent. The members agreed that if, in the future, the

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, April 30, 2007**

Committee is forwarding a committee report to the Faculty without making changes, it might not be necessary to meet with the committee. However, if the Committee is going to suggest changes in substance via the motions it drafts, the members should meet with the committee to discuss their report.

Professor Schneider said that it might have been helpful to ask the ad hoc committee to frame motions. The members agreed, in hindsight, that discussing with the ad hoc committee the framing of motions based on the report would have been helpful. Some members commented that there are lessons for the Committee to learn from recent events about the dangers of focusing on meta-issues before substance, when bringing motions before the Faculty. Some members felt that getting a sense of the Faculty's views on issues before spending a great deal of time framing motions can be helpful to the Committee. Professor George suggested that a committee-of-the-whole approach might be a better way of structuring such discussion. The members agreed to draft a letter of response to Professors Ratner and Damon.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**Implementing a Writing Attentive Curriculum:
Suggestions for a Three Year Pilot Study
Beginning AY 2008 - 09**

I

The members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Writing understand our charge to be the development of a proposal to implement Recommendation 18 of the *2006 Report of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP)*, that "all students be required to take at least one course designated as Writing Attentive, with pedagogical support to be provided for faculty engaged in such writing instruction" (26). Cap's proposal of a writing requirement, moreover, reiterates the earlier recommendation made in the *2005 Report of the Working Group for Writing Instruction (WGWI, appended)*, in which a majority of the WGWI recommended that "students be required to take one W [writing attentive] course by the end of the second year" (4).

In the course of the Ad Hoc Committee's consultations and discussions, however, we have encountered substantive faculty opposition to implementation of a college-wide writing requirement. The Committee, therefore, has decided not to recommend that writing become a college requirement at this time, despite our differing individual positions on the requirement's merits. We believe that writing instruction at the College is most likely to prosper under the aegis of an intellectually coherent program shaped, overseen, and ultimately evaluated by faculty. Before we shape our curriculum to emphasize writing - and certainly before we require writing courses of our students - we should establish a structure able to organize and support writing courses.

In order to fully integrate writing with existing disciplinary instruction, this report will suggest 1) a range of writing initiatives (we identify no single curricular site as the "right" place for increased attention to writing); 2) a time line for those initiatives (three years of implementation followed by outside evaluation); 3) a means of implementing them (intra-departmental as well as across the college); and 4) a set of incentives and resources for those initiatives. It is our hope to offer an array of approaches by which writing instruction can become an explicit and articulated part of classroom - and faculty - conversation.

To that end, one of conversation and community, we have tried to find a way by which all parts of the college might contribute to a writing curriculum. Because we want to take advantage of existing structures - the Writing Center and some part of the First Year Seminar Program - the committee's central focus is on our present curriculum. It is the role that departments would play in teaching writing, therefore, that would most fully enable Amherst College's attention to writing to become realized in instruction that continues throughout students' time here. We want to find a way by which departments can regularly make W courses part of their curricular

offerings at all levels. Such courses could be topical ones that would be of interest to majors but also might appeal to interested non-majors; they could be junior level seminars; they could be team taught; they could be cross-disciplinary - in short, they could be as creatively and energetically shaped as our imagination invites.

As we consider incorporating a new emphasis on writing into our curriculum, it seems worth noting that many courses already require several written assignments, and that many courses currently ask for at least fifteen to twenty pages of writing and some for twice that amount. It also seems important to point out that some departments have always made their classes write almost weekly essays which they then discuss in class. Many of us spend a great deal of time in our offices looking at rough drafts and outlines, answering questions, encouraging good ideas, discouraging moves sure to get a writer in trouble. The need to implement a more prominent emphasis on writing is certainly not due to faculty sloth. Our students come to us untrained - whatever their previous schooling; none have a language, a common vocabulary, with which to discuss arguments in general and their papers. They have no names for the very strategies and structures - theses; evidence and its evaluation; transitions; the subordination and co-ordination of ideas; kinds of definitions - that we most want them to master. And we, too, may lack a vocabulary for the work we are being asked to do. The new emphasis on writing is designed to address our students' difficulties - and whatever our own might be.

Nor do we want to downplay the burden that an emphasis on writing poses. It is hard to teach writing, not simply because it takes longer to read and respond to papers when writing is an important part of what is being commented upon, but because, until we get the hang of it, we may sometimes feel that we are not teaching the very thing that we love to teach and feel the most expert at. At least initially, our own confidence may feel shaky.

