

Amended September 28, 2007

The second meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2007-2008 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, September 10, 2007. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with Dean Call reviewing with the members and President Marx possible dates for additional meetings. It was agreed that, in addition to convening at its regularly scheduled time on Monday afternoons, the Committee would hold November 19 as a possible supplementary meeting date and would consider meeting on some evenings.

Dean Call next discussed with the members a step that the College should take to comply more fully with U.S. copyright law. He explained that the issue, which was brought to his attention by Peter Schilling, Director of Information Technology, revolves around access to electronic course reserves for individuals who audit Amherst College courses. While U.S. copyright law permits the College to provide electronic access to course reserve materials to students enrolled in courses, the same law stipulates that the College must make every effort to insure that individuals who are *not* enrolled in courses cannot access these resources. To meet its legal obligations, while serving the needs of auditors, it has been proposed that auditors who wish to access electronic resources be treated as a type of enrolled student. This new category of student would receive the credentials necessary to access electronic course material, but would not be eligible for a grade or be guaranteed access or rights to any other resources associated with an Amherst education. Mr. Schilling has informed the Dean that, for a variety of purposes, peer institutions often charge a fee for auditing courses. He has recommended, and the Dean said that he agrees, that Amherst should charge a \$50.00 fee to those auditors who wish to have access to electronic course materials. The Dean noted that the \$50.00 figure was chosen because it is the minimum amount used commonly by Amherst's peer institutions, and that the fee would be waived upon request. This fee would not apply to Five College students, College employees, Amherst Regional High School students, or any other student enrolled in a course for credit. It was noted that auditors will, of course, continue to need the consent of the professor teaching the course in order to audit it.

Continuing the conversation, Professor O'Hara asked why it would be necessary to charge a fee to create this new category of student. The Dean said that, in order for the category to be credible, in terms of meeting legal obligations, a fee must be charged to confer a recognized status. Several members pointed out that the plan seems bureaucratic. The President noted that, while he can see the need for this policy, it is his hope that charging a fee (even one that can be waived) to audit will not create a real or symbolic barrier at a time when the College is reaching out to broader constituencies. Professor George asked if the Department of Information Technology (IT) is now overseeing copyright issues of this sort, since this area has been within the purview of the Library in the past. The Dean responded that both the Library and IT are involved in issues relating to copyrights, since both facilitate access to copyrighted materials for the College.

Dean Call next informed the Committee that, with Mr. Mager's impending retirement this spring, it seems to be an opportune moment to review the functions and structure of the Office of

Amended September 28, 2007

the Registrar. The Dean asked for suggestions of colleagues who might participate in such a review, noting the desirability of having faculty members serve, as well as administrative colleagues whose offices have frequent interaction with the Registrar's office. The members suggested a number of colleagues, and the Dean said that he would choose among them when assembling this group.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor George noted that he had questions relating to posters that he had seen around campus to promote a September 7 event sponsored by the Center for Community Engagement (CCE). The logo of an ice cream company was prominently featured, and the font size of the company was considerably larger than anything else on the poster, including any text related to community engagement. Professor George noted that there was also a registered trademark sign included, suggesting corporate sponsorship or at least explicit acquiescence, he felt. He has not seen anything of this sort before at Amherst, he added. Professor George commented that, while he has no principled objections to corporate sponsorship, in general, he wondered whether this was indeed an incident of corporate sponsorship—for example, a reduction in cost of the product in return for the advertising. If not, he asked what the rationale had been for the College providing this substantial amount of free advertising for the company. He also wondered if the College has a policy regarding corporate sponsorship of events on campus.

President Marx responded that this was not a case of corporate sponsorship. Quite the contrary, he said, the College had paid for the Herrell's bus to be on campus and for the ice cream as a means of drawing students to the CCE event. Herrell's had also been asked to provide its logo for inclusion on the poster, again as a means of encouraging student attendance. Two versions of the poster had been produced, one that featured the logo and one that did not. Professor Servos, said that he was comfortable with the posters, but shared Professor George's curiosity about whether there is a College policy regarding corporate sponsorship of Amherst events. Professor O'Hara noted that posters often include a statement that Antonio's pizza is being served at events, and she said that she does not see a problem with including this information. Professor George agreed, commenting that it was the prominence of the Herrell's logo, which eclipsed the information about the event, that had caused him to be concerned. The President said that he would check to see if the College has a policy concerning corporate endorsements of its events and that he would report back to the Committee.

