

**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