And finally, we recognize that not all departments can or even should regularly offer writing instruction. For example, small departments may well decide that they cannot stretch themselves any thinner than they already are, as they try to meet the needs of their major curriculum and keep up their enrollment numbers. All departments - and small ones, in particular - feel the need to protect their core. When they fear the loss of either instruction in their own curriculum or in FTEs because of college demands, they will resist moving into interdisciplinary fields. But we also expect that the college will continue to go out of its way to enable departments to teach writing courses without cost to their existing curriculum.

Here, then, is our implementation plan:

II

1. Create a named, rotating Professorship, devoted to writing.

The success of a new emphasis on writing in the College's curriculum depends upon the intellectual investment of all of us in its implementation. Although an organized approach is certainly called for during the initial stages of implementation, and may prove useful past the first three years, the committee recommends designating a central figure to undertake responsibility

for articulating a rational and structuring its implementation. That figure needs to be a member of the faculty - not a compositionist - of sufficient seniority and stature to integrate a new set of instructional interests with Amherst's existing academic commitments. Implementation calls for someone whose judgments and plans both faculty and administration can support.

2. Create a standing faculty committee whose charge is to oversee all parts of the pilot program.

While no one on the Ad Hoc Committee craves bureaucracy, creation of a formalized structure, chaired by whoever holds the rotating professorship, could assist in training for writing instruction and in organizing both a writing curriculum and its evaluation at the end of three years.

- a. allocate an implementation budget for the committee;
- b. provide for an outside evaluation team.

3. Reward instructors and departments who take on the task of writing instruction.

We urge that departments, rather than individuals, take on the responsibility for offering two W classes during the three year pilot program. Because a writing responsibility will pose difficulties for many departments who already feel the strain of meeting their current curricular needs, the college will need to find a means by which new responsibilities can be met.

- a. provide visiting 3 year appointments to departments that agree to develop and then offer two W classes within their curriculum;
- b. provide FTEs to departments that would make such classes a major requirement;
- c. train faculty who want to teach W courses, and remunerate them for taking up such training.

4. Make a percentage of all FYS offerings Writing Attentive (FYS W)

The FYS Program seems to be a site where writing instruction could be easily plugged in; however, given the complicated and competing demands already placed on FYS classes, we do not think it is appropriate to expect that FYS take on the major role in writing instruction.

- a. control enrollments so that these classes would be smaller than the usual FYS enrollment;
- b. ask instructors to commit to teach an FYS W for two years.

5. Enlarge the Writing Center

The Writing Center has been consistently effective in mentoring students' writing. We want to help it keep doing what it does well already.

- a. increase professional staff by one full position, with ESL as a permanent part of that position;
- b. find larger quarters for the Center while still keeping it centrally sited on campus;
- c. increase the number of peer tutors.

We have been broad rather than specific in describing what needs to be set in place before the college's curriculum can programmatically include writing as both a topic and a requirement. We believe that the details - where we know that numerous devils reside - might be best determined in the field rather than on paper. In other words, we have tried to provide sufficient detail to be practical, but insufficient particulars to bog us down. We have left unspecified two areas that are most devilish: 1) training for instructors; and 2) the disposition of FTEs. And note, also, that we have spent no time at all discussing how we will get students into writing courses if they are not required. We are optimistic that when the development of writing and argument are central to conversations among and about ourselves, our students will want to be part of that center.

Michele Aina Barale, Chair
Anston Bosman
Ute Brandes
Rick A. Lopez
George S. Greenstein

24 April, 2007

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, May 7, 2007**

The thirty-seventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006-2007 was called to order by the Dean at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, May 7, 2007. Present were Professors George, O'Hara, Parker, Schneider, Sinos, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The members approved the minutes of the meeting of April 26.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Marx noted, in relation to a question asked at the Faculty Meeting of May 1 by Professor C. Dole, that the Board of Trustees is now considering the issue of retiree health benefits for faculty and staff hired on or after July 1, 2003. He informed the members that there had been nine public meetings on this subject, to which all employees who are being affected were invited. The President explained that, since Medicare does not provide comprehensive health insurance coverage, Medicare supplement plans (the current one offered by the College is Medex 3) are used to cover expenses not covered by Medicare. Employees hired on or after July 1, 2003, will be asked to share in the risk that medical costs will escalate in the future and in the cost of supplemental insurance, although the Board seems to be in agreement that the College should absorb the majority of that risk. At the informational meetings, an example was used with the College contributing 40 percent of the cost of supplemental insurance each year to a notional account for eligible employees while they are employed at the College, though the Board seems inclined to have the College contribute a larger share. Upon retirement, the funds accumulated during employment would be available to the retiree to pay for eligible medical expenses.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call responded to Professor George's question, posed at the meeting of April 30, about rules governing the "double-counting" of courses toward two or more majors. The Dean said that Mr. Mager, the Registrar, has informed him that double-counting does not appear to be a problem. The Dean quoted from page 62 of the College Catalog as follows: "Students who elect a double major must present the signatures of both academic advisors when registering for each semester's courses and they must, of course, fulfill the graduation requirements and comprehensive examinations established by two academic programs. In addition, double majors may not credit courses approved for either major toward the other without the explicit consent of an announced departmental policy or the signature of a departmental chairperson."