Professor O'Hara returned to the proposal, mentioned at the last meeting, that the Committee of Six host regular informal open lunches with the Faculty to increase the Committee's accessibility to colleagues. Some members expressed enthusiasm for experimenting with lunches, while others expressed skepticism that such events would serve a purpose. After discussion, the Committee agreed that one or more of the members would make themselves available on a regular basis for lunches at Lewis Sebring, to which the faculty would be invited. To inform scheduling and to avoid conflicts, the Dean shared information about lunches for faculty that had already been scheduled, for example, Teaching and Learning lunches. It was agreed that, so as not to conflict with the members' teaching schedules and other lunches, the Committee of Six lunches should be held on first and third Thursdays, from 12:30 to 1:30 P.M.,

Amended September 28, 2007

and that they would begin on September 20. Professor O'Hara agreed to reserve one of the large round tables in the main dining room at Lewis Sebring. Some members felt that it would be particularly desirable to encourage new members of the Faculty to attend one or more of the lunches. Professor Servos said that it should be made clear that all faculty are welcome at the lunches, but that the lunches are not official meetings of the Committee. The other members agreed. They also decided that these lunches would not be funded by the College.

Prompted by the conversation about encouraging new faculty to interact with the Committee of Six, Professor Servos asked the Dean if a meeting would be planned this year with the Committee and the tenure-track faculty to discuss the reappointment and tenure process, as has been done in recent years. Dean Call said that he would be open to such a meeting and asked about the best timing. Professor Servos expressed the view that such a meeting would have to take place before the Committee began its tenure discussions in October or after it concluded reappointment deliberations in the spring. Professor Frank questioned whether the tenure-track faculty would find such a meeting helpful. Noting that they already meet with the Dean about matters of reappointment and tenure, she suspected that many of them would view an additional meeting with the Committee of Six as another of many obligations. Moreover, she questioned whether the Committee could say anything that would provide reassurance or comfort in this situation, or whether such a meeting would instead have the effect of making tenure-track colleagues feel even more pressured. President Marx recalled a meeting with the tenure-track faculty during which they were encouraged to share their perspectives at Faculty Meetings and said he had noticed a marked and positive change afterward. Professor Jagannathan said that he feels that singling out tenure-track faculty for such encouragement creates a heightened sense of inequities in faculty status. It appears to him that a good number of tenure-track faculty members already express views at Faculty Meetings. The members agreed not to have a special meeting with the tenure-track faculty but reiterated that the invitation to Committee of Six lunches would extend a special welcome for new colleagues.

Continuing the discussion, Professor O'Hara asked the members if they would find it helpful to have a retreat, as she had proposed at the last meeting. One purpose would be to clarify the role of the Committee of Six this year by establishing clear boundaries. Professor Servos noted that the role of the Committee is made explicit in the *Faculty Handbook*. Professor O'Hara responded that, in her experience, there seems to be room for interpretation. For example, she said, there has been ambiguity surrounding whether the Committee should play an advisory role to the President and the Dean at the same time it represents the Faculty; whether the members set the agenda or advise the President and the Dean about what will be on the agenda; and whether the members, when they bring questions to the table, should largely do so as a response to matters raised by faculty members, or whether it is appropriate to do so on behalf of themselves, their departments, or their disciplines. Professor Servos said that it is his understanding that the Committee's role is advisory to the administration and that the Committee does not set policy. The Committee asks questions of the administration and offers its views, but the administration can respond as it feels is appropriate, he noted. Professor O'Hara reiterated that boundaries do not always seem to be clear.