The Dean informed the members that the Memorial Minute Committees for Calvin Plimpton, President Emeritus, and Theodore Greene, Winthrop H. Smith Professor of History, Emeritus, would read their memorials at the Commencement Faculty Meeting.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Parker noted, in reference to the current report of the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) on grant-in-aid, that Professor Himmelstein's concerns about this benefit, which he raised on behalf of the CPR in 2000, do not appear to have been addressed point-by-point in the current report. Professor Parker praised both the 2007 and 2000 reports as thorough treatments of the subject. Dean Call noted that the CPR, over the years, has periodically reviewed this issue and said that different conclusions had been reached by different committees. He noted that benefits comparisons are very much a part of the employment decision-making process at this time, particularly for mid-career faculty and staff,

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, May 7, 2007**

and many senior administrators. Professor O'Hara agreed that the current report is taking into account different considerations and a different climate than was present seven years ago.

Professor Schneider next explained that many members of the Faculty have been discussing via email the subject of merit pay. He was asked to inquire whether there is merit pay for faculty and, if so, what system is in place. The Dean replied that he takes some information into account when setting faculty salaries, but that such information affects salaries minimally. The relative differences in compensation among faculty who have the same number of years in rank are typically small, he said. He noted, however, that dating from the time of hiring, there are some differences in compensation that are field specific. President Marx noted that the largest salary differences are the result of retention efforts, which may not necessarily be the most equitable measure of merit.

Professor O'Hara asked what criteria are used to award named professorships. Dean Call first noted that additional salary is not associated with such professorships. He said that, when making nominations for professorships, he reviews individuals' overall contribution to the College, with an emphasis on scholarship. However, many professorships are discipline specific or have other criteria that must be taken into account. At times, there might be too many qualified individuals who meet the criteria for a particular professorship. If that is the case, professorships are sometimes left unfilled for a time, he said.

Professor Woglom commented that it would be helpful if the Dean would provide the Faculty with some data on faculty compensation over an extended period, perhaps based on time in rank. He suggested expressing the highest salary as a percentage of the lowest salary for a given time in rank and providing both the latest data and the data from 2002-2003. Comparable information from the same periods that would also be desirable would be the average salary for women faculty members divided by average salary for men, controlling for time in rank. The Dean said that he is interested in understanding the Faculty's preferences and would be happy to work with Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research, over the summer to determine a useful means of presenting information to the Faculty that would facilitate an analytic approach to this issue. He reiterated that, if a merit pay system were to be put in place, much more information would have to be collected regularly from the Faculty in order to assess merit. The President said that, while he encourages discussion about the process of faculty compensation, the Dean of the Faculty sets actual faculty salaries. Professor Schneider noted that many colleagues are opposed to having a system of merit pay.

The Committee next reviewed drafts of the Dean's letters to chairs and candidates concerning reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

The Committee next discussed the proposal (appended) from the Committee on Education and Athletics that the description of the committee's membership be changed in the *Faculty Handbook* from "two students elected by their peers" to the following: "two students (one man and one woman) elected by their peers from a slate consisting of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, and a third appointed by the Student Government,..." No objections were expressed. The members voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward this motion to the

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, May 7, 2007**

Faculty and six in favor and zero opposed on the substance of the motion. The Committee agreed that this motion should be put on the agenda of the Commencement Faculty Meeting on May 24.

Discussion turned to a proposal (appended) from the Faculty Computer Committee to revise its charge by adding another faculty member, making the term on the committee two years for faculty members, and adding a student member. One member of the committee, under the new charge, would serve as the faculty representative to the College's Internet Strategy Group. Professor George noted the importance of the work of the Faculty Computer Committee and its expanding workload and expressed support for adding an additional faculty member. Professor Woglom, while acknowledging the nature and scope of the committee's work, raised concerns about increasing the burden of the Faculty by adding to its committee work. Professor Schneider agreed. Professor George also felt, in general, that ways should be found to reduce the Faculty's committee work. The Committee was supportive of adding a student to the committee.

Professor O'Hara wondered if a staff member, perhaps an Academic Department Coordinator, should be added to the Faculty Computer Committee, since staff members are very involved with technology. The Dean said that staff members interface with this committee, he believes through other groups, particularly the Core Data Team. He said that he would check with Peter Schilling, Director of Information Technology, to confirm how staff members' technology interests and needs are represented. Professor George said that he thinks that it might be best for faculty members and administrators to set policy. The members voted five in favor and one opposed (Professor Schneider) to forward the motion to the Faculty to alter the charge of the committee. The Committee voted one in favor (Professor George), three opposed (Professors O'Hara, Schneider, and Woglom), and two abstentions (Professors Parker and Sinos) on content.

Turning to the Faculty Meeting of May 18, Professor George said that he would be concerned if the Faculty votes at that meeting on the motion to require teaching evaluation of tenured faculty members, because a mid-day meeting on a Friday is an unusual time to resolve a contentious issue on which the Faculty appears to be closely divided. Some colleagues who wish to be heard and to vote on this motion have longstanding commitments that will prevent them from attending this particular meeting, he said. Professor George noted that, if discussion on the motion seems to be ending among those present at the meeting, he plans to move to table further action on the motion until the Commencement Faculty Meeting on May 24. Of course, anyone could call the question, he said, but he would vote against it in order to make it possible to postpone the final vote to May 24. Professor Sinos agreed.

Noting that the time of the meeting had been shared with the Faculty in early February, Dean Call said that he feels that it is important to continue the discussion that was begun at the last Faculty Meeting. The President agreed, commenting that the Faculty had signaled, during the recent promotion discussions, in particular, that it wanted to concentrate on substance and to get through business. Professor O'Hara noted that, while the time of the Faculty Meeting is different, the proceedings of the Faculty Meeting are not.

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, May 7, 2007**

Professor Parker expressed concern about recent attendance at Faculty Meetings. Professor Schneider agreed. While noting that it is desirable to have as many colleagues as possible at Faculty Meetings, the Dean said that recent vote totals are consistent with those of the last several years.

After deciding that the proposed mission statement should be discussed before Motion 2, the members voted six in favor and zero opposed to approve the agenda for the Faculty Meeting of May 18.

Turning to its review of the nominee for the Hitchcock Fellowship, the Committee voted six in favor and zero opposed to approve the nominee.

The Committee discussed briefly a letter (appended) sent to the members by Professor Rivkin, and the members agreed that the issue raised, the level of support offered through the parental leave policy, should be forwarded to the CPR.

Finally, the Dean, to inform the consideration of procedures for a Faculty vote this fall on a new major in Environmental Studies, reviewed with the members the votes that were taken when the Department of Women's and Gender Studies and its major were established. He noted that, when the Faculty approved the major, descriptions of foundational courses and a list of already offered courses that would fit within the major were provided. Once a major is approved, the Committee noted, curricular changes within the major come before the Committee on Educational Policy, not the Faculty as a whole.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

AMHERST COLLEGE
Department of English

March 5, 2007

The Committee of Six
Amherst College
Amherst, MA 01002

Dear Colleagues:

I write on behalf of The Committee on Education and Athletics to request that "two students elected by their peers" in the description in the Faculty Handbook of our committee be changed to:

two students (one man and one woman) elected by their peers from a slate consisting of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, and a third appointed by the Student Government,...

The most obvious motivation is evening out the numbers. With the addition there would be three representatives from each of our constituencies - the Faculty, the Athletic Department, and the Student Body.

But equally, if not more important, is the need to insure that 1) both men's and women's teams are represented, and 2) there be sufficient over-lap between our committee and a newly-formed Student-Athlete Advisory Committee made up of representatives of every team and several clubs.

As things now stand, one student is selected by the student government and another elected at large. Both are men. The change would insure that both genders are represented. By making the slate the Advisory Committee (which numbers about 40 students) each committee would be apprised of what the other is discussing and doing. This year luck - and only luck - has it that one student is on both committees.

Thank you for your consideration of our motion.

Yours sincerely

Kim Townsend, Chair
Patrick Benson, '08
Andrew Bruns, 07
Suzanne Coffey
Don Faulstick
Ben Lieber
Joe Moore
Nick Nichols
Rose Olver

From: Lyle A. McGeoch [lam@cs.amherst.edu]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2007 1:49 PM
To: Mary Miller
Cc: Peter Schilling; Scott Payne
Subject: proposal for new charge for the Faculty Computer Committee

Attachments: FCC Charge2.doc

Hi Greg,

I am writing on behalf of the Faculty Computer Committee to submit the attached proposal for a revised charge for our committee. The current charge is outdated in a number of ways.