Amended September 28, 2007

The conversation about the role of the Committee of Six continued, with Professor Jagannathan noting that the Committee members do not represent their departments or divisions but are charged with representing the Faculty as a whole. Professor Servos reiterated that, by offering their advice to the administration, the Committee has done its job. If the President and the Dean choose not to follow this advice, they do so on their authority. Professor Jagannathan noted that the Committee could frame a motion in such a case. Professor George said that he could not imagine that the President or the Dean would refuse to allow a Committee of Six motion to be placed on the agenda. Professor Jagannathan said that he has served on the Committee of Six on four occasions and that he has never faced such a moment. In his experience, on balance, relations between the Committee and the administration have been congenial. The President and the Dean each noted how deeply they value the counsel of the Committee of Six and said that they view their relationship with the Committee as a close and collaborative one.

At the conclusion of this discussion, it was agreed that the Committee would prefer not to have a retreat. Professor O'Hara commented that the discussion regarding the Committee's role that had just ensued was much like the beginning of a conversation that she had envisioned taking place at the retreat. It was agreed that the members, the President, and the Dean would re-read the language in the *Faculty Handbook* about the Committee's role and that they would return to this topic at the next meeting.

Discussion turned to the possible creation of a committee to explore the future of Film Studies and New Media at the College. Dean Call mentioned at the last meeting of the Committee of Six that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has recommended (see appended letter of May 15, 2007) the establishment of such a committee. The Dean asked the members whether they felt that the committee should be a standing committee or an advisory committee and whether they would like to develop a committee charge. He noted that another model might be that the committee could be constituted initially as an ad hoc committee for a specific term and could then become a standing committee, if desired. A faculty vote would be needed to establish a standing committee. Several members noted that, if the purpose of such a committee would be to bring forward a major in Film and New Media, a standing committee would not be needed. The Dean said that he believes that the faculty members who are interested in a Film and New Media major envision a program that resembles European Studies in terms of structure, that is one in which most if not all FTEs are based in other Amherst departments but are associated with the program.

The President said that he would like to understand the decision-making mechanisms that might lead to any new major or, conversely, to a decision not to have one. If a committee is formed to explore a Film and New Media major, and, presumably, the members of the committee are in favor of such a major from the outset, where does a broader discussion occur that takes into account the overall curricular priorities at the College, he asked. Several members pointed out that the CEP would have such a discussion if a major was proposed, as would the Faculty as a whole. Professor Servos noted that the administration is involved as well, particularly when facilities and capital requests are intertwined with a proposed major, as would be the case if film

Amended September 28, 2007

production was to become part of a Film major. He commented that colleagues typically come together, in order to advocate for a new major or program by making the best case possible. The more difficult conversations occur at the CEP and full Faculty levels. The Dean noted that issues surrounding a Film Studies and New Media major at Amherst are made more complex by the fact that three of the Five Colleges (but not Amherst and the University of Massachusetts) have approved a Five College major in Film Studies. Professor Frank noted that there have been a number of Amherst committees that have considered the future of film, but forward movement has suffered because it has been difficult to build consensus within them.

Professor Servos noted that the Environmental Studies group serves as an excellent model for how to bring a new major or program forward. The group emerged through faculty interest and has been working for a number of years to gather information from other institutions about environmental studies programs and to sponsor visitors to experiment with courses in this area at Amherst. The group has been supported, he noted, through grants from the President's Initiative Fund for Interdisciplinary Curricular Projects (PIF). Similarly, Professor Jagannathan brought up the example of Law, Jurisprudence and Social Thought (LJST). He recalled that some members of the CEP were initially skeptical about adding an LJST major, but they were persuaded by the arguments that the proposers and a visiting committee made about what was occurring in the educational landscape in this field.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Sinos said that she was not comfortable having the Committee of Six sponsor a committee with the purpose of proposing Film Studies as a major. Professor Servos agreed, commenting that, in his view, the current advisory committee should be encouraged, as was the group interested in Environmental Studies, but that this did not require the constitution of a new faculty committee. Professor George offered the counterexample of the Women's and Gender Studies (WAGS) major. He recalled that the Committee of Six appointed a committee to explore the development of a major in this field, but acknowledged that there may have been pressing reasons to do so. Most members said that they would prefer if a new major arose organically, by virtue of a group of colleagues joining together and designing a proposed program through research, experimentation, and mutual agreement. Professor O'Hara noted, that while it seems that a number of issues need to be resolved, particularly in terms of direction, if a proposal for a Film Studies major is to move forward, any proposal that is developed will allow for future flexibility. She commented that, with the exception of Professor McKinney, the members of the Department of Chemistry, have not contributed directly to the ongoing conversation about an Environmental Studies major. She noted, however, that informal discussions about the ways in which the department's curricular offerings could additionally support the program have taken place. The major is being designed with enough flexibility to make additional participation possible, she said.