The main changes reflected in the proposed charge are:

--- Addition of a fourth faculty member. All academic departments are now dependent on technology, and we feel that a fourth member could help ensure that the committee has a better understanding of the IT needs of the entire College.

--- Addition of a student member. Students are, of course, part of the academic enterprise, and we think that a student member could contribute substantially to the work of the committee. The president of the student government has agreed to our proposal to have a student member and has said that the senate would be able to hold an election for this position.

--- Specifying that faculty members of the committee would be appointed for two years, which is already the practice.

---Updating of titles and department names.

--- Formalizing the committee's role in advising on large faculty requests for equipment and support.

---Specifying that there would be a faculty representative to the ISG.

Thanks, and best wishes,

Lyle

Lyle A. McGeoch
Chair, Faculty Computer Committee

Proposed Revised Charge

4/24/2007

The Faculty Computer Committee

The Faculty Computer Committee consists of four faculty members appointed by the Committee of Six for two-year terms and one student member elected by the student government. One of the faculty members serves as chair. The committee advises the Director of Information Technology and the Director of Academic Technology Services (ATS) on topics related to the use of computer technology in support of research and instruction and on other IT issues affecting the academic life of the College. The committee also makes recommendations to the Director of ATS and the Dean of the Faculty on faculty requests involving significant investment in equipment or extensive ATS support. One member of the committee serves as a faculty representative to the College's Internet Strategy Group.

Current Charge, as found in the Faculty Handbook:

Three members of the Faculty, drawn primarily from those disciplines making the most use of technology, form a committee to work with the Director and staff of the Academic Computer Center. The members of the Committee are selected by the Committee of Six. One of the faculty members serves as chair. By definition, members of the Faculty Computer Committee also serve on the Information Technology Policy Committee, a campus-wide committee that addresses policy matters related to the use of information technology at the College.

AMHERST COLLEGE
Department of Economics

April 11, 2007

Committee of Six

Dear Committee of Six:

Our current parental leave policy is far less generous than that of peer institutions including Williams, Wellesley, and Dartmouth with whom we compete for both faculty and students. One consequence of current policy is that a faculty member who is the primary or only wage earner in the family is subject to economic hardship if he or she chooses to have a child and take parental leave. More generally, the current benefit level produces anxiety and additional stress among faculty attempting to balance professional and family considerations that could be mitigated by a more generous leave policy comparable to the aforementioned institutions. Given our interest in fostering a diverse and accomplished faculty and current plan to engage in substantial hiring during the coming years, I believe that it is an appropriate time to consider the desirability of making parental leave more generous.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Steven Rivkin

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, May 14, 2007**

The thirty-eighth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006-2007 was called to order by the Dean at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, May 14, 2007. Present were Professors George, O'Hara, Parker, Schneider, Sinos, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The members approved the minutes of the meeting of May 7.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the members that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has approved Professor Bumiller's request that, upon successful completion of her course, titled *Regulating Citizenship*, credit be awarded to all students who are enrolled. Professor Bumiller teaches the course at a local correctional facility, and an equal number of Amherst students and residents of the facility are enrolled. The Dean explained that the students who are residents of the facility would not be able to use the credit toward an Amherst degree, since they have not been admitted to the College, but could transfer the credit to another institution if they desired. The Committee was supportive of the CEP's decision.

Professor Sinos next expressed some concern that, because the members had been asked to vote via email on the motion to approve the proposed mission statement, the Committee had not had the benefit of a discussion when considering how to vote on this issue. Professor Parker, noting that he had been the only member not to vote in favor of the motion, said that he had done so to register his concern that the language of the mission statement further emphasized the production of knowledge. He had voiced the view at both meetings of the Committee of Six and the Faculty that not all fields generate knowledge, but, rather strive to encourage learning. He feels that the language of the mission statement does not represent everyone's sense of what they do, he said. The Dean apologized to the Committee for the need to vote by email, which resulted from an oversight that originally placed on the agenda a report on, rather than a motion to approve, the mission statement.

The Committee turned to personnel matters.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Parker asked if the President and the Dean would discuss the changes in format that had been implemented at Senior Assembly. President Marx said that, as an experiment, efforts have been made to redistribute among other celebratory ceremonies the activities and presentations that have typically taken place at Senior Class Exercises during Class Day (the Saturday of Commencement Weekend). He noted that these changes were prompted by sparse attendance at Senior Class Exercises. The President then reviewed the adjustments.