President Marx asked for more background on how proposals for a major or new department are passed or defeated. Professor Servos pointed out, and other members agreed, that adding a new program or major is very difficult and occurs rarely. Professor O'Hara noted that, often, a proposal does not move forward because consensus cannot be reached. Professor Servos suggested that the current Dean's Advisory Committee should be provided with encouragement

Amended September 28, 2007

and resources, but that, if the Committee of Six charged a standing committee with proposing a major, it would almost be bound to support the committee's recommendation. Most of the members agreed. The Dean thanked the Committee for their valuable counsel.

Dean Call next discussed with the members the possible make-up of the committees that will be formed to work on three major initiatives. As he mentioned at the last meeting, his preference is to make use of standing committees of the Faculty as much as possible. He suggested to the Committee that he ask the members of the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) if they would participate in the committee that would oversee the campus-wide academic facilities study (focusing primarily on classrooms and faculty offices). This committee would also include Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services; Tom Davies, Assistant Director of Facilities and Director of Design and Construction; Rick Griffiths, Associate Dean of the Faculty; Peter Shea, Treasurer; Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research; and the Dean. It was noted that members of this overview group should work closely with the Frost Library and Merrill planning groups, as the work of the academic facilities study committee would no doubt intersect with that of the other two committees. The members agreed that the CPR, as a cross-departmental committee, was an excellent choice to involve in the academic facilities study, and that the CPR would be involved in this project as part of its regular charge, in any case.

Discussion turned next to the establishment of a new standing Science Planning Committee (as recommended by the science faculty during a conversation held in July). The Dean noted that the committee would have a broad mandate. At the same time, it will be necessary to move the Merrill renovation process forward, he said, and for that reason, it might be desirable to form the Science Planning Committee and have them vet and refine the report of the ad hoc Merrill Planning Committee and help decide on the next steps for Merrill planning, while later forming a smaller group that would serve as a core Merrill planning group going forward. The Dean asked the members how the Science Planning Committee should be constituted. Professor Servos suggested that the membership include a faculty member from each science department who is selected by his or her department. After some conversation, the members agreed. Professor Jagannathan said that it would also be beneficial to have **one or two** non-scientists on the committee, both because the building has traditionally had office space for colleagues from other disciplines and because there are significant pedagogical and intellectual interactions between scientists and non-scientists. The Dean and the members discussed what the length of the term on the committee should be, and it was agreed that a two-year term would be best, since the discussion about the future of the sciences would be an extended one. The Dean suggested that the Committee review the report of the Merrill Planning Committee and then create a charge for the new committee. A vote of the Faculty would be needed to create the new standing committee.

Discussion turned to the make-up of the Library Planning Committee. It was agreed that members of the Library Committee, which includes students, as well as Mr. Brassord and Amrita Basu, Associate Dean of the Faculty, should serve on the committee, which should work closely with the CPR and the Academic Facilities Study Committee. Professor George asked if outside

Amended September 28, 2007

consultants would be used for the Academic Facilities Study. Professor Jagannathan recalled that a consulting group that was engaged for a study of Amherst classrooms in 2002 did not do a very good job when it sought consultation from the Amherst community to inform its work. He expressed the hope that any new group that is engaged would do better. The Dean noted that the new Academic Facilities Study Committee would help to select a new consultant.

Discussion turned to the topic of the new pilot program (see appended letter of August 24, 2007, from Professor S. George to the CEP) that is being launched this year at the College to support premedical students who are underprepared in the sciences. Students in the program would graduate in the normal eight semesters, completing all requirements for the degree. They would then be able to remain at Amherst for a semester or a year to complete premedical science requirements. Professor Jagannathan noted that the President had discussed such a trial post-baccalaureate program when he first arrived at the College, and he wondered why it was being launched years later. Professor George responded that time has been spent gathering information about whether there is a need for such a program and whether there are data that support the theory that, when students who lack preparation jump in to demanding pre-medical courses too quickly, they do worse than when they take more time to complete these requirements and do so later in their college careers. Some members of the Health Professions Committee were skeptical, initially, as well. Professor O'Hara commented that conversation about offering a fifth year have been ongoing since the 1980s. She said that, for a small group of students who are passionate and hard-working, but who lack preparation, it seems clear that spreading the pre-medical requirements in math, physics, biology, and chemistry over more than four years should make a difference in their ability to succeed.

Professor Jagannathan said, that while he is supportive of the program, as described, he wondered how the experiment would be assessed with such a small number of participants (up to three students a year for six years). Professor George said that the assessment would be qualitative. The College would follow the careers of participants in the program and would learn whether they were accepted to medical school and succeeded in the profession. He noted that a number of medical schools are excited about the program and commented that a similar program at Wesleyan has been very successful.

Professor Jagannathan noted that bright, less well-prepared students in other disciplines face similar obstacles, and that a case could be made that similar special opportunities should be developed for them, since the same underlying argument for justice exists. Professor Jagannathan mentioned specifically, in this regard, the inability of less well-prepared students to pursue a three-two engineering program in which the College might participate with, for example, Dartmouth or MIT, and the difficulties that they face if they want to major in a hierarchical major such as Physics. He also noted that certain students, particularly international students, sometimes arrive at the College thinking that they can pursue studies in engineering. They soon discover that they cannot pursue their plans without additional time and some resources that Amherst currently does not have. Professor Jagannathan suggested that, if the entire Faculty were asked to offer their views, many other needs analogous to those of less well-prepared pre-medical students would emerge. Professor Servos suggested and Professor

Amended September 28, 2007

Jagannathan concurred that, if such a program were to be adopted, a broader conversation with the CEP and the Faculty would be necessary, as such a proposal would be an issue of educational policy. Professor Servos noted that the pre-medical process appears to be less flexible than the one for engineering, which might be why the program for pre-meds is being addressed first.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Servos asked why the selection process for the trial post-bac program amounted to faculty members tapping students on the shoulder. Professor George said that having faculty members identify students is the procedure that is being used in the first year of the program only, since there wasn't much time to get the program off the ground. In the future, the plan is to make the opportunity known to students in their first year and to have them apply. Professor O'Hara pointed out that, occasionally, students do not begin taking their introductory science courses until their second year, and that these students might also be considered as candidates for this fellowship. Professor George agreed, noting that students who are identified as having relatively low quantitative skills are now, in fact, prevented from starting Chemistry 11 in their first semester and are purposefully pushed a semester behind. Professor Servos suggested that those who select the students for the program might wish to involve Joe Case, Director of Financial Aid, who, in his experience, works closely and effectively with the Faculty Fellowship Committee on issues involving the assessment of need.

The President noted that the post-baccalaureate program was not his proposal, although he supports the pilot. He said that he is not convinced that broadening such a program would be appropriate. The President expressed some concern about allowing students to have an extra semester to complete their academic work, as the extension of this model could become problematic. President Marx also noted that it is critical that students be given accurate information about their academic options, and that he is confident that the admission office is clear about engineering opportunities to those who are applying to the College.

Returning to the subject of broadening special opportunities for less well-prepared students, Professor Servos suggested that initiatives beyond offering additional time during the regular academic year to complete coursework could be considered. He commented that students could, perhaps, complete coursework over the summer to "catch up," and noted that the Committee on Academic Priorities had recommended that funding be provided for students to study a foreign language during the summer. Perhaps, funding could be offered for the purpose of having less well-prepared students study over the summer. Professor O'Hara expressed concern that typical summer courses in introductory lab based sciences are extremely condensed and might not provide the best learning outcomes for some students. The President noted that Amherst would also end up providing funding to other institutions under such a scenario. Several members pointed out that the College already does so in the form of post-graduate fellowships.