Two student speakers, the runners-up for Student Commencement Speaker, spoke at Senior Assembly, rather than at Senior Class Exercises. The tradition of a student speaker at Commencement will continue, the President said. He noted that the Woods-Travis Prize, the chief academic award, would be given at Commencement this year, as would the Obed Finch Slingerland Memorial Prize, which is awarded to the senior who has "shown by his/her own determination and accomplishment the greatest appreciation of and desire for a college education." In addition, Phebe and Zephaniah Swift Moore Teaching Award recipients will be acknowledged at Commencement this year, rather than at Senior Class Exercises, the President said. The award recognizes secondary school teachers and counselors who have been important in the lives of Amherst students. The presentations of the Thomas H. Wyman 1951 Medal, the Howard Hill Mossman Trophy, and the Psi Upsilon Prize were shifted from Senior Class

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, May 14, 2007**

Exercises to Senior Assembly. President Marx noted that the announcement of honorary class members, a tradition that he said he particularly admires, was shifted from Senior Class Exercises to the Senior Dinner, which seemed to be much appreciated. The President said that the decision was also made that, at Senior Assembly, the Dean would announce the name of each award recipient and the name of the award, but that he would not read descriptions of the awards. In this way, time could be made for the presentation of additional awards and for the two student speakers.

Professor Parker suggested that reading some brief description about the prizes given at Senior Assembly would be appreciated. The Dean agreed that a happy medium should be found in this regard. Professor Schneider said that the brevity of Senior Assembly was appreciated by many. Professor Woglom noted that, while he is in favor of experimenting with different formats, he feels that students should not be singled out for special recognition through awards that are presented during Commencement. He commented that the College has made efforts to move away from special recognitions in favor of making Commencement a day during which everyone celebrates the achievement of earning an Amherst College degree.

Taking some issue with the characterization of the Woods-Travis Prize, Professor George noted that the award is strictly numerical (raw GPA), and he said that the winner is not necessarily the most accomplished or well-rounded student, academically. In discussing alternative times for presenting the award, the Committee noted that the prize could not be awarded at Senior Assembly because the Faculty votes on the winner at the Commencement Faculty Meeting, which does not take place until after Senior Assembly. The President commented that the Faculty has been concerned about the level of intellectual engagement among students, and that he had thought that celebrating the winner of the top academic prize in a more prominent way might focus more attention on academic achievement. He agreed that a purely numeric calculation of academic performance may not be the best measure of academic excellence and suggested that the Faculty might want to consider the criteria for the award in the future.

Continuing with “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Parker asked if all faculty members who applied for a Senior Sabbatical Fellowship received one. The Dean said that, regrettably, there was insufficient funding available to make awards for all colleagues who applied.

On another topic, Professor O’Hara expressed the view that departments should be informed as soon as possible that an unexpectedly large freshman class—approximately 470 students—is expected this fall. She commented that a class of this size would put strains on introductory courses and first-year seminars, in particular, and said that departments will need to make plans to accommodate larger numbers, if the educational experience of students is not to be compromised. She asked the Dean and the President whether the new first-year class has a tilt toward some disciplines, since she had heard that the Class of 2011 would include many strong science students. The President and the Dean said that the news that the class would be so large is very recent, and that they will consider ways to meet the needs that will emerge as a result. They explained that “summer melt” (when students make decisions during the summer to attend other schools) may only be about eight to twelve students, if past patterns hold true. The President commented that the unexpectedly large incoming class reflects that the yield has

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, May 14, 2007**

jumped from 36 percent last year to 40.4 percent this year, despite the fact that the acceptance rate (17.5 percent) was the lowest in decades. The Dean noted that seven students who have accepted Amherst's offer of admission into the Class of 2011 have been nominated to be Schupf Scholars. He thanked those faculty members who made such great efforts to speak with these exceptional students during the time that the students were making their college choices.

Professor Woglom noted that this had been a difficult year for him on the Committee of Six, because he cares about Amherst, yet he feels that so little appears to have been accomplished. He believes this is in part due to an Amherst culture that he sees as unwilling to gather information to inform discussions of important issues and which he feels too often asserts as true things that may or may not be true. Professor Woglom expressed the view that faculty at Amherst are in a very privileged position, but with that privilege comes the responsibility to be self-critical. The College is not meeting that responsibility, he contends. Professor Woglom expressed disappointment, for example, that a faculty committee would not develop a proposal for a writing requirement, while asserting—without any evidence to back up the assertion—that writing instruction has been improving over the past three years. He was also disheartened when the Committee of Six was unwilling to gather and share information on grade distributions to inform discussions about grade inflation. He noted that, when he asked at the Committee of Six meeting of May 7 for information on faculty salaries, he was dismayed that the administration's response was that it would work to gather such information over the summer. In Professor Woglom's view, this was an untimely delay, particularly given the Dean's characterizations of faculty salaries at the last meeting,