After noting that the Committee would discuss at its next meeting the draft of the self-study for the upcoming (March 2008) reaccreditation review by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, the Dean distributed an attendance and voting list for Faculty Meetings. Dean Call asked that the Committee review the list and said that he is interested in having language regarding the assistants and associates of the Dean of the Faculty clarified. The

Amended September 28, 2007

members agreed to return to the issue of attendance and voting at Faculty Meetings at its next meeting, after reviewing the information given by the Dean, as well as supplemental information that he would provide then.

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

AMHERST COLLEGE
Department of Anthropology and Sociology

May 15, 2007

The Committee of Six
c/o Dean of the Faculty

Dear Colleagues:

Professor Andrew Parker, on behalf of the Dean's Advisory Committee on Film and New Media, has proposed to the Committee on Educational Policy the creation of a Committee on Film and New Media. This committee would be charged in part with proposing a new film studies major.

The CEP endorses the creation of this new committee. A number of colleagues teach courses in film and are interested in making film studies a formal area of study at the College. The lack of a committee, however, has impeded efforts to turn good ideas into a concrete proposal.

We cannot, however, agree with Professor Parker's proposal that the Dean give this committee "authority to frame an FTE in production and to carry out a national search." FTEs do not originate with the Dean and should not be allocated on an ad hoc basis. Departments originate FTE proposals, The CEP evaluates and ranks each proposal relative to other proposals submitted at the same time and then makes its recommendations to the Dean and President. We would certainly encourage a Committee on Film and New Media to work with appropriate departments to frame an FTE proposal in production to be submitted to the CEP next spring. The Committee could at the same time propose a film studies major to be phased in once the necessary positions have been filled. This is what Environmental Studies has done over the last two years.

We should also note that contrary to Professor Parker's letter, the Five-College Film Studies major has not been approved for Amherst students. We hope the new committee will address this issue.

Sincerely,

Jerome L. Himmelstein
Chair, Committee on Educational Policy

Cc: Andrew Parker

April 18, 2007

To: Dean Greg Call and the members of the CEP

From: Andrew Parker, for the Dean's Advisory Committee on Film and New Media

Re: Next Steps

Following your request at our meeting on March 30, I met with members of the Dean's Advisory Committee (Heidi Gilpin, Leah Hewitt, Peter Lobdell, Christian Rogowski, Helen von Schmidt) to discuss charging a Standing Committee to oversee the formation of a program in film and new media at Amherst.

The members of the Dean's Advisory Committee are excited that the Five College Film Major (Appendix 1) is now available to Amherst students. Many of the film and media courses we currently offer College (Appendix 2) would satisfy requirements for the Five College Major.

Where the Five College Film Major focuses narrowly on film and emphasizes formal analysis and history (as opposed to production), the members of the Dean's Advisory Committee are proposing a parallel major program at Amherst that would be unique in integrating analysis and production and in incorporating both analog and digital media. Such a program would require two FTE positions to anchor its curriculum and supplement our current offerings in film and new media: one in analysis and history to be located in English (already requested as a "replacement" position), and one in production to be located in Fine Arts and/or Theater and Dance (not yet requested).

We hope that the Dean, if supported by the CEP, will form this spring a Standing Committee in Film and New Media with authority to frame an FTE in production and to carry out a national search. We imagine that the person filling this position will be an experienced artist.

Though we envision that this Standing Committee will ultimately submit a report providing the rationale for the major program and the design of its curriculum, we underscore several factors that we think justify taking these next steps now:

- questions of "visual literacy" now affect the entire curriculum
- film and new media are not only global in their presence but also especially good at promoting "global comprehension"
- Amherst is alone among its peer institutions without a major program in film
- current Amherst faculty teaching core and advanced film courses are close to retirement

Please let us know if other information will be helpful to you.

Appendix 1: FIVE COLLEGE FILM STUDIES MAJOR

After twenty years of productive cooperation, the Five College Film Council is proposing a Five College Film Studies major. The joint major, the first of its kind in the Five Colleges, will take advantage of the expertise of our many film scholars and filmmakers to provide a long awaited chance for the students in the five colleges to officially major in the study of film and video. While the proposed film studies major is not contingent on the building of the Five College Film and Video Center, it is a sign of the coming of age of the field in our area that these projects are appearing simultaneously. The formation of the major and the completion of the center will make the Five Colleges the preeminent place in New England in which to engage in film studies.

The Five College Film Studies major is in film studies as opposed to film production. While the film faculty believes that all students should be familiar with film and video production, the major is not designed to train students to enter the film industry without further training. As with all liberal arts majors, film is studied in relation to all the arts, humanities, and social sciences and can lead to careers in teaching, arts administration, web design, or freelance work in non-industry venues. The major is comprised of ten courses, one of which may be a component course. (A core course is one in which film is the primary object of study; a component course is one in which film is significant but not the focus of the course). Of these ten courses, at least two (but no more than five) must be taken outside the home institution. In addition, each student must have an advisor on the home campus and the requirements for the major may vary slightly from campus to campus.

PROGRAM OF STUDY

1. One introduction to film course (must be taken on the home campus)
 2. One film history course (either a general, one-semester survey or a course covering approximately fifty years of international film history)
 3. One film theory course
 4. One film genre course
 5. One national or transnational cinema or authorship (generally a single director or group of directors) course
 6. One special topics course (may be a component course)
 7. One advanced seminar in a special topic
 8. One film, video, or digital production course, but no more than two courses may be used toward the major.
- * Two electives from any category
 - * A thesis is optional.

In the course of fulfilling the program of study, at least one course must focus on non-narrative film (documentary or experimental) and at least four courses should be at the advanced level. Courses can fit into more than one category, but a single course may not be used to satisfy two of the numbered requirements.

Appendix 2: COURSES IN FILM AND MEDIA STUDIES 2007-08

Fall 2007

Coming to Terms: Cinema. See English 16.
First semester. Professor Cameron.

Screenwriting. See English 24.
First semester. Visiting Lecturer Johnson.

Production Workshop in the Moving Image. See English 82.
First semester. Five College Professor Perlin.

The Non-Fiction Film. See English 83,
First semester. Senior Lecturer von Schmidt.

Topics in Film Study: Cinema and New Media. See English 84.
First semester. Visiting Professor Hudson.

Mode of Melodrama. See English 95, section 01.
First semester. Professor Cameron.

National and Global Cinemas. See English 95, section 02.
First semester. Visiting Professor Hudson.

Film, Myth, and the Law. See Law, Jurisprudence and Social Thought 25.
First semester. Professor Umphrey.

Spanish Film. See Spanish 33.
First semester. Professor Maraniss.

Performance Studio. See Theater and Dance 62.
First semester. Professor Woodson.

Spring 2008

Screening Asian Americans. See American Studies 30.
Second semester. Five College Visiting Professor Cardozo.

India in Film: Hollywood, Bollywood, Mollywood. See Asian Languages and Civilizations 30.
Second semester. Professor Emeritus Reck.

Japanese Cinema. See Asian Languages and Civilizations 34.
Second semester. Professor Van Compernelle.

Vampires, Immigrants, Nations. See English 01, section 03.
Second semester. Visiting Professor Hudson.

Film and Writing. See English 19.
Second semester. Senior Lecturer von Schmidt.

Topics in Film Study: Five Contemporary Filmmakers. See English 84, section 01.
Second semester. Professor Cameron.

Topics in Film Study: Film Theory and Criticism. See English 84, section 02.
Second semester. Visiting Professor Hudson.

European Film. See French 61.
Second semester. Professor Caplan.

Popular Cinema. See German 44.
Second semester. Professor Rogowski.

The Changing Images of Blacks in Film. See Theater and Dance 27 (also Black Studies 18
and English 93).
Second semester. Professor Mukasa.

Video and Performance. See Theater and Dance 50.
Second semester. Professor Woodson.