In response, the President said that he has greatly valued Professor Woglom's contributions and his service on the Committee of Six and noted that a number of administrators have spent a great deal of time responding to Professor Woglom's requests for data and providing him with information. The administration had worked hard, for example, to answer Professor Woglom's questions and to reassure the Faculty in the fall that admission standards were being maintained. Professor Sinos said that she has found it valuable when Professor Woglom has asked for information. Professor O'Hara commented that for one group of faculty members, in particular, data is the primary vehicle for understanding certain issues. In regard to the issue of grade inflation, she expressed hope that data could be collected that would be informative yet protected the identity of individual faculty members.

President Marx said that the administration has set out to be more forthcoming and more transparent than has been the tradition at Amherst. He also pointed to the hiring of a full-time Director of Institutional Research in 2004, early in his presidency, and noted that an Associate Director of Institutional Research was hired just two months ago to help meet the increasing demand for research to inform decision-making at the College. In terms of the salary information, he noted that he and the Dean had learned only very recently that the Faculty had been discussing the issue of merit pay and that further information might be required. The Dean said that he had not realized that Professor Woglom expected to have the salary information provided to him before the end of this academic year. He noted that he needed some time to consider how best to gather and organize this information and said that he would work on this project after Commencement. President Marx agreed that consideration should be given to what

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, May 14, 2007**

information should be provided and in what form, so as to avoid potential divisiveness and damage to the community over the issue of faculty salaries.

The members next reviewed the theses and transcripts of students recommended by their departments for a *summa cum laude* degree and having an overall grade point average in the top 25 percent of the graduating class. After a discussion of the theses and the departmental statements, the members voted unanimously to forward most of them to the Faculty, while deciding to seek further information about two.

The members turned to Committee assignments. The President began the discussion by suggesting that one way of alleviating some of the burden on the Faculty, and of ensuring the efficiency and effectiveness of the work of College committees, might be to discontinue or combine some committees, to redistribute the work of some committees, and to consider changing the membership of some committees. The Committee, the President, and the Dean reviewed the list of standing and ad hoc committees and discussed possible changes. It was agreed that some pruning would be possible and helpful, and that any changes in the status or membership of standing committees would be brought before the Faculty for a vote. The members felt that changes to ad hoc committees should be made by the administration, in consultation with the Committee of Six. Professor O'Hara suggested consulting with the committees themselves. In response to the view expressed by several members regarding the significant burden placed on colleagues who serve on the Committee of Six, the Committee on Educational Policy, and the Committee on Priorities and Resources, the President said that he would be open to proposals to re-think how these committees function and/or their structure. Noting that certain professors seem to serve constantly on committees, Professor Parker sensed that committee assignments may not be shared equally among all members of the Faculty.

After a brief discussion, the members voted six in favor and zero opposed to approve the agenda for the Faculty Meeting of May 24.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, May 21, 2007**

The thirty-ninth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2006-2007 was called to order by the Dean at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, May 21, 2007. Present were Professors George, O'Hara, Schneider, Sinos, and Woglom, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The members approved the minutes of the meeting of May 14. Professor Parker was absent by prior arrangement.

The Committee spent the first portion of the meeting on personnel matters and then returned to the topic of committees.

The Committee discussed the creation of advisory committees for the Center for Community Engagement (CCE), the Teaching and Advising Project (TAP), and the study of film and new media at the College. The members made suggestions of colleagues who might serve on the committee, which will act as an advisory board to the CCE. It was agreed that a broad cross-section of the College community, possibly including members of the Faculty, students, administrators, and staff, should serve. Professor O'Hara suggested that individuals have a longer rotation than is typical for a faculty committee, and she proposed that the term be four or five years. It was agreed that a separate group made of alumni would have a consulting role in regard to the advisory board and the CCE.

Dean Call next recommended that a similar advisory group, comprised of members of the Faculty, be formed to assist with the development of the TAP and with governance and oversight of the project. He said that he envisions the creation of a faculty development center that would provide support for both pedagogy and research. An advisory board would be helpful in identifying next steps and could serve as a sounding board for new ideas, he noted. Associate Dean Basu will be leading this effort, and she has expressed the desire to foster a rich and inclusive conversation about the development of the TAP; she would welcome the advice of an advisory group, Dean Call said. Professor O'Hara suggested that the Thalheimer Professorship be expanded to three or four professorships encompassing the different divisions of the curriculum. Such professors could be responsible for fostering conversations about pedagogy and curriculum among faculty within their disciplines, as Professor Cox (who will end his term as the Thalheimer Professor at the end of this academic year) has done so successfully in quantitative areas. She noted that the lunches and meetings that he has organized have been very productive. President Marx said that he would be open to considering a Thalheimer-like model, but that taking such a step would be in addition to forming an advisory group for the TAP and moving forward with that project.