AMHERST COLLEGE
AMHERST • MASSACHUSETTS • 01002

Stephen A George
Manwell Family Professor in Life Sciences
Phone: 413-542-2477
Fax: 413-542-7955
E-Mail: sageorge@amherstedu

August 24, 2007

Committee on Educational Policy
c/o Prof. Martha Umphrey

Dear CEP colleagues,

I am writing as Chair of the Health professions Committee to let the CEP know about a pilot program to support premedical students who are under-prepared in the sciences. In brief, the program will offer up to three students in each Amherst class the opportunity to remain at Amherst without charge for either a semester or a year after graduation to complete premedical science requirements. The program should not require formal CEP or faculty approval, since it involves no new courses or changes in existing courses, and no change in the expectations' for receiving an Amherst degree. However, because it will affect the course choices of some students, it is something we would like the CEP to know about

As you may know, in order to apply to medical schools in the U.S., applicants must have completed at least 8 lab science courses with a particular distribution among Biology, Chemistry and Physics, as well as at least one semester of calculus. The courses Amherst students take to fulfill these requirements are challenging. In some cases, under-prepared students would be well served by slowing down the pace at which they take these courses, leaving some to be completed after graduation. However, students on financial aid may be reluctant to plan their course of study in any way that would require taking courses after graduation, because they lack the necessary financial resources. They sometimes continue to take the courses at a fast pace that for them is not compatible with academic success. This new program is designed to assure those students that Amherst will support them in completing premedical science courses after they graduate.

For the initial pilot phase of the program, three students in each Amherst class who need extra time at Amherst to complete premedical requirements will be identified and invited into the program. These students will be expected to graduate in the normal 8 semesters, completing a major or majors of their choice. They will then be able to stay on as non-degree special students for an additional semester or year after graduation, depending on the number of lab science courses they need to take to complete premed requirements, at a rate normally of two such courses each semester. During this "post baccalaureate" semester or year, they would take only the two science courses, and would also do some combination of lab research, community service, and/or premed-related internships.

Participants will normally be identified after one semester of lab science work at Amherst, plus often a semester of calculus, typically at the end of either the first or second semester of their first year, although students will also be eligible to be named to the program in the Fall semester of sophomore year. This year, the selection of participants was made by an ad hoc group consisting of Pat O'Hara, Steve George, Carolyn Bassett, and Allen Hart, with input from other faculty teaching introductory chemistry courses, as well as Jennifer Innes. In the future we expect the Health Professions Committee to select prospective participants, in consultation with the Dean of New Students, faculty teaching introductory Chemistry, and Quantitative Skills Center staff. Application for the program

will be open to all students, but we will identify students who will be encouraged to apply. For this first year of the program, we identified several rising sophomores during the summer, and we will work with them and their faculty advisors at the beginning of the coming semester to inform them about the program and invite them to sign on. We will continue aiming for three students in each Amherst class through the class of 2015; students in '15 would be selected by summer of 2012. This pilot program will be reviewed in 2012, which will allow time for students in the classes of '10 and '11 to have completed their postbaccalaureate semester or year. If the program is deemed successful, it will be continued, probably at or near the initial level of up to three students in each Amherst class.

Amherst faculty who teach premedical students have over the years discussed many possible ways of modifying the science workload of less well-prepared premedical students, including course loads of less than four courses per semester, allowing more than 8 semesters of work before graduation, and offering a separate science track for premedical students. All of these would require substantial changes in our standards for academic work in the sciences, changes which faculty-including those serving on the Health Professions Committee-have been reluctant to recommend. The new program maintains our standards for science courses and courseloads, while supporting premeds who need extra time to complete premedical requirements. The program is consistent with Amherst's tradition of providing significant fellowship support for our students' academic endeavors after graduation, although it differs from other fellowships in that selection will take place early in the student's career at Amherst, the Health Professions Committee rather than the Committee on Student Fellowships will select participants, and the post-graduate study itself will take place here at Amherst

One final note: we informed medical schools in the Northeast Consortium on Medical Education, a group to which Amherst belongs, about the program. Admissions staff at several medical schools contacted us to say they were enthusiastic about it. Medical schools are very committed to finding a diverse group of qualified applicants, and they believe the flexibility in preparing to enter medical school that our program offers will increase the number of minority-students who can qualify for careers as physicians.

Although no action on the part of the CEP is required, we would welcome your thoughts about this program, and would be happy to answer questions about it.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

Stephen A. George
Manwell Family Professor in Life Sciences Chair,
Health Professions Committee

xc:
Tony Marx
Greg Call
Pat O'Hara
Carolyn Bassett
Allen Hart