Professor O'Hara expressed some concern that the TAP would have a joint focus on teaching and research. She said that the College has traditionally provided less support for programs to enrich teaching and curricular development and has focused more of its resources on supporting the Faculty's research. Professor Woglom agreed and said that the Faculty would benefit from having a teaching center. Dean Call noted that, after conducting research on various models of teaching and learning centers, he and Associate Dean Griffiths had come to the conclusion that the most effective models integrated support for faculty teaching and research into a faculty development center, rather than combining support for faculty teaching with

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, May 21, 2007**

support for student learning. Working toward this model is in no way meant to signal that the College will provide less support for pedagogy, the Dean noted. Professor Sinos commented that some members of the Faculty may not welcome training in pedagogy, since courses in education departments, which teach pedagogy, have a reputation for lacking substance, she said. President Marx said that the College should provide programs to support the improvement of teaching. The TAP is in a nascent phase at present, and many of the services that it will provide, and its structure, have yet to be decided. The establishment of the Faculty Innovation Fund (FIF) and Work-in-Progress Seminars, and increasing the travel allowance for Faculty, launched this initiative this year, the Dean said. Agreeing that an information advisory group would be helpful to the development of the center, the members offered suggestions of faculty members who might serve.

Concluding the discussion of committees, the Dean noted that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has recommended that a committee on the study of film and new media be formed. Dean Call said that he supports the CEP's recommendation and will look to establish the proposed committee as an ad hoc committee in the fall.

President Marx next informed the Committee that the position of Interterm Colloquium Green Dean has been shifted from his office to that of Public Affairs. In addition to managing the program that brings speakers to campus during Interterm, the coordinator will devote some of his or her time to helping faculty members and academic department coordinators arrange other lectures or organize conferences.

Turning to the topic of the teaching of writing at the College, the President noted that he has had numerous informal discussions of late about this topic with faculty members. They have reiterated to him that the Faculty should have the primary responsibility for teaching writing, but have said that they would not exclude the possibility of having individuals who have been trained in the teaching of writing contribute to writing efforts at the College. President Marx said that he agrees that Amherst and its students could benefit from the expertise of so-called "compositionalists," if these professionals are properly integrated within a larger proposal. He expressed his hope that the possibility of hiring compositionalists would be part of conversations, as they move forward, about meeting the College's educational responsibility regarding writing.

The Committee turned to a personnel matter.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Schneider asked about the status of the search for a new Director of the Mead Art Museum. The President said that a decision would be made soon, and he said that he anticipates that further resources will be devoted to the museum in the years ahead.

Professor Sinos next asked if the unexpectedly large size of the entering class for 2007-2008 would necessitate that FTEs beyond the cap be awarded for next year. The Dean said that he would be generous with visiting appointments in order to accommodate the extra students. He pointed out that it would be up to the Trustees to raise the cap and that, if they do, it would take a year to search for new tenure-track colleagues. Such searches, if they occur, would be undertaken in 2007-2008, he noted. The number of First-Year Seminars presents the greatest

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, May 21, 2007**

challenge at present, he said. The Committee then reviewed three course proposals and voted unanimously to forward them to the Faculty. Turning to its review of the nominee for the Woods-Travis Prize, the Committee voted five in favor and zero opposed to approve the nominee. The members next reviewed the theses and transcripts of students recommended by their departments for a *summa cum laude* degree and having an overall grade point average in the top 25 percent of the graduating class. After a discussion, the members voted unanimously to forward all of the recommendations to the Faculty.

The members turned next to a consideration of attendance and voting at Faculty Meetings. After some discussion about the possibility of adding, moving, or removing administrative positions within various categories—attendance without vote, attendance with vote, etc.—the members decided that no changes should be made at present. The Committee viewed this issue as a complex and potentially divisive issue within the Amherst community and felt that caution should be exercised when making changes. It was agreed that Molly Mead, the new Director of the CCE, and Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research, should be invited to the meetings as guests in 2007-2008.

At the meeting's close, the Dean and the President expressed their appreciation to the Committee for their hard work throughout this very busy year.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty