

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 3, 2007**

The first meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2007-2008 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 9 A.M. on Monday, September 3, 2007. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The President opened the meeting by welcoming new and returning members of the Committee of Six and said that he looks forward to working with the Committee this year. The members then considered five course proposals and voted to forward them to the Faculty for approval. Professor Sinos suggested that it would be beneficial to develop ways to facilitate cross-departmental discussion about course proposals when course content overlaps. If a faculty member is alerted that another department is planning to offer a course that is similar to one that he or she is proposing, one or another of the departments might want to make scheduling or other adjustments, she noted. Professor Servos commented that, logistically, it would be difficult to achieve such coordination when courses are submitted to the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) over the summer. The President said it would be desirable to explore systems that would allow for coordination, both during the year and in the summer, if possible. Dean Call agreed to discuss the possibilities with Nancy Ratner, Researcher for Academic Projects, who assists the CEP with the course approval process.

Under his announcements, President Marx explained to the members that, after four years of conversation on campus about the priorities that will inform the upcoming capital campaign, he will continue working in the coming months with Trustees to raise very significant funds from a small number of donors. These funds will form what is known in advancement parlance as a nucleus fund, which would represent about half of the funding goal for the campaign. President Marx explained that it is the practice before formally announcing a campaign to have significant funding in hand as an expression of confidence that the overall campaign goal can be met, keeping in mind that shifts in the economy can affect that ability to raise funds. He said that he expects that the campaign will be announced in 2008.

Continuing his announcements, President Marx noted that, among the matters that he would expect to consider with the Committee of Six and other faculty committees over the course of the year are how best to meet needs surrounding writing instruction for all Amherst students, to combat grade inflation at the College, and to mitigate the burden imposed on the faculty by the demands placed on them (pressures related to scholarly and creative productivity, teaching, and College service).

Dean Call next reported back on an issue raised by Professor O'Hara at the end of last year. She had suggested that it might be beneficial for a staff member, perhaps an Academic Department Coordinator, to be added to the Faculty Computer Committee, since staff members work closely with technology. The Dean had noted that staff members interface with the Faculty Computer Committee, he believed, through other groups. He had offered to check with Peter Schilling, Director of Information Technology, to confirm how staff members' technology interests and needs are represented. The Dean said that Mr. Schilling has informed him that the

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 3, 2007**

vast majority of Academic Department Coordinators are part of the Desktop Computing Department Liaisons Group. These liaisons participate on IT listservs for the exchange of all time-sensitive notifications, attend meetings each semester to discuss new tools, and provide feedback on concerns.

Continuing his remarks, the Dean said that he was delighted to announce two new appointments in his office. Pat O'Hara, Amanda and Lisa Cross Professor of Chemistry, and Austin Sarat, William Nelson Cromwell Professor of Jurisprudence and Political Science and Five College Fortieth Anniversary Professor, have been named Senior Advisors to the Dean of the Faculty for Academic Life. The Dean said that Professor Sarat began his appointment in August, and that Professor O'Hara will start in July 2008, at the conclusion of her term on the Committee of Six. Both appointments are for one year and are renewable. The creation of these new positions within the Office of the Dean of the Faculty is a direct outgrowth of the recommendations of the Committee on Academic Priorities, Dean Call commented. Professor Sinos asked if the appointments entail a reduction in teaching for these colleagues. The Dean said that no such reduction is associated with the appointments.

Dean Call noted that, in her role as Senior Advisor, Professor O'Hara will focus on raising the visibility of Amherst science research, enhancing collaborative opportunities within the College, the Five Colleges, and internationally; coordinating support for less well-prepared science/math students (including participants in Summer Science and the Phoenix Program); investigating new initiatives for student research; and developing outreach opportunities in science. The Dean noted that Professor Sarat will concentrate his work on issues surrounding student intellectual engagement including grade inflation, flexibility in class scheduling, the intersections of academics and athletics, and evaluating the benefits for students and faculty of the Academic Internship Program. He will also focus on program development for the Schupf Scholars Program and will work with departments to identify students who may have an interest in post-graduate academic study, and with the Office of Admission to identify further applicants who manifest intellectual curiosity, including those who may be interested in pursuing Ph.D.s.

Continuing his remarks, Dean Call informed the members about the following three initiatives that will be under way in 2007-2008: the undertaking of a campus-wide academic facilities study (focusing primarily on classrooms and faculty offices); the assessment of programmatic needs that might be addressed through the renovation of Frost Library; and the consideration of the future of the sciences at Amherst and planning for the renovation of the Merrill Science Center. He expressed the hope that standing committees of the Faculty would work on the first two of these projects, while the third would require the establishment of a new standing Science Committee (as recommended by the science faculty during a conversation held in July).

While applauding the Dean's desire not to create new committees, Professor Jagannathan commented that members of the Library Committee who would join the Library Planning Group might not necessarily have special talent in the area of building renovation. The Dean said that, when making appointments to the Library Committee, he had considered that such expertise

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 3, 2007**

would be required. President Marx noted that it is necessary that plans for the library move forward expeditiously, if a compelling argument for additional resources is to be made to the Board—and in order for this project to be included among the campaign's funding goals. He expressed the hope that the Library Committee would seek advice broadly, by holding open meetings and by consulting with faculty groups.

Professor Sinos asked about the timetable for developing a plan for the library. The Dean noted that a sense of the project's direction and scale is needed by the time the Trustees meet in April. President Marx responded that this schedule would permit the project to move forward toward greater specificity, if the plans that are developed receive Board approval.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Jagannathan said that he had some questions about the launch of the new Content Management System (CMS) and how the system will be managed and supported. He asked the Dean if Mr. Schilling would be discussing this project in his report to the Faculty at the September 3 Faculty Meeting. The Dean said that he believed that Mr. Schilling did indeed plan on reporting on the CMS.

Professor O'Hara asked the Dean about the status of the Committee's review of attendance and voting at Faculty Meetings. The Dean recalled that last year's Committee of Six had decided, after some discussion about the possibility of adding, moving, or removing administrative positions within various categories—attendance without vote, attendance with vote, etc.—that no changes should be made at present. The Committee had viewed this issue as a complex and potentially divisive one 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 Community Center Engagement, and Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research, should be invited to attend the meetings without voting privileges. Upon the Committee's request, the Dean agreed to provide the members with a list of those who are entitled to attend Faculty Meetings and their privileges in regard to voice and vote.

Professor O'Hara next asked the Dean if he planned to share with the Committee and—through the minutes—with the Faculty as a whole information about a new pilot program that is being launched this year at the College to support premedical students who are underprepared in the sciences. The Dean said that he would be happy to do so. Professor George said that he had brought information with him about the program, and he then distributed a letter to the CEP that described this trial post-baccalaureate program in detail. The members agreed to review the letter and to discuss the program at their next meeting.

Professor Frank asked the Dean whether a committee has been created to explore the future of Film Studies and New Media at the College. Dean Call said that the CEP has recommended the establishment of such a committee and suggested that the Committee of Six discuss this matter at its next meeting.

Dean Call informed the Committee that he had been asked by a member whether the Committee might wish to have a retreat to discuss the agenda for the year. He asked the members to think about whether they might like to have such a retreat at the Deerfield Inn in the near future. Professor O'Hara said that she would welcome such a planning session as an

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 3, 2007**

opportunity, at the beginning of the year before business is pressing, to talk about the role this year's Committee wishes to play and to be reflective about the past year. Professor Sinos suggested that the Committee of Six might host regular lunches with the Faculty. The members agreed to consider these ideas at the Committee's next meeting.

The Dean next discussed with the members options for a regular meeting time for the Committee of Six, and it was agreed that the Committee would meet from 3:00 P.M. to 5:30 P.M. on Mondays. 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 extra meetings. He informed the Committee that Assistant Dean Janet Tobin will continue to serve as the Recorder of Committee of Six minutes and that Marcy Larmon, Director of Programming in the Office of Alumni and Parent Programs, will serve as the Recorder of the Faculty Meeting minutes. Continuing his announcements, the Dean informed the members that community teas will be held once again this year on Thursdays at Frost Library, from 3:30 P.M. to 4:30 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. He then reminded the Committee that, during the first week of classes, Monday classes would be held on Wednesday.

Dean Call then reviewed issues of Committee of Six confidentiality and attribution in the minutes, noting that the public minutes should be used as a guide in questions of whether matters discussed by the Committee can be shared with others. Professor Frank asked, as a newcomer to the Committee, what matters other than personnel matters are kept confidential. The President and the Dean said that minutes of discussions of certain sensitive or unresolved matters and plans in their formative stages, about which they are seeking the advice of the Committee of Six, are sometimes kept confidential. Often, discussions of these issues are made public once the matter is in a less tentative state. The Dean said 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. The members agreed that, for reasons of transparency, there should be direct quotation in the minutes although members could be referred to simply as "a member" if they so requested. The President, the Dean, and the members agreed to strive for transparency in the minutes.

The Dean next 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.

In response to a question posed by Professor Frank, Dean Call then reviewed rules governing participation in the Committee's tenure discussions when members belong to the department of a tenure candidate. The Dean next asked the members to consider colleagues to

**Committee of Six Minutes
of Monday, September 3, 2007**

serve on Memorial Minute Committees for Ernest Alfred Johnson, Professor of Romance Languages, Emeritus, and Mirjana Lausevic, Joseph E. and Grace W. Valentine Visiting Assistant Professor of Music, in 2006-2007. Dean Call expressed regret that he had only recently learned of the death of Professor Johnson, who passed away on May 14, 2006. He informed the members that Professor Lausevic had died on July 15, 2007.

Professor George next expressed concern that a proposed committee assignment that appears on the Faculty Meeting agenda of September 3 had not been discussed by last year's Committee of Six. Dean Call noted that an unanticipated issue had impeded the Committee's first choice from serving and that the new nominee was among the candidates vetted by last year's Committee of Six. Professor George said that it is important that committee assignments rotate among the Faculty, and that committee service should not be imposed on a limited few. Professor Frank asked if all faculty members serve on committees. The Dean said that, to inform the Committee, he would provide the members with a full committee history for each faculty member. Professor Sinos noted that it would be helpful to consider committee assignments earlier in the spring than has been the practice in the past so that the Committee has more time to review nominations.

With limited time remaining, 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 October 2, October 16, November 6, and December 18. He noted that he had received both positive and negative feedback about the experiment of last spring of having a Faculty Meeting with lunch after classes concluded. The Dean asked the members to think about whether alternative times for Faculty Meetings should continue to be explored and tried.

The members reviewed and approved the agenda for the Faculty Meeting of September 3 and adjourned at 9:55 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

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@amherst.edu

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

Amended October 1, 2007

The third 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 17, 2007. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The minutes of September 3 were approved.

The Committee turned briefly to a personnel matter. Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the members that he had had a productive discussion with the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) about their role in the upcoming campus-wide academic facilities study. He also asked the CPR to consider specifics about the means needed to implement the recommendations of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP), in order to inform planning for the capital campaign.

Dean Call next reported that he had consulted with Peter Shea, the College's Treasurer, about the question raised at the last meeting of the Committee about whether Amherst has a policy regarding corporate sponsorship of events on campus. Mr. Shea said that, to his knowledge, Amherst has never accepted payment in exchange for allowing a company to serve as a sponsor of a College event. While noting that Amherst departments and programs at times may accept donated food, drink, or the like for an event and that they may acknowledge these sorts of things in a program, he said that this practice does not seem to be the question at hand. A true corporate sponsorship transaction, he informed the Dean, would require a contract and, therefore, would need to be reviewed by the Office of the Treasurer, as are all contracts entered into at the College. If a sponsorship proposal came forward, the Treasurer said that it would undoubtedly come before the senior members of the administration for consideration. In short, there is no written policy because, on a pragmatic level, one has not been needed.

Discussion turned to the 2006-2007 Summary of the Quantitative Skills Working Group (appended), which was sent to the Committee by Professor Ratner, on behalf of the working group. Some members noted the disturbingly high number of students who are not taking any math, science, or lab courses. The Committee agreed that the summary should be shared with the Faculty as a whole by appending it to the Committee's minutes, and that it should be referred to the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) for review and comment. The Dean next reviewed with the members and President Marx possible dates for additional Committee meetings.

Returning to the topic of how best to consider the future of Film Studies and New Media at the College, Professor Frank said that some colleagues have shared with her the view that, since the CEP has endorsed the creation of a Committee on Film and New Media that would be charged, in part, with proposing a Film Studies major, the Committee of Six should consult with the CEP before deciding that such a committee should not be formed. She has been told that, in the past, committees have been constituted to consider new majors without the endorsement of the Committee of Six. Professor Jagannathan wondered whether the CEP, in the past, has established committees for this purpose. Professor O'Hara noted that the CEP has created structures for exploring ideas, offering the example of the working groups that were formed to explore ideas generated by the report of the Special Committee on the Amherst Education (SCAE). Professor Servos noted that standing committees are created by vote of the Faculty,

Amended October 1, 2007

and ad hoc committees are formed by the President, with advice from the Committee of Six. The members agreed that any committee that might be formed to explore a Film Studies major should be an ad hoc committee. Professor Sinos said, she would worry if a committee were constituted by the Committee of Six or the President for the purpose of proposing a major.

Professor Frank said that it is her understanding that any committee that would be formed would have a broader purpose than just proposing a Film Studies major. Professor Servos responded that, if that is the intention, the committee should have colleagues who represent the Faculty as a whole, in addition to colleagues who are advocating for a new major. If the intent is to shape a proposal for a Film Studies major, then interested faculty may wish to develop plans by coming together outside the framework of standing or ad hoc faculty committees, which might include colleagues who are uncertain if they would support a major.

President Marx asked why it has been so challenging for previous committees to build consensus and put forward a proposal for a Film Studies major. Professor Frank responded that the answer to that question is complex and multi-faceted. From her conversations with various interested parties, she speculated that the fact that the field of New Media is very new, and that different faculty constituencies have had diverging interests, has made it difficult to move forward with a unified argument. Adding to the complexity of the situation is the need to consider any Amherst Film Studies major in relation to the new Five College Film Studies major. Professor Frank said that the CEP appears to be interested in the major at this point, and that what seems to be needed is a structure that will get discussion going. Professor Jagannathan said that forming a committee to develop a proposal for a new major is not unprecedented, since the Committee of Six had appointed a committee to explore the development of a major in Women's and Gender Studies. President Marx commented that it appears that what is needed is for the various interested constituencies to come together and agree on a proposal to be vetted by the CEP, the Committee of Six, and the Faculty as a whole.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Jagannathan asked what the mechanism might be to bring the various stakeholders together. He suggested that the Dean could provide funding and set a deadline by which a proposal should be developed. Professor Servos reiterated that the Environmental Studies Committee could serve as model for how to move a proposal for a Film Studies major forward. The group's work has been supported through grants, for which its members applied for renewal each year, from the President's Initiative Fund for Interdisciplinary Curricular Projects (PIF). Applying for the renewal funding has kept the process moving forward, he noted. The initial set of circumstances surrounding the development of a proposal for an Environmental Studies major resembled those that are now threatening forward action on Film Studies, Professor Servos said. A willing and encouraging administration and the emergence of a faculty point person (Professor Dizard) overcame the initial fragmentation of the faculty who were interested in a new major in this field, he noted. Professor Servos said that the community-building and information-gathering phase of the Environmental Studies effort has lasted about three years. Professor Sinos agreed that the best model would be for a group of interested colleagues—perhaps those who were members of the Dean's Advisory Committee on Film and New Media that brought a proposal to the CEP—to come together and apply for

Amended October 1, 2007

funding from the Dean, since proposals for new projects are no longer being accepted for funding through the PIF. Another model, Professor Jagannathan noted, might be to appoint a committee, along the lines of the one created to develop a proposal for a major in Women's and Gender Studies, that would include both advocates of a Film Studies major and colleagues who are neutral in their views about this idea. This committee would explore whether or not it would be desirable to have a major in Film Studies, rather than simply developing a proposal for one.

The Committee decided that the Dean should ask the CEP for advice about which of the above models should be adopted. Professor O'Hara asked the Dean to inquire whether the CEP had one of these models in mind when it endorsed the idea of creating a committee. The Dean agreed to consult with the CEP and report back to the Committee.

At 4:10 P.M., Rick Griffiths, Associate Dean of the Faculty, joined the meeting on behalf of the Reaccreditation Steering Committee to discuss with the members the first draft of the College's self-study report, the final version of which will be submitted to the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) in January. Professor Servos complimented Dean Griffiths on the narrative flow and beautiful writing in the document, and the other members also expressed praise for this effort. Dean Griffiths noted that many administrative units of the College had contributed to the self-study report and that writing and editing were a team effort.

The members next asked a series of questions about several sections of the document, focusing on issues revolving around tone, rationale, and the compilation of data. Dean Griffiths thanked them for their input and for raising pertinent issues. He agreed to incorporate the Committee's feedback into the next draft of the self-study report. In response to questions raised about the increasing emphasis on assessment by accrediting and governmental agencies, particularly in the area of student learning, the Committee engaged in a discussion about the place of assessment at Amherst and within higher education overall. The review of the self-study report also prompted a wide-ranging discussion of the impact of the open curriculum at Amherst. At the conclusion of that conversation, Dean Griffiths informed the members that a revised draft of the self-study report would be shared with the Faculty as a whole and said that an open meeting would be held so that the Faculty could offer its views of the document. The members thanked Dean Griffiths, and he departed at 5:00 P.M. The members then discussed briefly the Committee's practice of asking departments of tenure candidates to secure additional letters from outside reviewers when the Committee feels that additional information is needed.

Discussion turned to the topic of attendance and voting at Faculty Meetings, which the members agreed was a very sensitive, complex, and potentially divisive issue. The Committee was reminded that this issue arose last year because of the arrival of colleagues to fill new administrative positions, who currently reside in a kind of limbo with regard to their status at Faculty Meetings. While a conversation did ensue, members often wondered, during the course of their consideration, whether the costs of making any changes would outweigh any potential benefits. This conundrum was not resolved, despite a lengthy dialogue. The Committee discussed whether it might be beneficial to pare the list of administrators who attend the meetings with voice and vote and possible criteria for doing so, while noting that there is an

Amended October 1, 2007

unwritten rule that administrators who have voting privileges will not vote on matters relating to the curriculum. A range of views was expressed—from limiting voting privileges to faculty members; to reducing the number of administrative positions that carry voting privileges, while grandfathering the current occupants of those positions; to adding some new administrative positions to the list of those that carry voting privileges; to attaching the votes of administrators to their membership on faculty committees; to retaining the status quo. The matter remained unresolved at the conclusion of the conversation. It was agreed that a small number of administrative colleagues who are invited each year to Faculty Meetings as guests, with voice and without vote, should now be given a standing invitation.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Quantitative Skills Working Group 2006/7 Summary

In 2006-2007 the QSWG focused on the distribution of quantitative courses among Amherst College students. We also discussed issues pertaining to academic support in introductory quantitative courses including the benefits of intensive sections. Because of changes in mathematics and chemistry placement, and because of low enrollments in some intensive sections, we did not believe additional statistical analysis at this time would enhance our understanding of the overall benefits of intensive sections. We hope that the committee will return to this issue next year.

Enrollments of Amherst Students in Quantitative Courses

Given the long standing tradition of an open curriculum at Amherst, the choices our students make in shaping their education is a subject of ongoing discussion. For example the January 2006 report of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) emphasized the pleasure afforded to our students in being able to “take charge of their education...” and the attendant responsibilities falling upon both students and faculty. But the report immediately notes an area of concern, namely the breadth of student course selection. Four areas in particular were cited as gaps in the education of some students: foreign language competence, global comprehension, exposure to the arts, and familiarity with the methods of science. The CAP encouraged the development of courses “outside the hierarchical structure of classes intended for majors” and (Item 19) recommended the creation of FTEs to support quantitative literacy (for both non-science majors and less prepared science majors). The QSWG in its Spring 2006 report described a survey of quantitative approaches taken in the humanities, arts and social sciences, revealing a wide range of individual teaching components. Because it is difficult to generalize from such idiosyncratic examples, the QSWG this year undertook a simpler but more quantitative approach, namely an examination of enrollments in math and science courses as conventionally described.

To capture a snapshot of Amherst students' course selection, we describe the distribution of courses for students in the Class of 2006 as a whole and by academic reader rating. All students who had completed at least 27 Amherst College classes (n=324) were included, with the cutoff of 27 chosen to accommodate students who had taken a single semester abroad and may have also made use of the first year withdrawal option or taken 5 College courses. (Similar results obtain when the cutoff was raised to 31 Amherst courses.) Note that Amherst College courses constituted over 97 percent of total 5 College courses taken by students who matriculated to Amherst in the fall 2002 semester.

We placed student course work into the following categories:

Mathematics: Any mathematics course in the Amherst Mathematics Department.

Natural Science: Any Amherst course, whether for majors or non-majors, in Astronomy, Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Neurobiology (i.e. 26), and Physics and a number of natural science based courses in the Psychology department (12,15,24,25,26,56,59,60,61).

Laboratory Science: Lab courses were selected from their catalog description from the six science departments listed and Psychology.

Quantitative: Any of the above courses, as well as quantitative methods courses taught in the Psychology (22) and Economics (55 and 65) departments.

Table 1 summarizes the four year course selections of the Class of 2006. While clearly many Amherst students have had a thorough grounding in natural science and quantitative thinking (37% and 55%, respectively, have had four or more courses in those categories), not all students have had such exposure. Forty-four percent of the class took no mathematics courses at Amherst, 58% took no lab science, and 19% took no natural science classes at Amherst of any sort. We will have more to say on these aspects below.

Table 1. Distribution of Students in the Class of 2006 by Numbers of Mathematics, Science, and Quantitative Courses Taken (students must have completed at least 27 Amherst College courses by the end of the Spring 2006 semester)

	Number of Courses				
	0	1	2	3	4+
All Q Courses	12.65%	13.89%	9.57%	8.95%	54.94%
Natural Science	19.14%	23.07%	13.89%	5.56%	37.35%
Lab Science	57.72%	9.26%	3.09%	2.78%	27.16%
Mathematics	43.52%	30.56%	14.81%	4.32%	6.79%

Table 2, below, parses the course work of the Class of 2006 according to the average academic reader rating (ARR) assigned to their applications at the time of admission rounded to the nearest integer. The overall distribution of course work does not vary dramatically by ARR, though there are some general trends in the data: science majors and premedical students (taking those with 4+ classes in Natural Science to be one and/or the other) tend to be ARR 1's and 2's; and Mathematics majors predominantly ARR 1's. Students with little or no course work in these areas, however, are to be found in roughly similar proportion across the ARR scale (here lumping 4, 5 and 6 as 4+).

Table 2. Distribution of Students in the Class of 2006 by Numbers of Mathematics, Science, and Quantitative Courses Taken and Academic Reader Rating (students must have completed at least 27 Amherst College courses by the end of the Spring 2006 semester)*

	Average Academic Reader Rating	Number of Courses					Students
		0	1	2	3	4+	
All Q Course							
	1	8.70	8.70	4.35	13.04	65.22	23
	2	13.13	13.75	6.25	6.88	60.00	160
	3	11.63	13.95	11.63	13.95	48.84	43
	4+	13.27	15.31	15.31	9.18	46.94	98
Natural Science							
	1	21.74	13.04	13.04	8.70	43.48	23
	2	19.38	23.13	10.63	5.63	41.25	160
	3	16.28	25.58	18.60	4.65	34.88	43
	4+	19.39	27.55	17.35	5.10	30.61	98
Lab Science							
	1	52.17	13.04	4.35	0.00	30.43	23
	2	51.88	9.38	3.75	3.75	31.25	160
	3	58.14	9.30	4.65	4.65	23.26	43
	4+	68.37	8.16	1.02	1.02	21.43	98
Mathematics							
	1	34.78	26.09	13.04	4.35	21.74	23
	2	43.75	30	11.25	7.50	7.50	160
	3	44.19	39.53	13.95	0.00	2.33	43
	4+	44.90	28.57	21.43	1.02	4.08	98

*Average academic reader rating is rounded to the nearest integer.

How might one interpret the course data presented? Members of the QSWG are disappointed that the response of so many students to Amherst's open curriculum is to avoid totally courses in quantitative areas. As noted earlier, nearly one fifth of our students take no course in natural science (19% of the Class of 2006), 44% no course in mathematics, and well over half (58%) no laboratory science; these last courses are those that allow students actually to experience the methodological approach of those disciplines. It is true that all but 13% of the class took at least one course in the Quantitative category, but that category is so broad as to lump Mathematics 11 (calculus), with experimental biology, with atmospheric chemistry. Amherst's Liberal Studies Curriculum, as detailed in the current catalog (p. 69) encourages students to undertake course work in a half dozen areas, two goals of which are to "work within the scientific method" and "employ abstract reasoning." Of course, any such description of course work is, necessarily and appropriately, somewhat ambiguous. Nevertheless we feel there is a disparity

between the educational goals we profess for our students and the classroom experiences too many of our students elect.

Another way to consider the course work of Amherst students is to compare it with that of students at other colleges and universities. We did not attempt to request course registration information from other schools; rather, we surveyed the distribution requirements of a baker's dozen of our sister institutions. We selected a group of top colleges and universities with no advance knowledge on our part of their requirements (except for Brown, whose open curriculum is well known). Table 3 encapsulates the quantitative curricular requirements of those institutions. Naturally, different schools have crafted their curricula in different ways; some require course work in life vs. physical science; some separate out mathematics; some specify lab components; and others simply combine mathematics and science (at least as far as we can tell from web-accessed catalog information). Overall requirements range from none (Brown) to five quantitative courses (Wellesley).

Table 3. Quantitative Curricular Requirements at other institutions

INSTITUTION	QUANTITATIVE CURRICULAR REQUIREMENTS
Brown	None
Carleton	3 courses in mathematics and natural sciences
Columbia	2 terms in science; 1 core course in frontiers of science
Dartmouth	1 course in technology or applied science; 1 course in quantitative and deductive science; 2 courses in natural sciences (1 of technology or natural science courses must include a lab, field, or experimental component).
Harvard	1 core course in quantitative reasoning; 2 core courses in science (A and B)
Middlebury	1 course in physical and life sciences; 1 course in deductive reasoning and analytical processes
Pomona	1 course in physical and biological sciences; 1 course in mathematical reasoning
Princeton	1 course in quantitative reasoning; 2 courses in science and technology, with laboratory
Stanford	1 course in engineering and applied sciences; 1 course in mathematics; 1 course in natural sciences
Swarthmore	2 courses in natural sciences and engineering; a natural science and engineering practicum.
Wellesley	2 courses in basic skills and data analysis; 3 courses in natural and physical sciences and mathematics
Williams	3 courses in science and mathematics
Yale	2 courses in quantitative reasoning; 2 courses in natural sciences

Although the schools specify their requirements in differing ways, to a first approximation the median quantitative requirement of these diverse schools is three courses within science and mathematics (as, for example, at Carleton, Columbia, Harvard, Princeton, Stanford, Swarthmore and Williams). One can then consider the course work of Amherst's class of 2006 according to this “average” course requirement of these other schools. The majority of Amherst students in the class of 2006 did satisfy this “3 quantitative course” requirement that is applied at many other institutions, but 36% of the class did not. ($12.65 + 13.89 + 9.57 \approx 36\%$.) Several of the institutions require two classes in the natural sciences; 43% of the Amherst class took fewer. Acknowledging the imprecision with which different courses are grouped at different schools, interested readers can compare the 2006 class profile with the quantitative requirements of any of the comparison schools.

The data we have collected are, we realize, limited in any number of ways. The analysis of the Class of 2006 could be replicated with other graduating classes; we could employ a larger, or different collection of comparison schools; and we could have attempted, course by course, to deem courses in other departments more or less “quantitative” in their approach. (We did not, for example, include any first-year seminars in either the mathematical or natural science category, although such modes of learning do play a role in some of the offerings.) Courses in social psychology or economics similarly were not assessed for their quantitative component. Despite these, and no doubt other, limitations in our analysis, we feel nevertheless that the data we present do suggest that there are serious lacunae in the education of a significant fraction of Amherst students. This seems true whether judged by our members' internal sense as to what constitutes a broad liberal arts education, or by comparison to the requirements of other institutions. As the QSWG, we have confined ourselves to the distribution of mathematics and natural science classes taken by the Class of 2006. A similar analysis could be done for course work in the arts, or foreign language, or global comprehension—the other areas highlighted as problematic by the CAP report.

If there were to be consensus that a significant number of Amherst students fail to engage, during their four years here, the breadth of subject matter that the College professes to value, what might be done to improve that situation? The most straightforward solution, adopted in one form or another by almost all American institutions of higher learning, would be to impose upon our students some form of quantitative course distribution requirement or core curriculum. But this “simple” solution – some would say “simplistic” – raises a host of other issues and, at the least, runs counter to Amherst practice of recent decades. This “cure” extends well beyond our charge.

A far more modest approach, one consistent with current Amherst philosophy, would be to confront the lack of breadth in the course work of some students through improvements in the advising system. Given the subjective nature of conversations between a diverse faculty and even more diverse student population, and in the absence of course requirements, it is difficult to prescribe specific practices. One suggestion, discussed on and off in recent years in various guises, would be to create a correspondence between each Amherst course and the six educational objectives we espouse as part of the Liberal Studies Curriculum. (See Catalog p.69.) Of course some courses will be harder to categorize than others, but even so a rough mapping should be possible. The results of that mapping would then be included in each

student's transcript. Students and their advisors would know, semester by semester, which educational areas had been attended to and which not, and the discussion of an individual student's course breadth would be much better informed than at present. The QSWG recommends that the College explore the inclusion of such information on student transcripts.

The Quantitative Skills Working Group:

Jennifer Innes, Moss Quantitative Center
David Ratner, Biology
Nancy Ratner, Admissions and Academic Projects
Steve Rivkin, Economics

September, 2007

Amended October 10, 2007

The fourth 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 24, 2007. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Corrections to the minutes of September 17 were given to the Dean.

In response to a request by the Committee, the Dean distributed lists of standing and other committees of the Faculty and their current membership. President Marx noted that last year's Committee of Six had discussed the possibility of discontinuing or combining some committees, redistributing the work of some committees, and/or changing the membership of some committees, with the goal of alleviating some of the burden placed on the Faculty and of ensuring the efficiency and effectiveness of the work of College. While it was agreed that revisions would be useful, the members did not bring specific proposals forward to the Faculty, although their discussion did result in a decision to redistribute the work of the Copeland Committee (the Faculty Committee on Research Awards and the Dean's office now administer this program) and to eliminate that committee. President Marx noted that changing the structure or membership of standing committees requires a vote of the Faculty. Professor Frank commented that committee assignments appear not to be shared equally among all members of the Faculty, noting that having all faculty members serve might also decrease the burden on those colleagues who serve regularly. Professor Servos noted, for the Committee's information, that, in 1997, after a survey of the Faculty about this subject and consideration by the Committee of Six, the Faculty had voted to restructure several faculty committees in order to reduce the number of faculty members needed and to improve the efficiency of faculty governance.

In this vein, President Marx asked about the role of the Committee on College Housing. Dean Call noted that the committee has not met for some time, since there has not been a major issue involving housing in recent years. If not for this committee, Professor Jagannathan asked, would there be a mechanism for addressing faculty members' concerns about housing? Professor Jagannathan noted that a number of colleagues who live in College housing, particularly assistant professors, have brought to his attention questions about the transparency and efficiency of the process by which housing is prioritized and allocated. Professor Sinos agreed, commenting that the process seems to be opaque and very slow, and that colleagues appear not to be given timely information about whether housing will be available for them. She and Professor Jagannathan noted that, in the past, the housing process had been more open, with the names of individuals and their ranking on the housing list having been made available to the Amherst community. President Marx asked if this level of transparency had led to any difficulties among those participating in the College housing system. In response, several members noted that clear criteria have been developed for awarding housing, and they believe that the highly formulaic nature of the process has prevented such problems from arising.

Amended October 10, 2007

Continuing the conversation, Professor Servos asked, whether the “formula” had been accessible to all when the system was more open. Professor Jagannathan said that the formula was, and still is, well known and accessible. Professor Frank noted that the Committee on College Housing has served as a valuable advocacy group, and that important faculty concerns about College housing have been addressed through this mechanism in the past. She said that the housing lottery is not the only way in which faculty interface with the College housing system: that disputes may arise between the rental properties office and either junior faculty who rent or senior faculty who are selling their houses back to the College. The Dean noted that, at present, he is often asked to assist with questions that arise about housing for faculty members.

On a more general level, and stressing the importance and necessity of the Faculty’s involvement in the governance of the College, against which all other arguments should be measured, President Marx pointed out that the level of committee work that faculty members are being asked to assume places a significant burden on them. Faculty service time should be used effectively and efficiently, while ensuring oversight, especially in areas connected to the curriculum or to students’ academic experience at the College. President Marx suggested that the Committee review the list of faculty committees in their entirety at the end of the meeting, if time permitted. The members agreed to do so.

Dean Call made a series of announcements. He noted that attorney Jim Wallace would meet with the members to review tenure procedures and answer questions about the tenure process. Each fall, Mr. Wallace is invited to speak with the Committee of Six prior to personnel discussions to provide general legal advice related to the tenure and reappointment processes. The Dean asked the members if they felt that there was sufficient business to have a Faculty Meeting on either October 2 or October 16. After discussion of possible agenda items, the members agreed that meetings should not be held in October, but that there would likely be a Faculty Meeting on November 6, since new course proposals would require a vote by the Faculty in time for pre-registration. A proposal for a new Environmental Studies major is also expected to come before the Faculty this fall, the Dean said. He agreed to inform the Faculty that the dates of October 2 and 16 would be released, and that colleagues should continue to hold the dates of November 6 and December 18 for possible Faculty Meetings.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Jagannathan noted that attendance at the first lunch hosted by the Committee of Six had been sparse. The members agreed to have lunches, as announced, on first and third Thursdays through October to see if there is sufficient faculty interest to warrant the continuation of this experiment. Professor O’Hara said that she would try to arrange for more timely online reminders about the lunches through the online campus announcements.

Professor George asked Dean Call if any progress had been made regarding the creation of an archive of the *Faculty Handbook*. The Dean responded that Peter Schilling, Director of Information Technology, is considering ways of creating an electronic archive; he is expected to report back to the Dean soon. Professor George suggested that a complete copy of the

Amended October 10, 2007

Handbook be printed from the Web at the end of each academic year and placed in the College archives in Frost Library. The Dean agreed that both paper and electronic versions of the *Faculty Handbook* would be created annually and archived.

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 2006, so that there is no longer a restriction on the career stages of nominees for the fellowship. The Committee agreed that putting forward the proposals of tenure-track colleagues who apply, if their proposals are worthy, is particularly desirable.

Discussion returned to the role of the Committee of Six and began with conversation about the Committee of Six's interactions with other faculty committees. Professor Servos said that it is clear from language in the *Faculty Handbook* that standing committees are created by vote of the Faculty; ad hoc committees are created by the President. The Committee of Six advises on the membership of both types of committees. He noted that there is no language in the *Faculty Handbook* regarding the Committee's role in drafting charges for other committees. He commented on an excerpt (appended) from the minutes of the August 31, 2006, meeting of the Committee of Six, in which Professor Schneider asked for further clarification of the role of the Committee. In response, the Dean had described the Committee's responsibilities, including among them the drafting of charges for other faculty committees. Professor Servos said that, in his experience, the President and the Dean have been most likely to charge committees with particular tasks. The Committee of Six has been invited to express opinions on charges as part of its advisory role. The Dean said that practice may have varied slightly among different Committees of Six, and that the practice of the Committee drafting charges for other faculty committees may have been more common during the past several years.

Professor O'Hara noted that the Committee of Six had shaped several charges last year, with positive results, and commented that the Committee's role in this regard is somewhat ambiguous and may depend on whether individual Committees of Six have seen their roles as being more active or purely advisory. She offered the example of the Committee's decision in 2006-2007 to bring a proposal to the Faculty that the pacing of the allocation of new faculty FTEs be considered in concert with any increase the size of the student body. The Committee of Six had felt that it was important to act at the particular moment, when important decisions were about to be made about the future of the College. The question of how to increase the size of the student body was being considered by the FCAFA at the same time as decisions were being made by the CEP about how to solicit applications for new FTEs. These two interrelated issues were being considered simultaneously and yet in isolation from one another. The Committee of Six stepped in to make sure that these two issues might be approached in a coordinated way, she noted.

Amended October 10, 2007

Continuing the conversation, Professor O'Hara said that she believes that the Faculty is best served by a Committee of Six that does not decide a priori whether it will be more or less active in its role, but is rather guided by the *Faculty Handbook* and by the details of a particular issue in taking a more active role when necessary. Nevertheless, she said it would be helpful for the Committee to consider at this moment the type of committee it aspires to be. Questions to consider include whether the Committee of Six should strive to clarify issues for the Faculty and whether the Committee should prioritize the tasks of other faculty committees when issues of concern arise. Professor Jagannathan said that, as the executive committee of the Faculty, the Committee of Six should have some latitude in its role involving matters of faculty governance, among them the drafting of charges to other committees. Professor Servos expressed discomfort with the idea of the Committee of Six taking on a role that is primarily executive in practice, as the result might be a tendency to dictate and give orders to other faculty groups. Professor O'Hara said that it is important—whether the Committee is primarily advisory, directive, or interpretive—for members to be clear and consistent in their interpretation of their role in faculty governance.

Professor George said that he has felt in the past that the Committee has sometimes overstepped its role when considering reports brought forward from other faculty committees. In his view, the Committee should discuss such reports and have the members' conversation shared through the minutes for the benefit of the Faculty—but should not alter the report, particularly without consulting the committee that generated it. He noted that Committee of Six conversation can serve to jumpstart faculty discussion, and that rehearsing the major discussion points of a report before a Faculty Meeting can be very helpful; best practice should be that the Committee forwards reports, unaltered, to the Faculty for consideration, he believes. Professor George commented that the colleagues who work on these reports devote a great deal of time and effort to them, and that their service to the College should be respected. Professor O'Hara agreed that the efforts of faculty committees should be valued and appreciated, and that the Committee of Six should consult with faculty committees if questions about committee reports arise and further discussion and/or clarification is needed. While agreeing that the work of faculty committees should be respected, Professor Jagannathan said that, if the Committee of Six believes that a report is not sufficiently cogent, it should not forward it to the Faculty; instead it should be returned to the committee with specific questions and suggestions for changes. It is also not uncommon for the Committee of Six to request a meeting with the faculty committee to discuss concerns before a final report is produced. If part of the Committee's role is to ensure that Faculty Meetings function in an orderly and reasonable fashion, the Committee might, on rarest of rare occasions, refuse to put such a report on the agenda, he said.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Professor Frank noted that she was hearing a desire to solve a tension in members' understandings of the Committee's role. She expressed the view that the Committee would need to feel its way as questions come up about the degree to which it wants to take an active role. Professor Servos said that he worries that it is easy for the Committee to drift into areas that are outside the boundaries of its charge.

Amended October 10, 2007

The Dean next asked the members to consider the charge to the new Science Planning Committee (the establishment of which was recommended by the science faculty during a conversation held in July, the minutes of which are appended). As he mentioned at a previous Committee of Six meeting, Dean Call said that the proposed science committee would have a broad mandate—which would include further work on the development of a vision for the sciences at Amherst in the future. At the same time, the committee would be responsible for moving the Merrill renovation process forward. The Science Planning Committee would vet and refine the report (appended) of the Ad Hoc Merrill Planning Committee. The committee would also recommend the next steps for Merrill planning (as informed by the report of the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) Interim Recommendations on a Projected Budget for the Committee on Academic Priorities, which was distributed to the faculty last spring and which is appended here), while later forming a smaller group that would serve as a core Merrill Planning team going forward. As the Committee discussed previously, the plan is for each science department to select a member to serve on the Science Planning Committee.

The Dean noted that, as part of its work, the Ad Hoc Merrill Planning Committee had visited Williams College and had been impressed with the advantages of the efforts of Williams, and those of other peer institutions, to work across departments when undertaking curricular planning. The members also took note of the manner in which Williams organizes and presents information about the sciences. While Amherst is certainly the equal of Williams in terms of the science education that it provides, the College does less well in showcasing science education in a compelling way, the committee concluded. The Ad Hoc Merrill Planning Committee ultimately decided that Amherst would benefit from having an organized, ongoing formal structure that would allow for and encourage cross-departmental conversation among the science departments.

Professor Jagannathan asked if the pertinent issues could be summarized as follows: the need to communicate more effectively about science education at Amherst, the need to renovate Merrill, the need to explore new directions in pedagogy and in the ways students are supported academically, and the need to increase support for student and faculty research in the sciences. In terms of committee structure, Professor Jagannathan and Servos expressed concern about creating a standing committee, unless there are ongoing needs in these areas. Professor Servos noted that an ad hoc committee could certainly explore new forms of pedagogy and support, work to ensure that Amherst is communicating well about the excellence of the science education it provides, and achieve consensus regarding a vision for the sciences over the next ten years. Professor Frank agreed, noting parallels with the Committee of Six's recent discussion about whether to create a standing committee to explore a new major in Film Studies and New Media. She noted that creating formal structures—ad hoc committees or working groups—for the groups that are working on these issues would provide institutional recognition of the work being undertaken and protection for colleagues from other committee service. Without this imprimatur, the groups' work might be impeded. She also questioned why a standing committee

Amended October 10, 2007

should be created to form a vision for the sciences when such committees are not being considered for the humanities or the social sciences.

The question of committee structure aside, the President noted that he has encouraged a dialogue about a vision for the sciences because of the urgent need to move forward with renovating Merrill. In his view, a vision for the sciences must guide any such renovation. Coordinated curricular planning would answer, for example, questions such as whether there would be a need for additional large classrooms or a greater number of small classrooms, whether scientific instruments might be shared or should be housed in separate areas, or whether departments might want to organize spaces around interdisciplinary themes—information that should shape the way the building would be designed. The Dean noted that he agrees with the Ad Hoc Merrill Planning Committee that there will be an ongoing need for a formal structure to encourage trans-departmental conversation about the sciences.

Professor George noted that some members of the science faculty and of the Ad Hoc Merrill Planning Committee have expressed cynicism about the need to develop a vision for the sciences, perceiving the task as mere window dressing for the renovation process. Professor O'Hara said that she has observed that colleagues' expressions of cynicism have alternated with demonstrations of excitement about the prospect of developing a vision. She feels that the prevailing mood of the science faculty at the July meeting was, for the most part, optimistic, positive, and energetic. She noted that, if the Committee of Six has concerns about following a major recommendation (forming a science planning committee) of the Ad Hoc Merrill Planning Committee, the members should consult with the planning committee.

The Dean reiterated that there is a significant and immediate need to develop an exciting, curriculum-based proposal for the Merrill project. The more exciting the proposal, the more generous the support for the project will be, he noted. The President agreed, commenting that he feels that merely making nuts-and-bolts improvements to the building, without a curricular guidepost, would be irresponsible. A cohesive sense of the direction of the sciences will be needed—and will be needed quite soon—if major spending on Merrill is to be justified, and if planning for the campaign is to proceed on schedule. Issues of vision and timing are also pertinent to the renovation of Frost Library, he said.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the members advised the Dean and the President that an organizational structure is needed for planning for the renovation of Merrill, including the development of a vision for the sciences, to move forward. The members recommended that a working group or ad hoc committee be formed, and agreed that the group's first task should be to refine its charge, based on the report of the Ad Hoc Merrill Planning Committee. Professor Servos said that he worries that the creation of a standing committee for the sciences might represent the beginning of a move toward a divisional organizational structure for the College.

The Committee returned to the topic of faculty committees. President Marx said that the key to lessening the burden on the Faculty is to determine which areas of College life require direct faculty engagement, which areas require somewhat less direct oversight by the Faculty, and which areas can be administered by professional staff members, who consult with the

Amended October 10, 2007

Faculty when appropriate. Professor Jagannathan said that he has been disturbed that, in recent years, some faculty members have moved away from their legislative and oversight roles and have become more like middle managers, that is they have become more engaged in matters of implementation. Professor Frank asked if course relief and compensation were solutions that could be considered, and President Marx said that, as he has stated on previous occasions, he is open to considering a variety of ideas and approaches, while being mindful of any potential divisiveness that might result.

After a substantial and detail-oriented conversation about the pros and cons of combining or eliminating a number of faculty committees and/or making changes in membership, the members decided to consider whether the College Housing Committee should be eliminated and the oversight of the College housing process should be shifted to the CPR, with support from the Dean. Several members commented that it might be beneficial to have the CPR oversee the housing process because the CPR would have greater clout, should an important housing issue emerge. Professor George was consulted about whether the number of faculty members serving on the Health Professions Committee could be reduced from four to three. He agreed that doing so would not have a negative effect on the functions of this committee. The members also considered whether there is a continuing need for an Orientation Committee, since the program is overseen by the Dean of New Students. It was proposed that the Dean of New Students be added, *ex officio*, to the College Council, and that the Council oversee Orientation, which is largely an administrative function of the Dean of Students Office. Professor Sinos pointed out that some faculty members feel that there should be more Orientation events that foster intellectual engagement, which suggests the importance of the faculty presence on the Orientation Committee. She questioned the wisdom of including this work among the business of the College Council. Dean Call noted that Professor Sarat will be exploring the matter of intellectual engagement especially during the first year, as part of his work as Senior Advisor to the Dean for Academic Life. At the Committee's request, the Dean agreed to explore whether the Health and Safety Committee had been constituted to meet federal or state requirements. If not, there might be possibilities for changing the membership of that committee, the members felt. The Dean was also asked to review the stipulations of the committee that makes awards from the Dayton Fund, with the thought that, if the Faculty approves a new Environmental Studies major, colleagues associated with that program could possibly take on the duties currently assumed by those on the Dayton Committee.

The Dean agreed to discuss the Committee's suggestions with colleagues who currently serve on these committees and to report back to the Committee of Six. He noted that several of the proposed changes would affect standing committees of the Faculty and, thus, would require a vote of the Faculty to implement.

Several members commented on the benefits of having faculty members rotate through College committees. These include the experience of working closely with colleagues outside their departments and with other members of the College community, with whom they might not otherwise interact. Some members expressed the view that adding to the work of already busy

Amended October 10, 2007

committees in the interests of reducing the total number of committees might not serve the College as well as does the current range of more and less burdensome committee assignments.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Excerpt from Committee of Six Minutes
of Thursday, August 31, 2006

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.

Minutes of the July 12, 2007, Meeting of Science Faculty

On July 12, 2007, at noon, Dean Call convened in the Lewis-Sebring Dining Commons an informal meeting with members of the science faculty to discuss the future of the sciences at Amherst, including issues surrounding curriculum, faculty and student research, and facilities. In attendance were Professors Baird, Benedetto, Bishop, Cheney, Cox, Demorest, Friedman, S. George, Goutte, Hall, Hansen, Harms, Hart, Hood, Hunter, Kushick, Kaplan, Leise, Leung, Loinaz, Marshall, C. McGeoch, L. McGeoch, McKinney, Miller, O'Hara, Poccia, Ratner, Sanderson, Tranbarger, and Velleman; John Carfora, Director of Sponsored Research; Janet Tobin, Assistant Dean of the Faculty; and Lee Barstow, Director of Advancement Information Systems, who served as Recorder.

The Dean thanked the assembled colleagues for their willingness to attend the summer lunchtime conversation. He then introduced John Carfora, who recently assumed the new position of Director of Sponsored Research in the Dean of Faculty's office. The Dean explained that Mr. Carfora's primary role will be to help Amherst faculty secure external funding to support their research activities. The creation of the position, Dean Call noted, was a recommendation of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP). The Dean thanked Mr. Barstow for taking the minutes of the meeting.

Dean Call continued his introductory comments, referring to the meeting's purpose as outlined in his email invitation and as informed by the two documents accompanying it. The Dean thanked those colleagues, in particular the members of the Merrill Planning Group (Professors Goutte, Hunter, Marshall, and Sanderson), who have worked over the past year to begin the process of planning for the renovation of the Merrill Science Center, in the context of considering as an underpinning for the project the development of a vision for the sciences at Amherst for the coming decades. The Dean explained that the draft document prepared by the Merrill Planning Group is not definitive, but rather should be viewed as the first step of a process that the group envisions as broad and inclusive, with the goal of building on what has been developed so far and ultimately achieving consensus. Pointing out that the Merrill renovation is a once-in-a-generation opportunity for the faculty, Dean Call said that it is his hope that the science faculty will engage in a planning process that will result in a project that is outstanding and visionary, rather than in a series of cursory upgrades to the building. The Dean pointed out that the Board has expressed support for this project, but noted that making a successful case for the building will depend on the faculty's ability to convey a compelling "blueprint" for science education and research in the years ahead, as well as for physical spaces.

Noting that, as part of its work, the Merrill Planning Group had visited peer institutions, including Williams, Dean Call shared his observation that, although Amherst's science curriculum is second to none, sister institutions do a better job of communicating their strengths in the sciences. He called on the faculty to tell Amherst's story, in order to build a persuasive case in support of two related, but not identical needs: the renovation of Merrill and the development of a new vision that articulates shared goals for science at Amherst.

The Dean said that one of the Merrill Planning Group's purposes in gathering the science faculty at this time is to broaden the dialogue, hear new ideas, and move conversation forward. The question, he said, is what needs to be done to keep the Merrill renovation on track and to build for the future. Dean Call encouraged the faculty to "think big" and to view the renovation as a catalyst for a more expansive conversation. He then opened the floor for discussion.

Professor Marshall, representing the planning committee, described the evolution of the members' thinking. Beginning with a purpose understood as, "Let's renovate Merrill," the members learned that to make decisions or even start planning, they needed to identify goals. In writing the draft document, they engaged in the first step of a process akin to the recent crafting of the mission statement for the College, he said. The result of the ongoing process will be a document that is more a statement of guiding principles than a summary of procedures and practices. He added that the document, in its final form, will be intended not only for faculty, but also for potential students and donors, and colleagues outside the sciences.

Professor C. McGeoch said that she understands that the document will conclude with, "...therefore, we need to renovate Merrill," but she wondered how it would be disseminated, and to whom. Dean Call responded that, at this stage, the document is meant to serve as a basis for discussion. It was drafted to support science faculty as they work toward reaching a consensus on goals for the Merrill renovation and for the directions that the sciences should take in the future. The document's purpose now is to provide guidelines and principles for the departments; over time it can be shaped to meet the needs of different College constituencies, Dean Call said.

Professor Goutte said that the planning group views the document as a foundation upon which the faculty should now be encouraged to build. The group saw the creation of this piece as an alternative to the impossible task of assembling the entire science faculty to discuss far-reaching and complex issues, without the benefit of some groundwork.

Professor Hansen expressed the view that the College already provides an excellent, state-of-the-art science education and that the current facility has not impeded his teaching or research, though a renovated Merrill is certainly necessary to maintain quality in the future. He fears that tension will be created if a flashy argument-in particular, re-defining the sciences at Amherst-must be articulated as a justification for renovating the building. He advocated for a message more along the lines of maintaining excellence, rather than transforming science education at the College. He sees the purpose of the document, therefore, as a way to explain to potential donors that they would be ensuring that science education at Amherst remains innovative and vibrant.

Professor Goutte responded that the planning group agrees that it is valuable to hear and share what Amherst does well, while noting that new ideas and approaches can enhance the sciences at Amherst. Professor Loinaz asked if this planning effort is a response to concern about the sciences, and the Dean responded that the planning process is motivated by the needed Merrill renovation, as well as CAP priorities, including increasing support for student research. In particular, the Dean said he shares Professor Hansen's view that science education is a strength of the College, and he sees the current planning process as a means to enhance that strength.

The student research priority is an example, said the Dean, of the opportunity to articulate the strengths of current programs while envisioning new approaches. Given that overseeing student research is very time-consuming for faculty, for example, possible solutions such as hiring additional postdoctoral fellows, post-bacs, or technicians to provide assistance to the faculty could be considered.

Professor Harms made the point that eighteen additional FTEs have been approved by the Trustees, and that innovative thinking about pedagogy and facilities will provide the justification for their allocation. She encouraged the faculty to think boldly and outside the box, offering as an example the idea of advocating for smaller classes (as few as twenty-five in introductory courses) and interdisciplinary ways of covering subject matter that is required for the different scientific disciplines.

Professor Hansen noted that issues were being conflated in the course of the conversation. There has long been a desire for smaller introductory science classes, but the primary limitation in terms of making smaller classes possible is the number of faculty, he said. He thinks that it would be more productive to articulate what is being done in the sciences and how a renovated Merrill will help the faculty continue to do what it is doing.

Professor Kushick agreed, putting the following scenario before the group. Suppose the chemistry department proposed a specific plan for smaller classes (forty or fifty students) and additional intensive support for students for the first two years, rather than in the first year only. Accomplishing such a plan would require four new FTEs, he said. He wondered if including such a plan in the proposed visionary document was practical. The Dean noted that, in fact, a new FTE had just been awarded to the department to meet goals that the department articulated for meeting the needs of less well-prepared students.

Professor Kushick argued against the idea of labs being taught by staff, noting that Amherst's focus on teaching is distinctive and that important learning goes on in the lab. Professors Hansen and Hall agreed, while Professor Poccia responded that careful placement of technicians and postdoctoral fellows can free up faculty time, while preserving the principle of faculty dedication to teaching. Professor Marshall pointed out that conditions differ among disciplines. Professor Hansen said that part of the stress, in terms of enrollments, that is being put on the sciences is the result of admission decisions. He noted that the sciences have little control in this regard.

Agreeing with Professor Harms that the faculty should be thinking creatively, Professor Sanderson noted that there is often overlap in terms of the material covered in the various statistics courses taught by different departments across the College. She wondered if collaboration among departments might make it possible to consolidate some of the statistics courses, freeing up space in the curriculum and faculty time so courses in other areas could be offered. Professor Sanderson supported the idea of considering new pedagogical models, as well as looking beyond new FTEs for solutions. She suggested, for example, that the ways in which Psychology 11 is taught could be improved if resources such as postdocs were made available to her department.

Professor Kaplan also supported thinking in new and creative ways, but noted that there can be practical difficulties that prevent innovation from taking place. He commented that, while he would like to teach collaboratively with colleagues from different disciplines, the need to cover the departmental curriculum in his small department makes doing so very difficult.

Dean Call noted that making it possible for faculty to teach interdisciplinary courses is, in part, a resource issue. He posed the following questions to the group: what would be the best way for faculty to make the case for teaching such courses? How would a need rise to the level sufficient for getting resources for doing so? He pointed out that there is no mechanism, at present, for advocating interdepartmentally. He suggested that there should be a tool in place that would enable faculty to advocate for goals that span departments, bringing a higher level of attention to such proposals.

Returning to the renovation of Merrill, Professor O'Hara suggested that it will be important to consider ways in which the renovation can facilitate more interaction and conversation among faculty in the sciences, which she feels is critical. A renovated building should also do more to celebrate the sciences (using exciting exhibits and graphics, for example), she said, commenting that other schools' science centers create such a feeling and are far more impressive overall. She said that Merrill does not meet her needs as a scientist. She described deficiencies in Merrill, mentioning the isolation of the disciplines and the lack of visibility of the Moss Quantitative Center in its current location. Professor O'Hara said that she feels that a better building will draw the best science students, noting that the current facility conveys the impression that the College's institutional commitment to the sciences is not great. Another area of concern is the lack of a vibrant and coordinated Web presence for the sciences at Amherst. She noted that other colleges (mentioning Williams, in particular) do a much better job in this regard.

Professor Marshall said that he supported the vision outlined by Professor O'Hara and reiterated that Merrill has many drawbacks. He noted that his research has been hindered by the constraints of the building, commenting that the air quality has become too poor in Merrill to continue his research involving lasers.

Professor Kaplan pointed out that the plans for celebratory exhibits and Web pages described by Professor O'Hara should include provisions for the additional staff that will be needed to build and maintain them. In addition, he urged the faculty to engage in the daunting task of imagining what the computational support needs in different scientific disciplines will be twenty years from now, since this is rapidly expanding area. Professor Kaplan noted that the College's strengthened commitment to less well-prepared students and the desire to reach out to students who avoid science (often members of underrepresented groups, he noted) should also be considered carefully as plans for the future are developed.

Professor Harms recalled that Merrill was built to accommodate the addition of a new wing, and she raised the possibility of moving the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science to Merrill to establish a new computational center there. Continuing with a general remark encouraging bold thinking, Professor Harms urged the faculty to imagine the best story possible for the future of the sciences, to take the larger view, and to put the most exciting package possible together. Dean Call and Professor

Marshall encouraged the faculty to think in the sort of broad and creative ways outlined by Professor Harms.

Professor Miller said that, while she is eager to take a fresh look at the curriculum in the Department of Biology, in her experience it can become complicated when trying to solve departmental challenges by collaboration with other departments, often because departments have very different needs.

Professor Harms offered the idea of breaking introductory classes into modules that would be taught across science departments. Majors could take the modules that related to their discipline's course of study only. In this way, departments might be freed from teaching some overlapping introductory material, and fewer introductory courses would be taught overall. Professor Cheney noted that students often have different needs, depending on whether they are pre-med or anticipate becoming research scientists. He said that the Board is concerned about the low number of Amherst students who pursue Ph.D.s in the sciences, in comparison to the number who aspire to be physicians. Professor Goutte argued that a balance is needed at Amherst between pre-meds and those who wish to pursue Ph.D.s in the sciences. She feels that having more of a sense of unity among the sciences would encourage more students to go on to graduate programs, and she noted that at Williams, for example, the sciences as a whole have a presence that is lacking at Amherst. She pointed to efforts by Williams--a brochure of current research spanning the sciences that gives the science great visibility and the inclusion of a coffee shop in the science center to facilitate informal interdisciplinary engagement among faculty. She suggested that strengthening departments with new FTEs would free up science faculty to work interdepartmentally. Professor Marshall agreed, noting that, at present, there is insufficient "wiggle room" within departments for faculty to teach outside of their departmental curricula.

Professor Cheney offered the idea of creating a position for a "sciences center" director at Amherst as a mean of creating greater cohesiveness among the sciences.

Mr. Carfora advocated for a common message that moves from an intrinsic to an extrinsic point of view and which would be valuable when pursuing outside funding. For instance, he said, experience shows that the word "integrated" is more compelling to funders than "interdisciplinary." Three steps are needed in the planning process, he said: to consolidate the strengths of the departments, to memorialize past successes, and then to ask what is the future of sciences at Amherst.

On a different, but related topic, Professor Cox, noted that he is involved in placing students in math courses at Amherst, and has recognized that such a placement has implications beyond math. For example, a student's math placement often affects the sequencing of chemistry courses that he or she can take and, thus, the pace at which the major can be completed. He suggested that it would be beneficial to have multiple entry points to majors. It was noted that at Smith students can enroll in half-semester courses, introductory courses that are paired with courses required for particular majors. This structure might be a way of accomplishing what Professor Cox was suggesting, providing flexible entry points.

In considering next steps for the planning process, Professor Hall suggested that a delegate be appointed from each department to bring departmental concerns to the centralized planning group. The group would then synthesize ideas. Professor Harms urged that the planning move forward quickly. Professor Sanderson advised that the group discuss ways to expose students to research experiences as early as possible after they arrive at Amherst. Students often want to begin research in their first year at the College. Professor Loinaz reiterated the point that research opportunities are limited by the number of faculty who are available to work with students.

Dean Call asked the group if, as the planning process moves forward, there should be two committees-- one to consider the renovation of Merrill and another to consider the future of the sciences at Amherst, or a single committee that would consider both of these issues. Attendees voiced support for the idea of a single committee. Professor O'Hara asked that representatives from IT, the Library, and the Moss Quantitative Center be involved early in the planning process.

In a final comment, Professor Hall urged the group to consider, prior to dividing it up in their minds, that Merrill was originally designed to house only three departments--Chemistry, Physics, and Astronomy. None of these departments has shrunk significantly since the building was built, and the addition of the psychology department has already increased the stress on the available space.

The Dean thanked his colleagues for a very productive discussion and adjourned the meeting at 2:05 p.m.

Report from the Merrill Planning Committee

April 6, 2007

Prompted by issues raised by the Committee on Academic Priorities and the need to renovate Merrill Science Center, the Dean- of the Faculty formed the Merrill Planning Committee in spring 2006. He requested that we, the members, who were drawn from different scientific disciplines, consider science education and research at the College from an inter-science perspective, both as a valuable exercise in itself and as a means of informing planning for the Merrill renovation. The committee's discussions were far-ranging, encompassing an examination of the sciences as they are today and of directions they might take-both individually and in concert-in the future. As requested by the Dean, the committee thought broadly and creatively and included in our consideration all of the sciences, rather than focusing only on those departments that currently reside in the Merrill building. Through conversations with colleagues, visits to other campuses, and consideration of written material on science education and programs, the committee developed an initial set of guiding principles and recommendations. This working document was shared with a large portion of the science faculty at a meeting held in July and is now being provided as an interim report to the faculty as a starting point for further dialogue.

A small liberal arts college that is serious about science education faces a great challenge in presenting its students and faculty with a powerful and attractive alternative to large universities. Amherst College is fortunate to have a faculty that is committed to both high quality research and teaching. We believe that Amherst can draw from these strengths and use its adaptability to become a model of excellence in science education.

Looking at the existing strengths of the Amherst science departments and the challenges faced by students and faculty of science, as well as the broad national trends in the sciences, we have attempted to envision the strongest future for the sciences at Amherst College, and we have defined several guiding principles. Here we present our recommendations for the future of the sciences at Amherst. Our small size imposes constraints on our ability to meet certain challenges in scientific education and research, and we discuss these constraints and some recommendations. We also believe, however, that our small size presents us with two unique advantages: the opportunity to present students with an intimate learning environment, and the opportunity to foster an integrative scientific community far more effectively than can a large institution. Our small size makes it possible for chemistry majors to know the biology professors, or physics majors to interact with computer scientists, or psychology majors to take advanced biology courses. We recommend strengthening science departments so that there is more room for flexibility and curricular innovation, and building an interactive scientific community.

Building a community of sciences at Amherst College will allow us, as a group of cooperating scientists, to more effectively address the common challenges we face, as well as to foster interdisciplinary areas of study and research. For example, each department currently struggles with ways in which to best support underprepared science students; as a cooperating group of science faculty, staff, and students, we can create resources, curricular initiatives, and programmatic changes that will help students throughout their four years in the sciences, rather than applying individual and uncoordinated band aids to each science course. Building a community of sciences at Amherst College will allow us to promote, encourage, and support vigorous scientific research activity, a key determinant in the quality of scientific education and development of students as well as faculty. Scientific progress is propelled by the constant exchange of information and ideas; we believe this can fuel progress at Amherst in the areas of teaching and research

in the sciences, while demonstrating that the intimacy and cross-disciplinary nature of liberal arts education can be put to use to create fertile ground for science education in the twenty-first century.

Current State of Science at Amherst

*Amherst faculty are dedicated to teaching undergraduates, and are fortunate that Amherst attracts high quality students who are eager to learn. Faculty members strive to meet the needs of students with diverse preparations and career goals. The sciences at Amherst College teach students the principles and practice of the scientific method within the context of a comprehensive liberal arts education that allows them to seek, value, and advance knowledge and engage the world around them. We challenge our students to observe the natural world, apply scientific principles, synthesize concepts, engage in creative problem solving, and develop skills in written and oral expression.

*Amherst faculty have a strong commitment to conducting the highest quality research within core disciplines. Faculty publish in leading scientific journals, receive grant funding from federal and private agencies, and present their research at scientific conferences. Most of these research endeavors involve Amherst students.

*Interdisciplinary teaching and research in the sciences is ongoing, including programs in neuroscience (integrating physics, biology, chemistry, psychology, and computer sciences), environmental studies (integrating physics, psychology, chemistry, geology, biology, and economics), scientific computing (geology, physics, computer science), and chemical-physics spectroscopy (chemistry, physics). A proposed program in biochemistry and biophysics is under review, and discussions about ways to enhance the relationship between physics and astronomy are continuing. Science faculty also collaborate on teaching with faculty outside of the sciences.

However, at present cross-departmental initiatives are difficult because departments often do not have the staffing flexibility to allow them. In addition, offering courses, hiring, and tenuring in cross-disciplinary areas is challenging. For example, the Neuroscience program at Amherst (the first in the country at a liberal arts college) was originally composed of faculty from physics, psychology, biology, chemistry, and computer science, but pressing departmental needs have pulled faculty efforts away from this program, leaving it sparse and less interdisciplinary than initially envisioned.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Change - Science is rapidly evolving.

> Amherst College must remain flexible and responsive if it is to continue to attract and retain the best students and faculty.

Student Needs - The range in student pre-college science preparation is widening, especially in light of college priorities to increase socioeconomic diversity of the student body.

> Amherst College must be equipped to serve all students, from those who are underprepared, to those who have already had extensive coursework and are ready to engage in research and upper level classes.

Research - Research is a prominent part of undergraduate science education at the top institutions across the country.

> Faculty must be supported in their efforts to create and sustain rigorous research programs at the College. Science students must have access to hands-on learning experiences and opportunities to participate in quality scientific research.

Interdisciplinary Science - Emerging importance of new cross-disciplinary areas of scientific inquiry. D

> Amherst College sciences must build an environment in which students and faculty are supported to explore and to grow in new areas of study or research that lie at the intersections of defined disciplines.

OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Core disciplines**
- 2) Interdisciplinary courses**
- 3) Research community**
- 4) Faculty research programs**
- 5) Science Steering Committee**
- 6) New Building**

RECOMMENDATIONS

1) Ensure integrity and quality of core disciplines.

The limitation of a small college is that it is difficult to offer comprehensive education in core disciplines and still be able to grow and innovate. We must not let new trends and needs compromise the strength of our nationally recognized programs in core scientific disciplines, but instead we must work to strengthen our existing departments so that they have the flexibility to stretch, to intersect, and to innovate to meet student, faculty, and College-wide needs.

-Providing core coursework in traditional disciplines is necessary to prepare students for admission to graduate and medical school and help students succeed in such programs. Most of the science departments are currently providing the bare minimum number of courses in the discipline to prepare students for admission to and success in doctoral programs or other career paths.

-Amherst College science faculty value the unique learning opportunities that are found in laboratory courses. The intimate learning environment, the hands-on manipulations, and the opportunity for extensive one-on-one interactions with faculty and with peers are invaluable for students of science. Amherst's small size allows science departments to incorporate such laboratory components into their curriculum. Having such laboratories taught by faculty rather than by graduate students is a compelling advantage that Amherst College must continue to offer its science students.

-Teaching of the fundamental theories and principles in well-established disciplines provides students with the foundation needed to pursue unanswered questions and to develop new lines of inquiry both within and across disciplines.

2) Expand opportunities for interdisciplinary study

The dramatic growth of knowledge in science fields and the erosion of boundaries among separate disciplines over the last decades mean that future scientists may require strong skills not only within their given discipline, but also across related disciplines. Educational institutions are therefore offering new integrative courses that draw from subjects that were traditionally taught separately, such as mathematics, physics, chemistry, geology, psychology, and biology. We view the small size of Amherst College and the liberal arts approach as being naturally conducive to an integrative atmosphere, and we recommend taking advantage of these features to facilitate crossdisciplinary interactions.

-Develop introductory level courses addressing current issues in science that are cotaught by faculty from across disciplines. This approach works especially well when presented early in students' academic careers because it provides students with a broad understanding of the principles in each science (and thus an educated foundation in which to pursue upper-level courses and majors). Providing interesting and broadly appealing courses designed for all students (not just prospective science majors) also leads to the recruitment of "walk-on scientists," meaning students who did not see themselves as "scientists," but develop an interest in a particular scientific field through such exposure.

- We also believe it is important for science faculty to forge greater ties with other social science and humanities departments to examine topics in education, literature, economics, anthropology, religion, politics and morality. One possible approach to providing such courses is through the First-Year Seminar Program. Faculty across the College could work together to create seminars that bring in both science and non-science fields to examine current societal issues. For example, a First-Year Seminar in Environmental Studies could bring in faculty from physics, biology, chemistry, anthropology, psychology, math/computer science, philosophy, geology, political science, and economics. Another possible interdisciplinary First-Year Seminar could be Global Health, with faculty from biology, economics, philosophy, psychology, chemistry, anthropology, history, math/computer science, and American studies.

-Provide introductory interdisciplinary courses that help students who arrive with weaknesses in academic preparation. One such course (Bio/Chem 03) will be offered for the first time in the fall of 2007 [by Professors George (Bio) and O'Hara (Chem)]. Providing other such courses could help these underprepared students accomplish their academic and career objectives in a way that our current curriculum does not.

-Provide enhanced support for current and future interdisciplinary programs, such as Neuroscience and future interdisciplinary programs. Support continued collaborative efforts between departments to co-teach interdisciplinary topics, such as Biochemistry, which has been co-taught by Biology and Chemistry faculty for thirty years.

-Create "3:2" or "2:1:1:1" programs with engineering schools to allow students to obtain both a B.A. degree from Amherst and a B.S. degree from the engineering school in five years. In these programs, the students spend three years at the liberal arts college and two years at the engineering school. In the past Amherst has had such arrangements with MIT, RPI, and Dartmouth. Many liberal arts colleges find that these programs attract more science students to the college. Since prospective Amherst students often ask about such programs, and we believe

that resurrecting Amherst's participation in these programs would enhance the recruitment of science students to Amherst.

3) Facilitate creation of a vibrant research community of students, staff, and faculty

Research experience is becoming a crucial component of undergraduate education in the sciences among the top educational institutions. Students who do not have research experience are often handicapped when applying for admittance to the top graduate programs or the top research internships.

Without the enormous resources provided by graduate students and post docs at universities, and without recognition of the time involved in student training, Amherst College faculty struggle to be able to offer research mentorship to all interested students. We recommend the allocation of resources, facilities and staff to facilitate research training. We recommend the elevation of on-campus research efforts to greater awareness and appreciation on campus. The presence, vigor, and visibility of the campus scientific research community will become increasingly critical in attracting top science students and faculty who are comparing Amherst College to larger universities.

- Provide opportunities for students to have hands-on experience with research at early stages in their academic careers, including summer research opportunities for first- and second-year students. Although the current Amherst College summer research program, funded by the Howard Hughes Medical Institute and other agencies, provides some opportunities, there are many qualified students for a limited number of positions (25 to 30 students are funded out of 70 who apply), and such positions are not available in all science departments (e.g., psychology, physics, and physical chemistry are not eligible for Hughes support). Providing students with hands-on research experience early in their academic careers may spark students' interest in particular scientific fields, and thereby motivate future study in this discipline.

- Provide fully funded summer research positions at Amherst College for students at all stages of their academic careers. Such a program could be heavily advertised by the Admissions Office and used to recruit students with research interests in the sciences.

- Provide guidance and assistance to students in finding research internships off campus for summer or post-college work

- Create a viewbook that describes the ongoing research activities of Amherst faculty and students to educate prospective science students (and their parents) about the types of research projects available to students at Amherst College.

- Provide opportunities for all students to begin thesis work the summer before their senior year. Acquiring the skills to pursue meaningful laboratory projects and field research is often time consuming. Beginning a project the summer before the senior year dramatically expands the depth and range of possible thesis projects. In the current system, we are able to support some students in the summer with funds from faculty grants and endowed departmental funds. We would like to be able to offer this opportunity to all rising seniors interested in pursuing a research thesis project.

- Provide staff to support and facilitate these hands-on learning and research experiences. This staff might include lab assistants, post-docs, and research fellows.

-Create project-oriented experiences in experimental, analytical, or computational research as part of the new introductory interdisciplinary courses.

-Modernize existing machine shop and electronics shop to provide support for both research and laboratory courses.

-Create additional laboratory spaces that allow students to engage in hands-on learning and research. Ideally these laboratory spaces should be flexible to allow for different styles of laboratories to be taught in different semesters as well as the summer.

-Create a Science Resource Center where students could go for assistance with laboratory projects and quantitative questions. This resource center would be staffed during "student-hours" (perhaps 2 to 10 pm) so that all students would be able to have assistance as needed with laboratories and homework assignments. Science fellows (recent Amherst science graduates) could potentially provide this type of staffing.

-Foster gender and ethnic diversity within the scientific community of Amherst College so that students who are underrepresented in these fields can find role models and feel encouragement to pursue scientific studies.

4) Support for faculty research programs.

The quality, the reputation, and the vigor of the Amherst College science community hinge upon the research programs that are initiated and maintained by faculty. Amherst attracts outstanding scientists who are committed both to teaching and to creating nationally recognized research programs. We recommend assisting faculty in establishing and sustaining these research programs.

The effectiveness and the reputation of science education at Amherst depend critically on the quality of on-site research programs. Scientific contributions made by Amherst faculty research programs go a long way in advertising the quality of the Amherst College scientific community. Publications in top scientific journals and receipt of competitive research awards put Amherst on the map and build its reputation among scientists, potential donors, granting agencies, future students and faculty, and parents of prospective students. Such faculty achievements are difficult to aspire to in an academic environment that places great teaching and administrative demands on its faculty without the research staff and graduate students that are present at universities.

-Provide staff who support faculty research. Support activities might include: ordering and maintaining supplies, maintaining laboratories, fabricating equipment in the machine or electronics shop, design and maintenance of electronics, computer assistance, and setting and cleaning up lab preparations.

-Develop new ways of assisting faculty with maintaining active research programs. These will differ widely from one research program to another, but examples might include developing closer connections with U Mass graduate students, fellowships for recent Amherst thesis students to remain on campus pursuing research following graduation, and support (or matching support) for research post-docs or research assistants.

5) Sciences Committee

In order to coordinate and streamline the efforts of the science departments to address the challenges elaborated here, we recommend the formation of a Sciences Committee. We do not envision this committee taking over decisions that are more appropriately left to individual departments, such as those relating to the allocation of space, teaching, FTEs, or funding. Rather, this committee would be instrumental in facilitating communication between the Science Departments and Programs, and in building a community of scientists at Amherst College.

-Coordinated efforts among all science departments would better serve the student body, especially as all science students take courses in multiple science departments. For example, all Biology majors must take two semesters of chemistry, one semester of physics, and one semester of math. All pre-med students take four semesters of chemistry, two semesters of physics, two semesters of biology, and at least one semester of math.

-Coordinated efforts among all science departments will better address the underprepared student who is likely to face the same challenges in many different science courses throughout his/her four years at Amherst College

-Coordinated research presentations and summer research opportunities will strengthen the vitality of the research community of students, staff, and faculty.

-Coordinated efforts among the sciences will facilitate the creation of interdisciplinary teaching opportunities and research projects.

6) Renovated Science Facility

We recommend taking advantage of the necessary renovations of Merrill as a time to incorporate structural features that will facilitate implementation of the recommendations we have elaborated here. We envision this to be an opportune time to incorporate unity and flexibility into a modern science facility that is welcoming to the Amherst College community and that puts the act of doing and learning science on display.

-Interaction spaces (such as conference rooms, group project rooms with computers, student study areas, attractive comfortable environment that welcomes the entire Amherst College community)

-Small seminar-style rooms as well as larger lecture halls and flexible class rooms -Science Resource Center for students taking classes or doing research

-Flexible lab space that can be used for interdisciplinary courses with hands-on components during the academic year and can serve for directed student research during the summer.

-Additional lab space to allow greater flexibility in the scheduling of introductory science courses.

**Committee on Priorities and Resources
Summary of Discussions and Interim Recommendations on Projected**

Budget for CAP

Spring 2007

In the fall of 2006, the CPR received a preliminary budget prepared by the Treasurer's Office with projected costs for implementation of all proposals of the Committee on Academic Priorities Report (CAP). Although the figures represented very preliminary estimates, they have served as a valuable entry point for discussions not only of costs but also of possible fundraising targets for a future Amherst Campaign.

Background

The CPR was asked at that time to prioritize various aspects of the CAP proposal for presentation to a meeting of the Board of Trustees on January 19, 2007. The Committee ultimately declined that request, explaining that CAP had itself set these priorities, and that all of the CAP Report had been approved, at least in a general form, by the Faculty (see Sum and Substance Attachment to the Faculty Meeting Minutes of May 25, 2006). We did recognize that discussion of the details of implementation of many of the issues had yet to be made. That discussion was to take place under normal Faculty governance procedures involving the work of several committees, including the Committee on Educational Priorities (CEP), the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) and the CPR as well as the Faculty as a whole. We noted in our meeting with the Trustees that the CAP Report could already be used as a starting point for fundraising, but that details of how or whether to proceed on many of the specific issues awaited more general discussions with the Faculty and Administration.

After the meeting with the Trustees, the CPR, including its ex officio members, revisited the preliminary budget estimates to see where it could meaningfully assist in making specific recommendations or comments regarding possible imbalances seen in the projected costs of various aspects of the proposals. We undertook this process throughout the Spring of 2007 and held meetings with various members of the administration and staff concerning CAP-related issues, attempting to understand the processes by which various constituencies would be involved in formulating details arising from CAP recommendations and setting priorities for a future Capital Campaign.

At our meeting of April 11, 2007, Chief Advancement Officer Michael Kiefer indicated that it was important for his office to have timely feedback to decide on fundraising priorities, but it was not clear from our discussions with him or other members of the Administration who would ultimately make those priority judgments. Mr. Kiefer indicated that the CAP report did identify and support likely fundraising priority areas, including access of a wider range of students, co-curricular community service,

curricular enhancement, more faculty positions, and continuing improvements to physical facilities. These priorities would probably be made more precise by various Faculty and Trustee committees. He noted that alumni embraced the philosophy underpinning the CAP's broad goals, but wanted more details soon. Dean Call indicated that the College now was gathering Board support for more specific goals. It is clear that initiation of various CAP recommendations will occur asynchronously over a number of years, and in a few major cases has begun already.

Discussion of Budget Estimates

The draft budget concerning CAP implementation was divided into three broad categories. These are: 1) Financial Aid (for increases in international students, increases in the size of the entering class, and elimination of financial-aid-based student loans), 2) Curricular Initiatives (increase in faculty size, Center for Community Engagement, increases in the Academic Intern Program and student research grants, need-based summer language study, full sabbatical supplements for faculty, and three new staff positions, two for research and one for curricular development) and 3) Other Expenses and Facilities (six staff positions to support the increase in the student body, renovations to existing facilities and new space to accommodate expansion of faculty and new programs).

The Committee of Six in its meeting of September 25, 2006, recommended that the CPR might be involved in discussions of financial implications of all issues in the first category above, and sabbatical fellowships, a staff position for support of faculty research and creative initiatives, academic internships, and summer language programs from the second category. President Marx asked us to consider priorities for the entire budget.

The CPR was struck by two issues which it thought it might address initially: 1) the cost of increases in students and faculty, intimately entangled with issues of financial aid, space resources and support services (which combines issues from all three parts of the budget estimate), and 2) funding for student and faculty research, scholarly and artistic work and co-curricular activities, including "community engagement," arising from parts of the second category of the budget, which we believe are intermingled and related, and not entirely characterized by the label "curricular initiatives."

Costs Associated with Expansion of the Student Body and Faculty

Between the time of our meeting with the Trustees in January and the beginnings of our discussions around budgetary issues, the Faculty voted to recommend moving forward on increasing student admits and beginning expansion of FTEs (see Faculty Meeting Minutes of February 20, 2007). Setting priorities in this area have fallen primarily to the CEP and FCAFA who already have guidelines for implementation of this expansion. The expansion raises a large number of complex financial issues that will become manifest as the increases are phased in. Our concerns on this issue are the coincidental timing of faculty hiring and student expansion, and the probable needs for

new classrooms, laboratory facilities, audiovisual facilities, and expanded support services. Additional issues involve creating a support network for under-prepared students, with, for example, the need to recruit faculty for entry-level courses and support staff in the Writing and Quantitative Centers. Although the preliminary budget makes some estimates of these costs, we do not believe the needs are well enough fleshed out yet to make accurate predictions.

Lack of detail at present also makes estimates of costs for facilities to accommodate new faculty and as yet undefined programs rather imprecise. Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities Planning and Management, at his meeting with us on May 02, 2007, described incipient coordinated long-term planning efforts for construction and renovation at the College which are underway. The integration of a campus-wide space planning effort into the gradual expansion of the College's curriculum will be essential. In fact, the Physical Plant's model for such integration could be a template for further discussion of the less tangible changes that we anticipate.

The related issues of the costs of student and faculty expansion, facilities and support services, and financial aid will be further examined by the CPR in the fall of 2007.

Research and Co-Curricular Initiatives

Other than the direct costs of additional faculty, the preliminary cost estimates in the "Curricular Initiatives" category of the budget included several items that we believe are intimately related. They pertain to the major activities of our students and faculty within and outside the classroom. For students, these are "community engagement," and research and other creative work opportunities supported by the College. For faculty, they are research support and sabbatical leave. These are all priorities for a vigorous intellectual life at the College and may have varying degrees of curricular, co-curricular and extra-curricular involvement. By and large, they exist outside the classroom but help to define in a fundamental way our distinguishing characteristics as an institution, particularly through the special form of mentoring that occurs when students and faculty work in small groups to explore ideas beyond coursework. These experiences are supplemented by student internships off-campus that are also sometimes supported by College funds. Some internships involve student assistance in the development of new courses by faculty, as well as faculty research projects.

Faculty research support and sabbatical supplement. We endorse the recommendation for three positions to assist faculty in research grant applications and other curricular activities. Amherst has traditionally lagged well behind many of its peer institutions in organizing and coordinating efforts to raise outside research funding. In addition to providing funds for ongoing research and continued scholarly development of faculty, outside grants often provide student research opportunities and overhead for the College. And since we typically advertise ourselves to potential students as a place where students benefit working one-on-one on scholarly projects with faculty, these grants are an important source for sustaining and expanding such activities.

We also endorse supplementing sabbatical leave pay. The labor-intensive nature of teaching at a small liberal arts college combined with decreases in funding opportunities by external agencies make it increasingly difficult for individual faculty members to make up for the loss in pay sabbatical leave currently entails. It is difficult for faculty to find adequate time during the academic year to do much more than maintain their scholarly life, with too little time to contemplate, innovate and develop new ideas and collect new data. Sabbaticals typically provide the main sustained periods for renewal and generation of novel paths of scholarship, or for the undertaking of major projects in the performing arts, social sciences or natural sciences.

These leaves are essential for junior faculty in continuing their PhD and postdoctoral research, and for planning for the long-term projects of their post-tenure careers. Sabbaticals are no less essential for senior faculty, particularly given the longer careers now routinely undertaken. Full year sabbaticals every sixth year are to be strongly encouraged to maintain a vigorous faculty, but a loss of 20% of salary during leave can prompt faculty instead to choose one semester at full pay, especially if they are at a stage where family financial commitments are substantial, for example those with young children, children in college or those caring for aging parents. The College's interest is to nurture faculty members to maintain high levels of scholarly work throughout their full career. The rewards for the intellectual life of the College in supporting these active research programs include enriching the quality of the classroom experience and enabling broader and more intellectual conversations both within and outside the classroom, critical elements of Amherst's identity.

The Center for Community Engagement (CCE) and other support for student co-curricular activities. The CPR was joined on February 28, 2007, by Associate Dean Amrita Basu, Rhonda Cobham-Sander, Special Assistant to the President for Diversity and Inclusion, and Special Assistant to the President for Principal Gifts Robyn Piggott. They reviewed the current plans and projected budgets for the Center for Community Engagement. Professor Cobham-Sander described the evolution here and at other campuses of such programs. She emphasized that the grant from the Argosy Foundation for development of a Center for Community Engagement will allow Amherst to explore a range of ideas as it builds a program appropriate to the Amherst culture.

The Center derives from a very generous gift of approximately \$13 million to promote a widespread culture of service at the College. Plans include expansion of student volunteer opportunities, increases in the number of local partnerships with service organizations, building new partnerships with regional, national and international NGOs, and expanding public-service internship opportunities for students. Summer stipends for hundreds of students will be contingent on their regular service in local communities during the school year.

We applaud the thoughtful and generous nature of the proposed program for "community engagement". Yet the CPR recognized that this powerful initiative would have still unclear ramifications for the College's planning for a campaign, as well as for its continuing curricular and fiscal obligations.

We noted the following important points: 1) the portion of the CCE budget devoted to student employment opportunities dwarfs the sum of all other student employment support for research and internships, 2) the budget's indicated necessity for a robust infrastructure to run the program, including seven new positions and two current positions, and centralized office space, 3) the likelihood that, by virtue of its size and visibility, the Center will convey a message that this will be a highly valued activity, perhaps implying that that it might be more valued than other equally important student activities, and 4) the gift represents a rare form of targeted funding which is exceptional historically if indeed it does not set a precedent. These points are considered in order below.

1. *Other College-supported student research opportunities and academic internships.* Support for students in the form of research funds used for student salaries on campus arises from many sources: the Dean of Faculty's Student Research Fund, which supports a wide range of research activities, Academic Internship Awards (formerly Mellon Academic Internships) which usually originate from faculty-initiated projects that would benefit from student involvement, the Faculty Research Awards Program (FRAP), departmental budgets for academic year student research assistance, Federal Grants such as NSF and NIH investigator-originated projects with budget lines for student involvement, other extramural grants such as the Howard Hughes Medical Institutes Program for summer science projects for underclassmen in the sciences, and various other restricted funds. The budget for these activities projected for 2008 is about half of the budget for community-based activities supported by the Argosy fund. Many of these sources of support are variable, dependent on the success of institutional and individual competition for outside grants. Much of what is supported is co-curricular by nature, extending classroom learning into research environments. Much takes place in the summer. Support usually incorporates substantial hidden costs, since many of the programs provide little administrative support (which instead originates from established administrative offices and extra faculty time), little if any technical support and relatively small supply budgets. There is little coordination of the various programs. The Dean of Faculty should be commended for increasing support from the Dean's Office for summer student research and academic internships in recent years, but this is still insufficient to meet all the needs of providing regular opportunities for large numbers of students to work one-on-one with faculty on scholarly pursuits.

2. *Infrastructure.* The combined supported research activities and academic internships are in stark contrast with the proposed CCE activities. The CCE plans to add seven new administrative positions and incorporate two existing ones to coordinate the program, and its budget includes training programs, workshops, fees for community partners, stipends for participating faculty, funds for activities in both summer and the academic year, additional staff, distinguished speakers, program assessment and advisory board meetings, travel and transportation. The Director, according to the organizational chart supplied to the Committee, will report directly to the President's Office, establishing the position in some ways on a par with the Dean of the Faculty and Dean of Students. Funds are essentially guaranteed for seven years, after which support may revert to endowed funds. By contrast, other student activities which comprise a

wide range of intellectual pursuits are not coordinated, have little or no funding for infrastructure (e.g., supplies, administrative and technical positions, faculty stipends, outside speakers or a central office), and have more unpredictable sources of funding.

Coordination of the varied activities that the College now supports under the umbrella of student research activities and internships, with an office and director, would facilitate applications and distribution of funds and give these activities enhanced visibility. These activities might be grouped as intellectual programs, scholarly projects or creative activities to give them a prominence and coherence they currently lack.

Infrastructure support in addition to a director and office might include a committee to review applications. Requirements for additional personnel, supplies and travel requirements would be discipline-dependent, and these would augment and facilitate the kinds of faculty-student interactions that should be a hallmark of our institution to distinguish Amherst from most small liberal arts colleges and universities of quality. We are not prepared at this time to outline in detail how a coordinated effort for student research and academic internships might function, but could imagine some aspects. Personnel needs might include post-doctoral fellows or technicians in science labs, temporary employment of performers for large scale works in music and dance, travel budgets to support visits to distant libraries with specialized holdings in languages, humanities or social sciences and for student attendance at professional meetings to present their own work or learn about our professional lives outside the College. Supplies might range from paint and canvas, to lab reagents, to raw materials for stage sets. A creative review committee would be important in imagining the possibilities and should poll the faculty concerning what would be necessary to fruitfully expand student/faculty research opportunities and collaborations in various fields.

3. *Visibility and student choices.* By virtue of its size, the Argosy grant will send the intended message that the College values highly commitment to community activities. The Dean of the Faculty told the CPR that it was the hope that 75% of students would take part in at least one CCE internship experience during their undergraduate years. We do not disagree with the message, but it seems to us that the program will have a major impact on student choices of extra- or co-curricular activities at which they spend their time, and possibly even on choice of majors. While we agree that community-based activities (and experiential learning) need to be emphasized at Amherst, as the CAP Report recommended, there are many other equally valuable activities that could suffer, given choices between guaranteed support and limited support. In addition, some concern was raised by students on the CPR that the funds would significantly influence students' academic and career decisions, choice of majors and possibly even affect the degree to which students could participate in political activities and other civic projects not explicitly funded by the CCE. Further concerns were raised about its effects on the work-study program (diverting student job distributions toward Center-funded academic year activities), and on how in practice it would interact with the College's academic mission and course distribution. A compensatory increase in student research and internship programs would alleviate these real and perceived imbalances.

4. *Targeted funds.* Since the gift of the Argosy Foundation is targeted to a single objective, even though richly varied in potential activities, it raises the issue of the type of fund-raising to be conducted in a future Campaign. It is our understanding in discussions with Michael Kiefer and our experience in previous Campaigns that unrestricted funds are preferred because of their flexibility. However Mr. Kiefer pointed out, as a result of the changing demographics of alumni populations, donors are becoming increasingly more interested in targeting donations. If the pursuit of targeted donations becomes a major objective of the next Campaign, it is important to recognize this alteration, since it may be necessary and indeed fruitful to find specific areas of the CAP recommendations especially suited to individual or corporate donors. In this case, the Faculty might serve as a more valuable resource than in previous campaigns.

Recommendations

In light of these considerations, we recommend that:

1. In order to extend the curricular experiences and enrich the intellectual life of Amherst's students, the College increase its funding for student research and internships, with primary emphasis on opportunities to work with Amherst faculty on campus or off, summer and academic year.
2. The College enhance and augment the visibility of student-faculty scholarly interactions by designating a coordinator for the myriad research programs and opportunities now available, and for future such initiatives.
3. The College recognize the special needs and hidden costs resulting from the wide range of scholarship of the faculty through support of appropriate forms of infrastructure, in addition to student stipends. Such recognition might include a faculty advisory committee, informed by broad campus discussion, to work with a coordinator to develop guidelines and budgets.
4. The College recognize in word and deed, e.g. office space and publicity, the significance of student research and internship activities to our core educational mission, ensuring they are on a par with community-based initiatives.
5. To facilitate and encourage continuous scholarly renewal of the faculty, sabbatical supplements sufficient to bring sabbatical pay for all faculty to 100% be an objective of the Campaign.
6. A campus-wide space planning process be initiated in response to the projected increases in students and faculty.
7. Finally, in order to anticipate the physical and fiscal requirements for smoothly integrating the rich and varied proposals arising from CAP, the CPR and similar committees and administrative groups must monitor closely both projected and unexpected costs associated with these substantive changes.

Respectfully submitted,

Dominic Poccia, Chair
Sean Redding
Ronald Rosbottom
Jonathan Borowsky '07
Callie Fogler '07
Mirza Ali Khan '08

Members of the Committee on Priorities and Resources, 2006-07

Amended October 15, 2007

The fifth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2007-2008 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, October 1, 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 "Announcements from the President." President Marx noted that, in the Committee's recent discussion about faculty committees, important issues relating to their structure, oversight, and number had been the focus. In addition to considering how committees are constituted and what they do, the President suggested that it might be useful for the Committee to think about how committees work. He asked whether the practice of having most chairs serve for only one year adds to the burden of the Faculty, because colleagues are continually working to bring themselves up to speed in a role that may be new to them. He asked if having greater continuity in chairmanships of major committees would result in faculty members' investment of time being put to more efficient use and whether greater continuity would allow chairs to bring the expertise that they develop in their first year to a second year. The Dean noted that the desirability of having chairs serve for two consecutive years has not been considered, generally, when committee assignments are made. He said that faculty leaves often interrupt continuous committee service. Professor Servos noted that there have been occasions, under unusual circumstances, when a colleague's chairmanship has been extended beyond a year. While commenting that having committee chairs serve for two years seems reasonable, Professor George noted that committees most often operate on the basis of consensus, and he said that, in the operation of many committees, the chair's role does not differ significantly from that of the other members of a committee.

President Marx said that having department chairs serve for at least two years might also be beneficial, for the same reasons that he had outlined in relation to committee chairs. Professor Jagannathan asked whether there is already a structure in place for having department chairs serve for more than one year, but no more than three. Dean Call noted that, according to the *Faculty Handbook*, the term of a chair's appointment may vary, but a Chair typically serves no more than three consecutive years. The Dean noted that, as with committees, the terms of chairs often vary because of leave schedules. President Marx commented that, in four to six departments it is typical for chairs to serve for only one year, and in other departments, service ranges from two to three years.

Professors Sinos and Jagannathan asked the President if problems are arising from the length of chairs' terms. President Marx responded that chairs of committees often legitimately need time to get up to speed each year. Professor Sinos said that a benefit of the regular rotation of faculty chairs is that it allows a significant number of faculty members to participate in faculty governance and to learn about different areas of the College. Dean Call said that having the Faculty serve as committee chairs for two consecutive years would diminish the amount of time faculty must devote to the learning curve needed for these positions and that the knowledge gained by chairs might be put to use effectively. Professor Sinos noted that faculty often serve on committees for a year and then use the experience that they have gained in the role of chair the following year.

Amended October 15, 2007

Returning to the topic of the length of service of department chairs, Professor George noted that chairs do not have a very powerful role at Amherst, and purposefully so. A relatively short term helps to ensure that chairs do not consolidate power. Professor Frank noted that learning how to be a good chair takes time, and she said that it's hard to gain a foothold on the duties when the term is relatively brief. Professor Sinos commented that chairs had longer terms at Amherst in the past, and that it was felt that difficulties arose as a result. Professor O'Hara commented that, because of the lack of continuity of the chairmanship, tenure-track professors might receive different messages about their progress.

Continuing the discussion, Professor Jagannathan noted that individual colleagues have strengths and weaknesses, and, while it might be prudent to do so, it can be awkward for departments to choose a colleague to be chair based on whether he or she has administrative talent. Thus, the selection can become a mechanical process. Professor Servos noted that larger departments have the luxury of taking colleagues' ability and experience into consideration when electing chairs, but that smaller departments must use a system of regular rotation. President Marx expressed confidence that Amherst faculty members can do an excellent job as chair for a term of two years. Professor Frank said that she would welcome the opportunity to discuss issues of governance and service, including the consideration of additional compensation—in the form of course relief, earlier leaves, or “amnesty” from future service on major committees for a stipulated period, for example—for faculty who take on roles at the College beyond teaching and scholarship that place significant demands on their time. President Marx said that he would be open to such a conversation and suggested that the members develop a list of possible approaches and include the pros and cons of adopting them. The Committee could then discuss this issue at a future meeting. The members agreed. As a final comment about committees, Professor Jagannathan noted that it would be helpful for faculty members, when they are appointed to a particular committee, to be given a sense of the rhythm and flow of the work of the committee, so that they can plan their schedules accordingly. The Dean and the other members agreed.

President Marx informed the members that Professor Cobham-Sander has been planning to step down from her position as Special Assistant to the President for Diversity at the end of 2007. He expressed his gratitude for the fine work that she has done and for her willingness to serve in this role for an extended term. President Marx noted that additional progress needs to be made in the area of diversity for both faculty and staff. He remarked on the relative lack of diversity within the Faculty and staff, while noting the success that Amherst has had in constituting a diverse student body. The President said that this is a particularly critical moment for moving forward in the area of diversity. As Amherst moves toward a major demographic shift in the Faculty in the coming decade, it is paramount that the College—using all of the tools at its disposal, including bridge appointments and targeted “opportunity” hires, as recommended by the Committee on Academic Priorities—build a Faculty that is both of the highest quality and which is reflective of the diversity of the student body. He asked the members to give him advice on how best to address the issue of increasing diversity at Amherst, and the Committee agreed to return to this subject soon.

Amended October 15, 2007

Dean Call next made a series of announcements. He reported that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), at the Committee of Six's suggestion, had considered possible models for moving forward a proposal for a new major in Film Studies and decided that it would recommend that a group of interested colleagues—perhaps those who were members of the Dean's Advisory Committee on Film and New Media that brought a proposal to the CEP—come together and apply for funding from the Dean and submit a proposal to the CEP in the spring. Dean Call said that he plans to meet with those colleagues who have expressed interest in working on such a proposal for a major in Film Studies.

The Dean informed the members that, during the month of October, Kenneth Rosenthal '62 and Lizzie Barker, the new Director and Chief Curator of the Mead Art Museum, will be leading a series of meal-time conversations about the future of the Mead with faculty members, students, staff, alumni, and community members. It is Mr. Rosenthal and Ms. Barker's hope that at least one representative from every academic department will be able to participate, and they would welcome additional faculty participation in the form of written comments and/or the completion of a forthcoming survey, Dean Call said. He noted that these discussions will help the Mead shape its goals for the coming years, in keeping with the needs of its constituencies and the demands of the curriculum. The conversations will serve as the conclusion to a strategic planning process begun more than two years ago by the ad hoc Mead Study Committee and will provide Ms. Barker with an opportunity to learn more about what the faculty needs from the museum. Dean Call said that the rapid pace of this process has been dictated by the Mead's upcoming reaccreditation review by the American Association of Museums (AAM). These conversations are being held in October so that a draft of the results can be shared with the AAM reviewers during their November site visit. At the conclusion of the Dean's announcement, Professor Sinos said that she appreciated Ms. Barker's efforts to involve the Faculty in the museum, and several members said that they have been impressed with Ms. Barker's plans and ideas. Professor Sinos expressed the hope that Ms. Barker would view the Faculty as allies and their involvement in the museum as a vehicle for drawing students to the Mead.

President Marx noted that, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) and the Faculty's expression of support for college-wide programs in artistic practice in the form of both FTEs and other initiatives, the College has been investing in the arts in a number of ways. He commented that, in addition to efforts to make the Mead a more visible and welcoming presence, a campus-wide collaborative art program took place on September 28. Dean Call noted in the same vein that the theme of this year's Copeland Colloquium is Art and Identity, and that the Copeland Fellows—who are practicing artists—will be making a variety of presentations over the course of the year. This is the first year of a three-year pilot program in which the Copeland Program has a project theme and the Fellows will be on campus for a full year.

Dean Call, noting that some questions have emerged, offered clarification on aspects of the procedures for promotion to the rank of Professor. Changes to these procedures were approved by the Faculty in 2006-2007 and have taken effect this year. He reminded the members that promotion to the rank of Professor may originate with the department or with the

Amended October 15, 2007

candidate and usually occurs between six and eight years after the tenure decision. Candidates may put themselves forward in requesting that a promotion committee be formed. A candidate's promotion committee consists of all tenured full professors in his or her department(s) and, at the request of the candidate, may include up to two other tenured 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. The Dean noted that the Promotion Committee decides whether or not to bring the case forward. In the case of joint appointments, there is one promotion committee, which is made up of the tenured full professors from both departments, and, again, may include up to two other tenured full professors from the College Faculty, chosen by the candidate, in consultation with the Dean. 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 promotion committee. Should the department have one member at the rank of tenured full professor, he or she will also serve. Again, at the request of the candidate, the promotion committee may include up to two other tenured full professors from the College Faculty, chosen by the candidate in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty.

Professor O'Hara asked if the Promotion Committee can decide that a case not be brought forward, even if the candidate has asked for his or her case to be reviewed. The Dean said that the committee may make that recommendation. President Marx expressed some concern with the candidate playing the major role in choosing some members of the Promotion Committee who will judge his or her case. Some members wondered what protections were in place to ensure that the committee was constituted fairly. It was noted that only the candidate (but not the department) could add members from outside the department, and that the reason for doing so should be to have colleagues on the committee who have a good understanding of work that may have moved in interdisciplinary directions. The thought is that department members might be less familiar with work outside their fields. Having the Dean consult with the candidate about which additional colleagues are added to the committee should ensure fairness.

The Committee turned to a personnel matter. Turning briefly to the upcoming consideration of this year's tenure cases, the President and the Dean discussed the process of the members' review (for all cases), at the meeting of October 15, of the departmental recommendation; the characterizations of the outside reviewers; the outside reviewers' CVs; a description of the process by which the outside reviewers were chosen and information about their relationship, if any, to the candidate; and the outside reviewers' letters for each case). The President said that the purpose of this review is for the Committee to form a preliminary judgment as to whether there seems to be a sufficient array of letters, whether the qualifications and academic foci of the reviewers seem appropriate, and whether the level of engagement of the reviewers with the scholarship of the candidates appears to be satisfactory. If the members feel that additional letters are needed, the department will be contacted about how to proceed with providing them. Professor O'Hara suggested that the Committee also receive the Dean's letter to the Chair about tenure so that the members can review what departments were asked to provide to the Committee. The Dean agreed to provide the letter, along with the other materials.

Amended October 15, 2007

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Servos said that, he wished to express dismay over the announced resignations in the Frost Library’s Archives and Special Collections. Daria D’Arienzo, Head of Archives and Special Collections, and John Lancaster, a distinguished, long-time Archives and Special Collections Librarian at the College who retired from Amherst at the end of 2005 and who has been working on a part-time basis as Archives and Special Collections Cataloger, have decided to leave the College in December. Other members concurred with Professor Servos’s sense that their retirements constitute a loss for the College. The President and the Dean said that they too regretted that these fine colleagues have chosen to retire from these positions.

The Committee next discussed the request (appended) from Professors Dizard, on behalf of Professors Clotfelter, Cox, Delaney, Demorest, Hagadorn, Harms, Lopez, Martini, McKinney, Miller, Moore, Reyes, Servos, and Temeles that the Committee of Six place a motion to create an Environmental Studies major before the Faculty and reviewed draft catalog copy for the major. Professor Servos informed the members that he would not vote on this issue, since he is a member of the group proposing the major. He asked for guidance from the Committee about whether he should speak during the discussion. The Dean said that practice has been that a colleague in this position has provided answers to questions of information. The Committee agreed that it would be valuable for Professor Servos to participate in this way.

The Committee expressed great enthusiasm for the College having a major in Environmental Studies. Professor Sinos asked if the number of science courses that would be required would provide sufficient grounding in the sciences, and the scientists on the Committee, in particular, had strong views on this subject. Professors O’Hara and George expressed concern that the required science courses being proposed for the major did not include labs. Professor George wondered about the logic of having the one required natural science course (Biology 23) be a non-lab course, while also listing its prerequisite, Biology 18 (which does have labs), as an elective. Professor O’Hara agreed, noting that Chemistry 38, which is listed as an elective, also has a prerequisite, Chemistry 12, which itself has a prerequisite, Chemistry 11 or 15. All of these courses do have labs, she noted. Both Professor George and Professor O’Hara expressed concern about the “hidden” requirements that lie beneath the surface of the courses that are being proposed for the new major. Returning to the subject of the science content within the proposed major, Professor Jagannathan noted that, while he is very supportive of the proposed program, he was surprised that none of the required courses would appear to offer a foundational knowledge of basic concepts in the areas of energy and entropy. He said that this content could be offered through a chemistry or physics course, or a course designed specifically to be a part of the curriculum for the major.

Professor O’Hara said that she hopes that the Department of Chemistry’s participation can grow beyond the single course now listed as an elective. Noting that most pre-medical students take Chemistry 11 in the fall, she said that she could conceive of the department offering, for example, a “green” version of Chemistry 11 in the spring. She asked Professor Servos if the courses for the major would be flexible. He responded that there is certainly room for additional courses to be included in the major, and he said that the faculty group that has been

Amended October 15, 2007

shepherding this proposal through would encourage other faculty to participate. He noted that for this proposal, the group was not suggesting a definitive curriculum, but had assembled courses from what was already being offered at the College, which, in aggregate, seemed sufficient to constitute a major comparable to those offered by the College's peers.

Continuing the conversation, Professor O'Hara noted that a quick review of the programs of some peer institutions revealed that most majors had more than one required science class. One member pointed out that the proposal was for a program in Environmental Studies rather than Environmental Science. Professor Servos said that different Environmental Studies programs have different emphases. President Marx asked for clarification on how the process for approving the major would move forward. If the Faculty voted to create a major based on the Environmental Studies group's proposal, could the parameters and/or courses of the major be changed by the Environmental Studies Program in the future? Could a course in chemistry become a requirement, for example? The Committee said that they believed that such changes could be made. Elaborating on the process, Professor George noted that departments inform the CEP, basically as a courtesy, when they make extensive changes to their departmental curricula. He said that he would imagine that the same process would be followed for making changes to the new major in Environmental Studies once it was established. President Marx asked if the understanding is that the Faculty votes on a major based on a proposal that offers some sense of the parameters and then allows for organic processes to balance any curricular shifts that might be needed. He asked what the authority would be for such shifts. The members said that the CEP would be such an authority.

Professor Jagannathan said that, drawing on the courses that Amherst already offers as a means of creating the major may well be fine. The current proposal demonstrates the feasibility of such a major. However, he thought it would be better if the argument for the major is less constituency driven. Professor Jagannathan noted that he would like to see the proposal shaped differently. He said that intellectual arguments that will shape the major and the foundational ideas should be placed up front. In his view, the major should have required courses that are appropriate for the major, which do not have hidden prerequisites, and the other members agreed. The Committee also agreed that a major in Environmental Studies should be approved. The hope would be that the proposed program would later be broadened through the addition of more interdisciplinary courses. Some members argued that at least one lab-based course should be a required part of the major. Professor O'Hara wondered if Colloquium 22, which would be the foundational introductory course for the major, might include some of the basic scientific content that the members had been discussing, and even a lab. The Committee said that they would like to see a concrete proposal brought before the Faculty this fall, and they felt that the proposal should be restructured along the lines outlined by Professor Jagannathan. The members agreed that the proposal should not be delayed, but that it could be stronger.

Professor Servos asked why the scientists on the Committee felt that lab experiences would be so important. Professor Jagannathan said that labs often help to make abstract concepts real and tangible for students. Professor Servos suggested that the proposed major is meant to be flexible enough to allow students to associate a variety of sciences with their interests in

Amended October 15, 2007

environmental policy, history, or economics. Some might be interested in field biology, others ecology, for example. Professor George said he thought that students with those interests should be doing at least some labs in the field. Professor Sinos asked, in reference to the proposal's claim to include humanities, how the humanities have been incorporated into the major. Professor Servos noted that the electives include history courses (he said that he views history as a humanities discipline) and a philosophy course. Professor Servos noted that the hope is that, in the future, an FTE in environmental history will teach a regular broad survey of environmental history, as well as other courses within the major. He commented that the Department of Economics is currently searching for an environmental economist and that the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science is searching for a statistician who would teach biostatistics. He hoped that both of these colleagues would teach courses that would contribute to the major. Professor George said that he had been concerned about the prospect that students, particularly those majoring in Biology and Geology, might use the Environmental Studies major as a second major of convenience. He was pleased to see that, in the proposal, few of the required courses would overlap among these majors, so significant "double-counting" of courses toward two majors could not occur.

President Marx noted that it appears that colleagues in History and on last year's CEP have a continued interest in a new FTE in environmental history, which would support the focus of the major, as proposed. The Department of Chemistry, if it wished to become more involved in the new major, could likewise make a proposal to the CEP for an environmental chemist, which would fall within the CAP's recommendation that interdisciplinarity be fostered as a college-wide priority. Another option might be that the department applies for an FTE to teach the courses currently being taught by a member of the department, so other department members could teach courses in environmental chemistry, if they desired to do so.

At the conclusion of the conversation, Professor Servos said that the Environmental Studies group would support colleagues in other departments offering more courses in Environmental Studies. At this juncture, he said, the group feels that it is important to begin to provide Amherst students with the opportunity to major in Environmental Studies. The members agreed, but asked that the Environmental Studies group reformulate the proposal so that there is a greater emphasis on the intellectual arguments for the major and the strengths of the proposed program within the field of Environmental Studies.

At 5:00 the Committee was joined by attorneys Jim Wallace and Vincent O'Rourke, who reviewed tenure procedures with the Committee and answered questions about the tenure process.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

AMHERST COLLEGE
American Studies - Sociology

Jan E. Dizard, Charles Hamilton Houston Professor of American Culture

28 September 2007

Gregory S. Call
The Dean of the Faculty &
The Committee of Six

Dear Colleagues:

We write to request that you place a motion to create an Environmental Studies major before the faculty, hopefully in a meeting this fall. There is a very specific reason why we think this should be dealt with this fall: there are two searches underway, one for an economist who specializes in environmental economics and the other for a second statistician to enable the Mathematics and Computer Science Department to offer a new course or a section of an existing course that emphasizes environmental issues in statistics. We think having a major to which these new hires can contribute will enhance our ability to attract the strongest candidates.

This said, there are broader programmatic reasons why we think the time is ripe for a major in environmental studies. Several years ago, with support from the PIF program, we surveyed what comparable institutions (Middlebury, Williams, Colby, Oberlin, Carleton, among others) were doing in this field. We discovered that we were far behind the curve. Virtually all small liberal arts colleges have environmental studies majors, majors that require science courses with labs as well as humanistic and policy oriented social science courses.

As we met and talked about what other institutions were doing, we recognized that we were very close to having a critical mass of faculty, drawn from across the curriculum, that would make it possible for us to offer a major in environmental studies. With the abovementioned searches underway, and with a visiting position in environmental history and a commitment from the History Department to make it a priority to seek a tenure track position in environmental history, we are confident that we can offer a robust major beginning next year.

Two years ago last spring, we submitted a proposal for an Environmental Studies program to the CEP. The CEP was strongly supportive. In fact, they asked us why we were not pressing for a major. Our answer was straightforward: we needed two key new positions (one in economics, the other in history) in order to offer a major. Pending those appointments, the Committee of Six voted to create a "program" in environmental studies, which was included in the Course Catalog for 2006-07 and continues in the current (2007-08) Catalog.

In the meantime, in anticipation of an eventual major, Peter Crowley and Jan Dizard, with PIF support, offered Colloquium 22, "The Resilient ? Earth," in 2005-06 and 2006-07 which is intended as an introductory course to the environmental studies major. (Dizard and Ethan Clotfelter will teach a similar colloquium in the spring semester, 2008.)

Student interest is high-Pick Colloquia have been at or near the cap of twenty students; Colloquium 22 has had 35-40 students; last year visiting assistant professor John Broich had solid enrollments in his environmental history courses; this year's visitor in environmental history, Jill Payne, despite the fact that her courses came in too late to be included in the College Catalog also has fifteen or more students in each of her environmental history courses this fall. In addition, a number of us have been fielding questions from an increasing number of students interested in majoring in environmental studies.

With faculty commitment strong, student interest growing, searches underway for faculty critical to launching a major, we think it is now time for the faculty to decide if Environmental Studies should be added as a major.

We are appending herewith, for illustrative purposes, a draft of catalog copy describing the major. The courses and requirements listed are necessarily illustrative since we cannot, at this juncture, know what courses the new environmental economist and new statistician will teach. The offerings in environmental history will also depend, first, on a visitor next year and, hopefully, a tenure track appointee who will begin teaching in the fall of 2009. But what we can confidently say is that there will be new courses directly relevant to environmental studies in economics, history, and mathematics/statistics. When we are in a position to specify these courses, we will submit the major program to the CEP for formal review and another vote of the faculty approving the actual major program.

Sincerely,

Jan E. Dizard
(on behalf of Professors Clotfelter, Cox, Delaney,
Demorest, Hagadorn, Harms, Lopez, Martini,
McKinney, Miller, Moore, Reyes, Servos, and Temeles)

cc: Professor Martha Umphrey, Chair of the CEP

attached: draft catalog copy of proposed environmental studies major

A draft of catalog copy for an environmental studies major

Advisory Committee: Professors Clotfelter, Cox, Crowley, Delaney, Demorest, Dizard (Chair), Hagadorn, Lopez, Martini, McKinney, Miller, J. Moore, Payne, 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 beginning of agriculture. Since then, humans have had a steadily increasing impact on the natural world. Environmental Studies is a field that explores the complex interactions between humans and nature. This exploration requires grounding in the sciences, humanities and social sciences. To major in this field, six courses are required, which collectively reflect this interdisciplinary commitment. Beyond these required core courses, majors will take at least four electives. A capstone seminar must also be taken. In the fall of the senior year, the successful completion of which will constitute passing the comprehensive requirement. For those seniors intending to write an honors thesis, the required seminar may be waived. For others who are uncertain about conducting senior thesis research, seminar work may lead to an honors thesis to be completed in the second semester of the senior year.

Required Courses.

1. Introductory Course (now Colloquium 22), team taught
2. Biology 23 ("Ecology")
3. A statistics course
4. An environmental economics course
5. An environmental history 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 38 (Atmospheric Chemistry)
6. Economics (Quite possibly a course focused on Economics and Environmental Policy)
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 (environmental history courses currently being taught by visitors and thus changing from year to year)
13. UST 35 (Law's Nature: Humans, the Environment, and the Predicament of Law)

15. Philosophy 24 (Environmental Philosophy) To be introduced by Professor Moore
16. Pick Colloquia (one each semester-topics change from year to year)
17. Psychology 46 (Environmental Psychology)
18. Sociology 40 (The Social Construction. of Nature)

Amended October 29, 2007

The sixth 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, October 15, 2007. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Dean informed the members that Jenny Kallick, Professor of Music; David Schneider, Associate Professor of Music; and Adam Sitze, Assistant Professor of Law, Jurisprudence and Social Thought, have agreed to serve on the Memorial Minute Committee for Mirjana Lausevic, Joseph E. and Grace W. Valentine Visiting Assistant Professor of Music in 2006-2007. Professor Lausevic died on July 15, 2007. Dean Call said that he is working to form a Memorial Minute Committee for Ernest Alfred Johnson, Professor of Romance Languages, Emeritus.

In light of the Committee's recommendation that the proposal for a new Environmental Studies major be reformulated to reflect a greater emphasis on the intellectual arguments for the major and the strengths of the proposed program within the field of Environmental Studies, the Dean asked if the Committee wished to meet with representatives of the faculty group that has developed the proposal for the Environmental Studies major. The Committee agreed that a meeting would be helpful, and Dean Call agreed to ask the Environmental Studies group to send some representatives to meet with the Committee of Six on October 22.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor George inquired about the committee that will review the functions and structure of the Office of the Registrar, which was discussed by the Committee of Six on September 10. Professor George noted that, since Mr. Mager, the current Registrar, will leave his position at the end of March, there does not seem to be much time to do the review and also to have a search for a replacement. He wondered if the committee has been named. He also asked whether consideration of the structure of the Registrar's office might include possibly changing the reporting line of the office so that it would no longer be on the faculty side of the College's organizational chart. Professor George expressed concern about any changes in structure that might erode faculty control over the awarding of academic credit for the degrees Amherst confers and/or the independence of the Registrar in implementing the policies approved by the Faculty. He also asked if the Dean remained committed to having a faculty member chair the committee and to having another faculty member serve on it. In the same vein, Professor Sinos commented that some faculty members have conveyed concerns to her about the possible weakening of the role of the Registrar as the Faculty's representative, should a restructuring result in a change in the reporting line.

The Dean said that, after consulting with colleagues, he has become convinced that the best approach is to have the committee initiate a search for a new Registrar and consider simultaneously the functions and structure of the office. He noted that Allen Hart, Professor of Psychology and Dean of New Students, has agreed to chair the committee; his experience on the Faculty and in the Dean of Students office gives him a broad perspective on the work of the

Amended October 29, 2007

Registrar's office. The Dean said that he would announce the members of the committee soon and that there would be one additional faculty member.

Professor George noted that having a committee run a search while simultaneously engaging in a reconsideration of the basic function and organizational place of a College office seems unusual. Dean Call responded that it has been his experience on a number of search committees that the search process itself may reveal not only an excellent pool of candidates, but that it may also help educate the search committee about the range of organizational models and practices at peer institutions. It is his hope that by focusing on the search, the committee may also learn whether there are models or practices at other institutions that would be interesting to investigate. Dean Call said that, under Mr. Mager's leadership, the College has had a well-functioning office that provides excellent service to faculty and students. However, with the Registrar's retirement, the impending move to online registration, and the increasing demands for data and the astute analysis of it, it seems an opportune moment, perhaps even a necessity, to examine what the College does with its most important academic information and how the Amherst community's expectations for excellent service and analysis can best be met and how resources can be most efficiently allocated.

Professor Servos said that he shares some of Professor George's concerns and is puzzled about how a review of the functions of the Office of the Registrar will interdigitate with a search for a new Registrar. He commented on the recent growth in the staffing of the Dean's office and asked if the College may be missing an opportunity to look at how multiple pieces of the administration relate to one another. The Dean noted that it is his hope that the committee that will focus on the Registrar's search will begin the process of studying the functions and the structure of the office, but that no specific plans will be made in terms of reorganization until the new Registrar arrives—so that he or she can be involved. Professor Jagannathan asked what candidates for the position will be told in this regard. The Dean said that they will be informed that the selected candidate will play a role in developing the office and negotiating change, if needed. The Dean said that, while there is no presumption that the reporting line will change, he would not foreclose the possibility.

Professor George reiterated that his concern is that, if the Registrar were no longer to report to the Dean of the Faculty, it would be more difficult for him or her to resist pressures to grant credit for courses that may not meet the Faculty's standards. Professor George noted that half of all students who graduate from the College receive transfer credit for courses taken on study abroad programs or at other colleges outside the Five Colleges toward their Amherst degree. The Dean said that he does not believe that having a different reporting line would necessarily diminish the independence of the Registrar. He noted that the Registrar currently vets Five-College registrations to determine if courses at other institutions meet Amherst's criteria for a liberal arts course. If courses are questionable in the Registrar's mind, they are forwarded to Associate Dean Griffiths, who renders a judgment. This practice would remain the same even if the reporting line changed, Dean Call said. He emphasized that no decision about changing the reporting line has been made. Professors Sinos and Jagannathan commented that they have worked collaboratively with the Registrar regarding course approvals for courses being

Amended October 29, 2007

taken at other institutions and have found that the current process works well. The Registrar has asked pointed questions and has examined details closely.

Professors George and Sinos noted that, in the past, a President had tried to influence the Registrar to award credit for a particular course. President Marx said that he would never have imagined such a scenario. Professor O'Hara said that, clearly, some faculty members feel that there is at least symbolic significance to having the Registrar report to the Dean of the Faculty. Dean Call said that he would continue to protect the interests of the Faculty.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Frank said that she had been asked by a colleague to convey that the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Support has questions about its charge. The Dean said that he believes that the membership and purview of the committee were broadened, as a result of conversations over the last couple of years, to include a focus on support in areas beyond the quantitative, including writing. Two faculty members from outside the sciences were added to the committee and are contributing to its work effectively, by many accounts. The Committee agreed that it would be useful to clarify the charge of the committee. The Dean noted that standing committees and their charge are voted into existence by the Faculty, with language included in the *Faculty Handbook*. If committees are ad hoc, they often receive a letter outlining their charge, he said. Several members wondered how the Committee on Academic Support is functioning in its expanded role. President Marx asked if the committee had any oversight role for both the writing center and the quantitative center, for example. Professor Servos said that it appears that it might be time to have a discussion about the Committee on Academic Support becoming a standing committee of the Faculty and developing a formal charge for it. Professor Frank agreed that the time appears to be ripe for such consideration. While there have been many informal efforts in regard to academic support, she said, a new standing committee could coordinate new and emerging initiatives and would be in keeping with the College's commitment to support as fully as possible the students who are admitted.

The Dean suggested that the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Support could work on developing its charge. Professor Jagannathan recommended that Professor O'Hara, in her new role as Senior Advisor to the Dean for Academic Life (beginning officially in 2008-2009) might gather the many interested constituencies—those that are involved in the Summer Science Program or peer mentoring, for example—to consider the charge and the structure of the committee. The members, the Dean, and the President, agreed that having Professor O'Hara coordinate this effort would be beneficial, and she agreed to take on a leadership role in this effort.

Continuing the conversation, Professor George wondered if the reporting lines of the directors of the Quantitative and Writing Centers might be reconsidered. He noted that Susan Snively, Director of the Writing Center, recently announced her retirement. Several members agreed that consideration could be given to organizing these centers for academic support under the Dean of Faculty's office, rather than within the Dean of Students office, as recommended for the Writing Center by an external review team. Professor O'Hara commented that this was an issue in the hiring of the first Director of the Quantitative Center. At least one highly qualified

Amended October 29, 2007

candidate lost interest in the position once it became clear that the director would have duties as an Associate Dean of Students, in addition to his or her other responsibilities. Professor Jagannathan asked whether the new Senior Advisors to the Dean for Academic Life might play a role in overseeing these positions, if they were shifted to the Dean's office.

The Committee turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 29, 2007

The seventh 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, October 22, 2007. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Committee turned briefly to personnel matters.

The Dean next distributed to the members a document (appended), prepared by Professor Dizard, that provides background regarding the proposed Environmental Studies major. The Committee reviewed this information before being joined, at 3:30 P.M., by Professors Dizard, Harms, and Temeles, who had accepted the members' invitation to meet with the Committee on behalf of the faculty group that is developing a proposal for the Environmental Studies major. Professor Dizard thanked the members for meeting with him and his colleagues; the Dean, on behalf of the Committee, said that the members were pleased to do so.

Discussion began with Professor Dizard responding to the concern expressed by Professor Jagannathan in the Committee of Six minutes of October 1, 2007, that none of the required courses for the proposed major would appear to offer a foundational knowledge of basic concepts in the areas of energy and entropy. Professor Dizard noted that he had inadvertently left Physics 9 off the list of electives for the major, but the intention of the group is to include this course. Professor Jagannathan reiterated that, while it is his hope that this content will be part of the curriculum of the new major, it could be offered through a chemistry or physics course, or a course designed specifically to be a part of the curriculum for the major, and not necessarily through a physics course. Responding to a question posed in the minutes about whether the proposed program would later be broadened through the addition of more interdisciplinary courses, Professor Dizard said that the list of courses in the proposal was meant to be illustrative and not fixed, and that they did not represent a terminus by any means. He was pleased to learn from the minutes that the Department of Chemistry would be interested in contributing courses to the program, noting that it was the Environmental Studies group's hope that precisely this sort of interest would emerge once a major became concrete, rather than hypothetical. Professor Dizard noted that the group had decided to launch the major with courses that are already being offered at the College, which are sufficient to constitute a major, but said that the hope is that, as the major evolves, many departments will come forward to participate. Over the next five years, in particular, the major should be considered a work-in-progress, he said.

Turning to the subject of "hidden" requirements that may lie beneath the surface of the courses that are being proposed for the new major, Professor George asked why, for example, Biology 23 would be required, while its prerequisite, Biology 18, would be an elective. Professors Temeles and Dizard explained that, in the future, the hope is that students will be able to fulfill the prerequisites, particularly in the sciences and in economics, with introductory environmental studies courses—courses that will cover much of the same content as introductory courses in chemistry and economics, but with an environmental emphasis. Professor Temeles said that, in the meantime, with permission of the instructor, students could take his ecology course, without taking the prerequisite. He noted that the goal is to create a distinct

Amended October 29, 2007

Environmental Studies core and not to duplicate other science majors. It was noted that a new FTE in the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science should enable the Environmental Studies major to include a statistics course that has an environmental emphasis. Also, a new hire in the Department of Economics may result in the creation of a “green” version of Economics 11, or another introductory environmental economics course.

Professor Sinos asked why it would be necessary to develop new courses to serve as prerequisites, if acceptable prerequisites are already available. Professor Dizard responded that the major would end up with fifteen or sixteen courses if current prerequisites were required and would be daunting to students as a result. Professor Harms noted, on a philosophical level, that the group believes that only those courses that represent the central and foundational ideas of the major should be required. She noted that graduate programs in Environmental Studies are most interested in students having a background in ecology, statistics, and economics and said that the major would be grounded in these areas.

Professor Jagannathan said that he was impressed with the framing of the justification for the major, as Professors Dizard, Harms, and Temeles had now described it. He did question one of the points in the document prepared by Professor Dizard, as described in the following sentence from the document: “As scientists began to turn their attention to environmental problems, it quickly became clear that these problems were not going to be resolved by technical fixes.” Professor Jagannathan said that it should be conveyed that having a background in the sciences is often very helpful when it comes to policy questions. Professor Dizard agreed. He noted that, overall, he now feels that there was misplaced specificity in the initial proposal, and he recognizes that the core of the major should have been described programmatically. The Committee noted that specificity is also valuable and asked that the Catalog description, which included the courses for the major, be retained in the proposal. Professor Dizard agreed to revise the proposal, with the Committee’s recommendations in mind, and to send it to the members for their review before it is brought before the full Faculty, most likely at the Faculty Meeting of November 6.

Professor O’Hara asked why the group has not included any lab-based courses as part of the major. Professor Harms said that, in the group’s view, at least initially, much of what could be accomplished in a three-hour formal lab could be done in other ways in the courses being proposed for the major. For example, a seminar might meet outdoors every other week to do exercises for three hours. Modeling, outside the context of a formal lab, would also be a part of some courses, she noted. She commented that, if sufficient staffing is put in place, it would certainly be desirable to have an introductory environmental studies course that included labs.

Dean Call asked when the group envisioned making the major available. Professor Dizard, who has been asked to chair the major program, said the hope is that there would be a major as soon as the motion to create one is approved by the Faculty, since all the courses listed are already in place. The Committee thanked Professors Dizard, Harms, and Temeles, and they departed at 4:30 P.M. The members next voted five in favor and zero opposed, with Professor Servos abstaining, to forward the proposal for a new major in Environmental Studies to the Faculty. The Committee agreed to vote on the substance of the proposal after receiving the

Amended October 29, 2007

revised version (which will be appended to the Faculty Meeting agenda for November 6) from Professor Dizard, who will provide it later this week.

The members reviewed the proposal (appended) from the Faculty Computer Committee to revise its charge and voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the proposal to the Faculty and six in favor and zero opposed on the substance of the proposal. The Committee next considered eleven proposals for new courses and voted six to zero to forward them to the Faculty. The members then reviewed the Faculty Meeting agenda for November 6 and voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward it to the Faculty.

The Dean made a series of announcements. He informed the members that Gretchen Krull, Assistant Director of Health Education and Sexual Assault Counselor, has requested that she and some of the Peer Advocates for Sexual Respect be allowed to speak with faculty in the Converse Lobby and to distribute literature after the Faculty Meeting on November 6. She has told that the Dean that some students have raised concerns about having the faculty notify them in advance when sensitive material will be presented in classes. Ms. Krull has noted that students feel that many faculty members do an excellent job of informing them at the beginning of the semester, but may not always be giving specific reminders about sensitive material as the semester progresses. The members agreed that it would be fine for Ms. Krull to set up a table with information and to speak with colleagues after the Faculty Meeting.

Continuing his announcements, the Dean informed the members that the search committee for the Registrar is now fully staffed. The members are Allen Hart, Professor of Psychology and Dean of New Students (Chair); Daniel Velleman, Julian H. Gibbs '46 Professor of Mathematics; Michael Ellison, Associate Dean of Admission and Financial Aid; Marie Fowler, Registration Assistant and Receptionist; Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research; Sandra Miner, Director of Database Services; and Janet Tobin, Assistant Dean of the Faculty. Dean Call also informed the members that the College Council has endorsed a Faculty Fellows Program. Faculty members who agreed to serve as fellows will develop and participate in academic programs for first-year students in the dorms. The Dean said he plans to make an announcement about the program at the Faculty Meeting on November 6. The Dean next noted that Peter Schilling, Director of Information Technology, has informed him that the simplest, most durable approach to keeping an annual record of the *Faculty Handbook*, as it is maintained on the College Web site, would be to print a copy once a year that will be kept in the archives in Frost Library and to save the text in a .txt file. The Dean said that this is the approach that will be taken.

The President next brought to the Committee's attention concerns that have emerged—as a result of recent court decisions—surrounding a policy voted by the Faculty in 1987 regarding recruitment on campus. That policy states that an organization wishing to use College facilities for recruiting will be asked each year to have a representative sign a statement affirming that it does not discriminate in its employment policies. Any organization that declines to sign such a statement will be asked to speak at an open meeting on campus to explain in what ways the organization does not follow such a policy and for what reasons.

Amended October 29, 2007

President Marx explained that, under Amherst's policy, if military recruiters come to campus, they must discuss at an open meeting the Pentagon's policy that prevents openly gay or bisexual individuals from serving in the military. The President noted that Yale Law School had, until recently, a similar longstanding policy. Under the Solomon Amendment, a statute that allows the federal government to withhold funds from colleges and universities that do not extend the same welcome to military recruiters that they do to other recruiters, the government threatened to withhold millions in grant funding to Yale if recruiters were not accommodated. This September, after an appeals court ruled in favor of the Department of Defense, the law school changed its policy. The United States Supreme Court last year unanimously sided against a consortium of schools seeking to bar, or to set similar conditions on, recruiters from their campuses, President Marx noted.

While lauding the spirit and intent of Amherst's policy and actions, President Marx noted that they are now clearly in violation of the law. He said that he sees three approaches that the College could consider. Amherst could keep the policy without making a public announcement that it was doing so; however, it is likely that it would be disclosed publically at some point that the College was in violation of the law and was either unaware of it, or was purposefully avoiding this subject. Under this scenario, the sciences at the College would be at serious risk, since grant funding could be eliminated, and faculty would no longer benefit from the peer review of essential bodies such as the National Science Foundation. A second option would be to make a public statement that the College would keep its policy, despite the consequences. The sciences again would be seriously threatened. The third option would be to continue to welcome military recruiters to campus and to invite them to participate in the sort of open meeting described in the current policy. If the recruiters chose not to participate, the College would host a meeting during which the military's discriminatory policy would be discussed. This issue is sufficiently important that such a related discussion might be held at the College, whether or not recruiters chose to attend. The campus would benefit from such discussions, the President believes, even if recruiters are not coming to Amherst. Any option should be weighed in light of the College's commitment to oppose discrimination against gay students, while also being sure not to discriminate against students who wish to perform military service, for example, through the Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC).

The President asked for the Committee's advice on the best way to proceed with addressing this issue. The Committee felt that the President should inform the Faculty at a Faculty Meeting of the need to modify the current policy. The members agreed that retaining the current policy poses a very significant risk to the sciences at the College, and that most colleagues would recognize that the third option, as outlined by the President, would retain the spirit and goals of the current policy. President Marx thanked the members for their advice.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Jagannathan asked whether progress has been made in establishing the ad hoc Science Planning Committee. The Dean said that department chairs of science departments would be receiving a letter about the committee this week.

Amended October 29, 2007

Professor Sinos next asked if the Faculty Housing Committee might be asked to do a survey to determine the level of satisfaction with the rental housing office. She reported that a number of tenure track colleagues have expressed concerns, at a systemic level, about the operation of the rental housing office. The Dean reported that there is currently a transition in leadership in that office, since Mark Healy, Director of Rental Property, is no longer with the College. Gary Doherty, Assistant Director of Rental Property, is assuming Mr. Healy's duties on a temporary basis. President Marx suggested that, if it becomes necessary to evaluate the services of this office, the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) might be asked to conduct a survey, as they have done for the issue of childcare.

The Committee turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Background for the Proposed Environmental Studies Major

A brief history of Environmental Studies at Amherst. For roughly fifteen years, a varied group of faculty have informally met to talk about the need for courses that focused on the environment. These conversations resulted in a new course now and then. Most visibly, several First Year Seminars began to be offered: Fred Cheyette and Ed Belt taught "In Search of a Land Ethic"; and Dick Schmaltz and Tom Looker initiated "The Imagined Landscape," which was joined in various iterations by Jan Dizard, Tekla Harms, Arthur Zajonc, Kevin Sweeney, and Richard Todd; and more recently, Joe Moore and Jan Dizard have taught "The Value of Nature" together and singly.

A few courses relevant to the environment have been regularly offered in the sciences, in courses designed for non-science majors as well as courses intended for students who are science majors. There was talk, some years back, of creating an environmental science major but interest in this was not high enough to gain traction.

Courses in the humanities and social sciences have been fewer and offered less frequently. Nevertheless, over the past decade or so, there have been courses focused on the environment offered in the economics, philosophy, sociology/anthropology, English, and LJST departments.

The creation of the Pick Readership in Environmental Studies in 1999 marked the beginning of a more focused conversation among what turned out to be a growing number of faculty interested in environmental studies as distinct from environmental science. When President Marx announced the Presidential Initiative Fund in 2003, this group, now numbering fifteen to sixteen faculty from across the college, was more than ready to accelerate our discussion and focus on getting environmental studies included in the curriculum.

We met more or less monthly over the course of the academic year 2004-05. We began with a review of what has been done at colleges with whom we regularly compare ourselves. We were chagrined but not surprised to discover that we are virtually alone in having no formal course of study in environmental studies. We then proceeded to invite faculty from those programs we found most interesting (Bates, Middlebury, Tufts, Oberlin, Carleton, and Mt. Holyoke) to come to Amherst and share their thoughts with us.

We pressed our visitors on the choice of studies rather than science and we heard nothing positive about environmental science as a major. Graduate programs in environmental science prefer students who have solid grounding in one or another of the science disciplines. Moreover, environmental science attracts students who are already predisposed to science, thus reinforcing the split between the sciences, on the one hand, and the humanities and social sciences on the other. Environmental studies, by contrast, brought together both faculty and students from a wide range of science and non-science disciplines. After considerable discussion, we decided that Environmental Studies was far more attractive for the reason that all environmental issues require an integration of science, social science, and the humanities. This begs the question of why we need an environmental studies major.

Why do we need an environmental studies major? When some of us first began talking about environmental studies some fifteen years or so ago, the field was in its infancy. Now, there are several professional associations devoted to environmental studies, a number of peer reviewed journals (e.g., Environmental History, Environmental Ethics, Conservation Biology, Restoration Ecology, and Ecological Restoration), well established majors in most colleges and universities, and a growing number of graduate programs offering PhDs in the field.

The impetus for growth in this field came, initially, with the realization that we are facing serious environmental challenges. From the 1970s on, we have been warned of all manner of threats to our health, our economy, and to nature itself. It would be odd if college curricula did not begin to reflect this mounting concern. As scientists began to turn their attention to environmental problems, it quickly became clear that these problems were not going to be resolved by technical fixes. If solutions are to be found, they are likely to require both creative thought about politics, economics, and social priorities and the participation of a citizenry that is prepared to understand issues that cut across the boundaries between science, social science, and the humanities.

Environmental studies was thus conceived as an interdisciplinary endeavor in which scientists and non-scientists could bring their respective disciplinary perspectives to bear on a wide range of issues. Bridging academic disciplines long separated is not easy but the success of environmental studies at a wide range of colleges and universities makes it clear that this is possible. The field is still far from mature, but it has clearly passed the point of having an uncertain future. What may have seemed a passing fad born of volatile public passions several decades ago must now be recognized as a durable and important field of study. Moreover, the experience of colleagues in environmental studies clearly indicates that a program integrating work in science, social science, and the humanities is attractive to students. Indeed, we owe it to our students to offer them a curriculum that broadly reflects both the long-standing traditions of scholarship as well as the emergent fields that will shape scholarship and public policy debates in the world in which they will take their places.

Many lament that our open curriculum allows students to avoid courses that they think lie outside their "comfort zone." An environmental studies major will be, so far as we can tell, the only major that will require majors to take courses in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities. Moreover, a number of environmental studies courses will be team taught by science and non-science faculty, presenting students with a model of faculty collaborating together in the classroom. This will convey to students the importance of being at least conversant in disciplines from across the curriculum.

The structure of the Environmental Studies major. We envision a major with six core courses, as follows: An Introductory, team-taught course; a course in Ecology; a statistics course with an environmental focus; an environmental economics course; and environmental history survey course; and, sixth, a capstone, team-taught, course to be taken in the first semester of senior year. These courses embody what we think is fundamental to (and unique about) environmental studies—these six courses embrace science, social science, humanities, methodology, and two courses in which scientists and non-scientists work together to make clear the importance of interdisciplinary inquiry.

In addition, there are currently fourteen courses offered regularly, and another 5-7 new courses that will be offered beginning in the fall of 2008 (with authorized searches now underway) from amongst which students may select electives to complete the major requirements. This list includes some courses with prerequisites, particularly in the sciences and in economics, which we hope, over time, can be dealt with by having introductory courses with an environmental studies emphasis that accomplish what the standard introductions (to Chemistry, Economics, etc.) accomplish. This will increase access to advanced science courses for students in environmental studies.

This is to say, up front, that the Environmental Studies Major is a work in progress. We expect that once the major is approved, a number of colleagues and their departments will see attractive ways to contribute courses to the major. Absent a major, however, there is little or no incentive for individual colleagues or departments to invest the time and energy required to devise new courses if there is no major to which these courses contribute. We now have a "critical mass" of faculty (and the courses they will teach) to launch a rigorous major. We are confident that, once launched, the range of courses we will be able to offer students electing to major in environmental studies will expand to make the major's interdisciplinary character even more pronounced.

Proposed Revised Charge

10/12/2007

The Faculty Computer Committee

The Faculty Computer Committee consists of three faculty members appointed by the Committee of Six for two-year terms and one student member elected by the student government. In addition, the Director of Information Technology (IT), the Director of Academic Technology Services (ATS), and the Librarian of the College are ex officio members without vote. One of the faculty members serves as chair. The committee advises the Director of IT and the Director of 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. 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.

Amended December 3, 2007

The eighth 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, November 5, 2007. Present were Professors Frank, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor George was absent by prior arrangement.

The President discussed briefly with the members the announcements he intended to make at the Faculty Meeting of November 6, including information about plans to renovate the Lord Jeffery Inn. President Marx also asked the members for suggestions of faculty colleagues who might serve as coordinators of upcoming colloquia that will occur during Interterm and in the spring.

Dean Call made a series of announcements. He informed the members that the ad hoc Science Planning Committee is now fully staffed with representatives from the science departments. The group will soon begin meeting on a regular basis. The faculty members who will serve on the committee are J.P. Baird (Neuroscience), Caroline Goutte (Biology) through fall 2008, David Hall (Physics), Tanya Leise (Mathematics), Mark Marshall (Chemistry), Anna Martini (Geology), Cathy McGeoch (Computer Science), L. Arielle Phillips (Astronomy), and Matt Schulkind (Psychology). The Dean noted that the Memorial Minute Committee for Ernest Alfred Johnson, Professor of Romance Languages, Emeritus has also been finalized. James Maraniss, Professor of Spanish; Donald White, Professor of German Emeritus; and Daria D'Arienzo, Head of Archives and Special Collections, have agreed to serve.

In reference to the Science Planning Committee, Professor Jagannathan asked if administrators would become members of the committee or would serve in an advisory role and when they would begin to participate, in either case. Professor Frank wondered if the committee would be ad hoc. The Dean said that the committee would meet soon to discuss when administrators should be brought into the process and to develop a charge. The committee would begin as an ad hoc committee and could decide at a future time if it wished to bring a motion to become a standing committee forward to the Committee of Six and to the Faculty as a whole. Professor Frank wondered whether a comparable committee should be considered for the humanities. The Dean noted that, while it is not anticipated that there will be a comparable planning process needed for facilities for the humanities, he would be open to having a conversation about forming a planning committee for the humanities. Professor Frank said that, at a future date, she would welcome the opportunity to have a broad discussion about what some perceive as the decline in prestige of the humanities at the College and nationwide.

The Dean next noted that, with the assistance of the Committee on Priorities and Resources, an Academic Facilities Planning Group has been formed and has just selected a consultant, Shepley, Bulfinch, Richardson, and Abbott to work with the College on a campus-wide academic facilities study that will focus on classrooms, laboratories, studios, performance spaces, and faculty offices. The firm designed James, Stearns, and Charles Pratt Dormitories. In addition, the Dean said, the Library Planning Committee will soon engage a consultant to assist with the assessment of programmatic needs that might be addressed through the renovation of Frost Library. Professor Sinos noted that it will be important for those who choose consultants to consider firms' history with the College, when relevant. She asked the President and the Dean

Amended December 3, 2007

about the timetable for developing a vision for the library. The Dean said that, in order for the renovation of the library to become one of the campaign goals, such a vision must be articulated by the time of Commencement at the very latest. The President reiterated that, in regard to the library and to other upcoming large-scale projects, such as the Merrill renovation, it is essential that a clear sense of vision and direction is established through a planning process. Professor Sinos said that she wished that discussions about the future of the library had begun earlier. The President and Dean agreed, noting some frustration with the pace of the process. Professor Jagannathan cautioned against rushing through the planning process and advocated for a short extension should more time be needed for planning for the future of the library.

The members discussed briefly the experiment of having informal open lunches with the Faculty to increase the Committee's accessibility to colleagues. The lunches were poorly attended and it was decided to discontinue them.

The Committee considered two course proposals and voted five to zero to forward them to the Faculty. The members also considered a renewal proposal for a President's Initiative Fund for Interdisciplinary Curricular Projects and made a recommendation to the President, who thanked them for their advice. Professor Servos, being a member of the Law in Science PIF, left the room during the discussion.

The Committee turned to personnel matters.

The Committee discussed structures and initiatives that might facilitate progress in increasing diversity within the Faculty. President Marx reiterated that, as Amherst moves toward a substantial demographic shift in the Faculty in the coming decade, it is imperative that the College be proactive in creating a Faculty that is of the highest quality and which is reflective of the diversity to which Amherst aspires. President Marx noted that there are some new tools that have been proposed to assist with diversity efforts, in particular the two FTEs recommended as target-of-opportunity hires by the Committee on Academic Priorities. He asked the members whether the Faculty is, generally, supportive of increasing the diversity of the Faculty. It was agreed that most Faculty and departments are committed to this goal. The members discussed the possibility of increasing the flexibility of the hiring system to allow for the ability to hire exceptional candidates of color, who might emerge through the search process or through other avenues and within subfields for which searches may or may not be authorized. Possibilities such as developing an infrastructure for recruitment and retention of faculty of color, shaping positions in ways that might attract minority candidates, providing job opportunities for their spouses, and other initiatives were also considered.

Since little time remained, it was agreed that the members would return to this subject at a future meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 3, 2007

The ninth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2007-2008 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 4:30 P.M. on Thursday, November 8, 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 President Marx sharing with the Committee his understanding of how the process of implementing the new major in Environmental Studies will move forward, specifically in regard to whether interested colleagues are now welcome to join the advisory committee for the major. The major was approved by the Faculty at its meeting of November 6. The President noted that, after the discussion at the Faculty Meeting of the place of the sciences within the major, a number of science faculty remained concerned about the lack of requirements in the sciences for the major, as it is currently envisioned. The President said that it is his understanding that interested colleagues can now join the advisory committee, if they wish, and that the committee is open to continuing the process of designing the major. Professor Jagannathan informed the President, the Dean, and the members that some colleagues in the Departments of Physics and Chemistry recently joined the advisory committee. He expressed concern that the process that is now in place for developing the requirements for a new major is not sufficiently formalized; in particular, he was not sure how differences of opinion about core requirements and electives, should such differences arise, are resolved. The Committee agreed that the new program's committee may wish to consider changes in the major requirements as the committee itself evolves. At the conclusion of this discussion, the Committee turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 6, 2007

The tenth 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, November 12, 2007. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Committee turned to personnel matters.

President Marx next discussed with the members several incidents of intolerance and hatefulness that have occurred on campus. He noted that disciplinary action would be taken against those who have violated College rules. The President, the Dean, and the Committee then considered steps that might be taken to address, more generally, issues of understanding, sensitivity, and respect on campus. Among the possibilities that were suggested were a letter to the community from the President; workshops, lectures, and an exhibition at the library; departmental meetings; and programming in the dormitories.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 10, 2007

The eleventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2007-2008 was called to order by President Marx at his home at 6:10 P.M. on Tuesday, November 13, 2007. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Committee turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 10, 2007

The twelfth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2007-2008 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 1:00 P.M. on Monday, November 19, 2007. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

President Marx discussed with the members his current thinking, after consulting with colleagues both at Amherst and at other institutions, about the institutional structures that might best facilitate additional progress in the area of diversity for faculty and staff. He noted that Professor Cobham-Sander has graciously agreed to continue as Special Assistant to the President for Diversity until the end of the spring term. President Marx said that he has decided to launch a national search for a new Special Assistant for Diversity and Inclusion. This individual would be responsible for overseeing areas relating to diversity for both faculty and staff. He or she would work closely with a faculty council, which would be made up of three or four faculty members, on issues of recruitment and retention that relate specifically to the Faculty. President Marx said that he feels that it is particularly important that faculty colleagues work in tandem with the new Special Assistant if the new position is to be effective. On the staff side, the President noted that he envisions that the new Special Assistant, who will be the College's Affirmative Action Officer, will work closely with the senior staff and with the Office of Human Resources.

Professor Jagannathan commented that the nature of the questions that arise in the area of diversity have become more and more complex and legalistic in recent years. He said that he supports the idea of hiring a professional who has the ability and training to navigate these intricacies and who would push the College to make greater inroads on the diversity front. Professor Frank said that she believes that it is a good idea for the Special Assistant to be able to effect change by having some authority over Human Resources. Other members commented that diversity was one part of Human Resources' broader portfolio of responsibilities and that, while the new Special Assistant should work closely with that office, he or she should not necessarily have direct supervisory responsibility over it. Professor O'Hara asked the President if he had explored models of how such a position should fit within the reporting structures of other institutions. President Marx said that he had done such research, but that there were many models, and that there seemed to be no one model that correlated with success. Professor Sinos said that she does not believe that diversifying the staff should be number-driven. The President said that he agreed, but wondered about setting targets, in some sense.

The Committee, the President, and the Dean discussed strategies for strengthening the diversity of the Faculty, including providing incentives through out-of-sequence and bridge FTE appointments. Professor Servos agreed that having FTE distribution play a role in diversity initiatives would be critical, but he said that a new Special Assistant who is brought in might not understand how best to conduct delicate negotiations with Amherst departments. It was agreed that any special process of FTE allocation for diversity purposes must closely resemble and respect the regular process of FTE allocation. The Dean noted that the Special Assistant could advise the Dean of the Faculty and the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and could work with departments to develop diversity plans, so that when an opportunity for a diversity hire

Amended December 10, 2007

presented itself—either through a regular search process or by having an individual come to a department’s attention at a time that is out of sequence with the normal FTE cycle—the department could bring it to the attention of the Dean and the CEP and, referencing the diversity plan, a decision about whether to pursue the opportunity could be made quickly. The Committee discussed the idea of identifying potential candidates of color earlier in their careers, perhaps through post-doctoral fellowships. Professor O’Hara discussed her hope that the Special Assistant might also take on broader challenges. For example, the small numbers of students of color who pursue careers in math and science is a pressing concern, and a subject of discussion at the national level. A Special Assistant could help the Faculty keep on top of new initiatives to increase diversity in this and other areas. The President thanked the members for their advice.

President Marx next noted that, in response to his recent letter to the Amherst community about several incidents of intolerance and hatefulness that have occurred on campus, he was contacted by members of the community who raised concern about the treatment of staff members at the College, about gender issues, about anti-semitism, and about the harassment of students who hold conservative views. The President said that he would meet with those who wrote to him about these issues to learn more about their concerns. He also noted that he has been in conversation with President Hexter of Hampshire, who would like to explore collaborative ways of raising awareness about issues of hate and intolerance.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Sinos asked why the Johnson Chapel bells no longer ring on the hour, as they did for many years. The President asked Assistant Dean Tobin to research this question, and she agreed to do so.

The Committee turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 10, 2007

The thirteenth 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, November 26, 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 the Dean responding to Professor Sinos's question, posed at the last meeting, about the Johnson Chapel bells. Dean Call reported that, according to Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services, at some point over the past several years students in South Dorm complained about the bells interfering with their sleep and studying. The bells were silenced as a result of these concerns. Mr. Brassord recommended that the ringing of the bells be re-established, perhaps with a timer that would preclude the bells from ringing during the wee hours. Most members were in favor of this suggestion, while others said that they did not have an opinion.

The Committee turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 18, 2007

The fourteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2007-2008 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 2:30 P.M. on Monday, December 3, 2007. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Committee turned to personnel matters.

Under "Questions to the Administration," Professor Frank asked about the search committee that she understood was currently being formed for a new Director of the Writing Center. She noted that, at present, there are various unresolved and ongoing conversations taking place at the College about writing and said that it was her understanding that the President wished the Committee of Six to continue this spring last year's discussion of this topic. She pointed out that the English department is conducting a series of conversations in preparation for a departmental external review in the spring, and that one of their topics of consideration will be their role in the teaching of writing at the College. She also commented that the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Support is working to integrate writing into an overarching structure of academic support. Professor Frank said that her question was similar to the one that the Committee had asked in regard to the search for a new Registrar, that is how to search for a Registrar while simultaneously considering the structure of the Registrar's office. In terms of the Writing Center, she wondered whether these two processes (searching for the position and considering possible changes for the center) were best done concurrently, or whether the search committee should consider the structure of the Writing Center/position before the search begins. Given that some of the Faculty's conversations about writing are likely to have an impact on the kind of Writing Center Director that the College may want to hire, she wondered whether it would make sense to consider an interim appointment for the position.

In response, the Dean noted that considering the structure of the Writing Center and/or the Director position could be a lengthy process. He noted that there are many interested colleagues to be consulted, and a number of issues to be thought through and discussed. While this process takes place, the support that the Writing Center provides to Amherst's students must not be compromised, Dean Call said. A search for an interim Director, whose term would not be known at this time, would be unlikely to produce as strong a field of candidates as a search for a Director would.

Some members argued that it might be difficult to attract candidates for the position if things are not clearly defined in terms of roles and structures, including reporting lines. Others felt that some candidates might find the opportunity to help mold the center, bringing new ideas and energy, to be attractive. It was noted that many faculty feel that the Writing Center should be under the umbrella of the Dean of the Faculty's office. Dean Call said that he feels very strongly that the center must also have ties to the Dean of Students office. He said that a double reporting line for the Writing Center—to him and Ben Lieber, Dean of Students—is under consideration, and that he and Dean Lieber will be meeting with the Committee on Academic Support to discuss this possibility.

Amended December 18, 2007

Continuing the conversation, Professor George reiterated a concern expressed previously by Professor O'Hara, that candidates for the Director's position might be reluctant to accept the job if the duties of an assistant or associate dean of students remain a part of the position. Professor Frank agreed and said that most faculty members who would be considering whether to apply—who would most likely be from other institutions—would view these duties as less relevant to the writing issues. She feels that it would be desirable to find a person, with a faculty background if possible, who has been highly trained in the practices and philosophies of teaching writing and who might come out of a rhetoric background, for example. She commented that the teaching of writing has become a respected field of scholarship. Such a person could offer workshops for faculty on the teaching of writing and could also oversee writing services for students. She feels that the Writing Center would garner more prestige among the Faculty if it were positioned as an extension of the Faculty's pedagogy, within the Dean of the Faculty's office, rather than as a part of student life. The Dean asked if a member of the English department might wish to become the Director of the Writing Center. Professor Frank said that this was a possibility the department was mulling over. She noted that the department feels that it may take a leading position, but should not be the only locus of writing instruction at Amherst, since the teaching of writing should be a part of all departmental curricula. President Marx said that the department's taking a leading position does not in any way imply that it would bear sole responsibility for teaching writing.

The Dean asked if the English department would consider adding a new colleague to their department who would hold a part-time tenure-track appointment dedicated to writing instruction that would be coupled with an administrative appointment as the Director of the Writing Center. Professor Frank said that she believes that the department might be open to the possibility. The President also said that he is open to exploring such options, but asked if there might be faculty concern about someone joining their ranks without going through regular procedures, and that such an appointment might not meet the needs of the department. Professor George noted that the scholarly work of a tenure candidate in this field would be unlike that of other tenure candidates at Amherst, if the scholarship focused on, for example, outcomes of different methods of writing instruction. Professor Servos urged the Dean to consider having the Writing Center become a part of the Dean of the Faculty's office, while noting that such a move would not be a reflection in any way on the leadership of the Dean of Students office. Professor Frank agreed and commented that Dean Lieber has been a leader in the effort to improve the writing of Amherst students, particularly those who are less well prepared. Professor O'Hara agreed, noting that, in her new role next year as Senior Advisor to the Dean for Academic Life, she hopes to serve as a touchstone for the Faculty for many of these issues. The Dean noted that it is his hope that Professors Gentzler and Barale will soon have an official role within his office to support writing instruction. Professor Frank said that it would indeed be desirable to meld the curriculum and teaching to an issue (writing instruction) that has been viewed as an issue of academic support. Dean Call agreed.

President Marx wondered if there might be models other than tenured or tenure-track for establishing a position that would allow the Director of the Writing Center to have faculty status.

Amended December 18, 2007

The Committee briefly considered whether the model of a Resident Artist/Director might be a workable one. The members then once again turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 20, 2007

The fifteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2007-2008 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 7:30 P.M. on Thursday, December 6, 2007. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Dean Call said that he was pleased to announce that Professor Sanchez-Eppler has agreed to become the Faculty Advisor to the Center for Community Engagement. Professor Sinos asked if this new assignment would involve a reduction in Professor Sanchez-Eppler's teaching. The Dean said that it would not.

Professor Jagannathan informed the Committee that Professor Frank had recently been awarded a literature fellowship from the National Endowment for the Arts. The President, Dean, and members of the Committee offered their warm congratulations.

The Committee turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call

Dean of the Faculty

Amended January 14, 2008

The sixteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2007-2008 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, December 10, 2007. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The Committee turned briefly to personnel matters.

President Marx informed the members that he has been meeting with individuals who have raised concerns in response to the incidents of intolerance that have occurred on campus. He said that plans are under way to have a public forum in February to raise awareness on campus about these issues. In addition, the President said that he had met recently with a group of students who hold conservative political views. These students told President Marx that they often feel that they are disrespected at Amherst because of their views, and they described incidents in this regard in which their interactions with faculty left them feeling that they had not been treated fairly or courteously because of their beliefs. The students reported that there have also been incidents of harassment, and in some cases, violence against students because of their conservative views. The President said that these students told him that it might make a difference to the general atmosphere of debate if there were more Amherst faculty members who shared their views. President Marx informed the students that the College does not have an ideological litmus test when hiring faculty—nor does he think it should—but he said that he feels that Amherst does and must have a range of views represented among the Faculty and students at the College. He noted that Amherst's responses to incidents of discrimination, harassment, threatening behavior, or violence related to gender, sexual orientation, race, religion, and political views—or any other reasons, for that matter—should be comparable, in accordance with the severity of the infraction, as all such behavior is in violation of the College's policies regarding respect for persons. The Dean and the Committee agreed.

The Dean next distributed to the members a letter (appended) from the members of the Department of Music regarding the report titled "The Arms Music Center: A Comparative Facility Report." The letter requests that the Committee of Six discuss the report. After a brief conversation, the members agreed that the report should be forwarded to the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) for consideration.

The Committee next discussed a letter (appended) from Professor Rosbottom in which he requests that the members address the issue, which was discussed at the Faculty Meeting of November 6, 2007, of warning students when sensitive material will be presented in classes. Professor Frank said that Professor Rosbottom seems to be under the impression that the Dean was suggesting that rules be imposed on the Faculty that might limit academic freedom, when it appears to her, that information about this topic was being provided in order to inform the Faculty and not to require them to respond in a particular way. Dean Call said that, indeed, he had not intended to advocate a particular position, but to raise awareness about issues surrounding the presentation of sensitive material that were brought to his attention by Gretchen Krull, Assistant Director of Health Education/Sexual Assault Counselor. Professor Servos noted that the *Faculty Handbook* (https://cms.amherst.edu/academiclife/dean_faculty/fachandbook/

Amended January 14, 2008

preintroduction, pre-introduction, B., Academic Freedom) states that the College subscribes fully to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) statements of principles on academic freedom (published in 1940). He read the following: “Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject.” Professor Servos also cited the following 1970 gloss: “The intent of this statement is not to discourage what is ‘controversial.’ Controversy is at the heart of the free academic inquiry which the entire statement is designed to foster. The passage serves to underscore the need for teachers to avoid persistently intruding material which has no relation to their subject.”

The members agreed that the issue is not whether Faculty should be discouraged from presenting a particular type of material, which all agreed they should not, but whether, in the interest of sensitivity to the needs of some students who have experienced violence in their lives, the Faculty might consider warning students when sensitive material is going to be presented in class. Professor Frank commented that some material that includes incidents of sexual violence could trigger serious and disturbing responses in students who may be suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder and that warning students when this sort of material will be presented can be viewed as a courtesy. Professor Servos noted that a call for sensitivity, respect, and thoughtfulness seems fine, but that it would be unreasonable to *require* that such a warning be given, particularly because it is impossible to anticipate all of the sensitivities that might exist among students. President Marx, while noting that academic freedom is clearly one of the most important values at the College, agreed that it is up to individual faculty members to decide whether they want to warn students about the content that will be presented in their classes. Professor O’Hara commented that raising awareness about this issue through discussion is valuable in itself. The committee then returned to personnel matters.

The members returned briefly to their discussion of the future of the Writing Center. Dean Call described progress that has been made on the recommendations outlined in the 2007 Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Writing. The committee’s first recommendation was to “create a named, rotating professorship devoted to writing.” The Dean reiterated his hope that Professors Gentzler and Barale will soon have an official role within his office to support writing instruction. The second recommendation was to “create a standing faculty committee whose charge would be to oversee all parts of the pilot program.” Dean Call noted that the newly created Faculty Seminar on the Teaching of Writing has facilitated an ongoing conversation among eighteen faculty members. The third recommendation was to “reward instructors and departments who take on the task of writing instruction.” In particular, the Ad Hoc Committee on Writing recommended that visiting appointments or, in some cases, new FTEs, be allocated to departments who commit to offering W (writing-attentive) courses. Dean Call noted that the committee might have stretched the intention of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP), which was to recommend that new FTEs be allocated to departments who teach writing-intensive courses, which would be designed for students who are less well-prepared in writing, rather than writing-attentive courses, which would be appropriate for all Amherst students. The hope is that some courses in all departments will be identified as writing attentive. Professor Frank noted

Amended January 14, 2008

that progress is being made, since writing-intensive courses are under way and are serving twenty-five to thirty students a year. The fourth recommendation was to “make a percentage of all First-Year Seminar offerings writing attentive.” The Dean said that this recommendation is currently being discussed by the First-Year Seminar Committee. The fifth recommendation was to “enlarge the Writing Center” and to increase the number of peer tutors. With the move of the Writing Center to new facilities in Charles Pratt this fall and increased funding, these steps have been taken. The committee also recommended that the professional staff be increased by one full-time position. A second Writing Fellow was added this year. President Marx said that he has had some questions about whether Ph.D.s who have more experience and who have been trained in the teaching of writing might be engaged in the Writing Center.

In regard to the new Director of the Writing Center, the Dean said that he was willing to discuss adding a new colleague to the English department who would hold a part-time tenure-track appointment dedicated to writing instruction that would be coupled with an administrative appointment as the Director of the Writing Center. An interim structure would be needed if this idea is adopted, he said. The Dean envisions a double reporting line to the Dean of the Faculty and the Dean of Students for the position. Some members and the President wondered whether teaching courses for the Faculty on how to teach writing, which has been proposed, should be part of the portfolio of teaching that would be part of the tenure-track portion, rather than the administrative side, of the position. President Marx asked about using a piece of the two FTEs that have been approved to serve writing needs for this position, when colleagues have yet to articulate a conception of how writing will be taught. He feels that such a vision should be in place before these FTEs are allocated. Professor Frank expressed the view that a writing requirement cannot be put in place until more faculty members feel comfortable with teaching writing. A Writing Center Director who is trained to teach writing could offer workshops for the Faculty so that they would feel better able to teach writing, she said. The President said that he is delighted that the Faculty is exploring the possibility of re-organizing the Writing Center, but reiterated that additional resources, in the form of FTEs, should depend upon specific plans about the teaching of writing.

Professor O’Hara wondered if the Directorship of the Writing Center might be a two-year position that could rotate among interested faculty who are skilled in teaching writing. In addition, she expressed the view that it would be desirable for the Writing Center Director to work closely with a faculty colleague interested in writing more broadly who holds a named, rotating professorship devoted to writing. Professor George expressed skepticism about the idea of taking an Amherst faculty member out of the classroom to head the Writing Center, which would mean replacing that colleague with a visitor. He views the teaching of the basic mechanics of expository writing as a specialized field and said that it might be best to bring in someone from the outside who is trained in the field of expository writing instruction to head the Writing Center. Professor Servos agreed, while emphasizing the importance of having writing taught in connection with course content. Professor George said that he feels that, in the case of instruction in writing mechanics, which is what a portion of Amherst students would benefit from greatly, writing professionals could teach this material outside the framework of an

Amended January 14, 2008

academic discipline. On a final note, Professor O'Hara said that it will be important to consider the Moss Quantitative Center in tandem with the Writing Center, as some issues are the same for both.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

AMHERST COLLEGE
Department of Music

October 31, 2007

Dean Gregory Call
Secretary
Committee of Six

Dear Colleagues:

We forward to you the report entitled "The Arms Music Center. A Comparative Facility Report" written and researched by two Amherst students-Marshall Nannes '09 and Jonathan Salik '09.

We request that the Committee of Six discuss this report with the President and Dean and that a record of this discussion be included in the minutes. The increasing sense of concern among students and faculty that existing facilities are insufficient and, in some cases, inaccessible in service of a campus broadly engaged with music underscores the importance of beginning a thoughtful consideration of this problem.

Sincerely,

Jeffers Engelhardt
Jenny Kallick
Eric Sawyer
David Schneider

December 7, 2007

Dean Gregory Call, Secretary

Committee of Six

Dear Greg,

I would appreciate it if the Committee would discuss the issue I brought up at the November 6, 2007, Faculty meeting.

Is there a policy that faculty members should warn students of curricular materials that some of them might find disturbing or offensive? If so, what would the range of such materials include? If there is no formal policy, only a decanal suggestion, could individual faculty members be liable in any way should they fail to so notify students, who might determine, *post facto*, that the material indeed did offend or disturb?

It was the suggestion, in the Dean's synopsis of the health professionals' comments as minuted, namely, that some professors weren't doing what they were supposed to do that caught my attention. I, for one, didn't know I wasn't doing what I was supposed to do.

I know that the College's concern is for the well being of our students, but mine is that upsetting or offensive subjects are part of the human experience. In my classes, I would have to give warnings on a regular basis.

Thanks for mulling this over.

Sincerely yours,

Ronald C. Rosbottom
Professor of French and European Studies

Amended January 31, 2008

The seventeenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2007-2008 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Friday, December 14, 2007. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Dean Call informed the members that Professor Townsend, who will be retiring at the end of this academic year, has told him that he feels uncomfortable with the practice, which started in the late-1990s, of having citations read at Commencement about retiring faculty members. After seeking the opinion of others who will be retiring this year, Professor Townsend found that they shared his view and would prefer not to have citations read about them. The Committee agreed that this tradition need not be continued, while expressing support that the citations continue to be included in the *Alumni Magazine*. The President and the Dean agreed.

This discussion about a change to Commencement led the members to discuss briefly changes in format that had been implemented at Senior Assembly last year. Efforts had 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). The President said that these changes were prompted by sparse attendance at Senior Class Exercises. The changes included having two students, the runners-up for Student Commencement Speaker, speak at Senior Assembly, rather than at Senior Class Exercises. The tradition of a student speaker at Commencement was continued, the President said. The Woods-Travis Prize, the award to the graduating senior who has the highest overall grade average, was given at Commencement last year, as was 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 were acknowledged at Commencement, 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 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 was made for the presentation of additional awards and for the two student speakers.

A member of last year's Committee of Six had suggested that reading some brief description about the prizes given at Senior Assembly would be appreciated. The Dean had agreed that a happy medium should be found in this regard. Concern was raised by some members last year, and was now echoed by Professors Sinos, Servos, and George, about students being singled out for special recognition through awards that are presented during

Amended January 31, 2008

Commencement. They expressed support for the College's efforts in past years 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 as the chief academic award, as he did last year as well, 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. The President noted, as he did last year, that, since the Faculty has been concerned about the level of intellectual engagement among students, 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. Other members and the Dean agreed. In discussing alternative times for presenting the award, Professor Sinos 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. It was suggested that the Woods-Travis Prize be awarded at the Phi Beta Kappa ceremony, and the President said that he would be open to considering this idea.

The Committee next discussed a letter (appended) from Professor Guttman regarding the library's policy that faculty submit lists of required texts for their courses so that the library can purchase additional copies to place on reserve for students from economically disadvantaged families. Professor Guttman expressed the view that all students should have their own copies of every assigned book. He suggested that the College's financial aid policy should make it possible to do so. Professor Servos asked the Dean what the current College policy is in this regard. Dean Call explained that students who receive grant aid from the College are asked to inform the Office of Financial Aid of any book costs that exceed the current \$1,000 allowance in their student expense budgets, so that the office can adjust their aid awards. The office informs students of the practice in several ways, including a presentation during Orientation, notes concerning their aid awards, and newsletters. Faculty members use several bookstores, and many students buy their books online or through the student-run Option. Professors Sinos and Frank said that they agreed with Professor Guttman about the importance of all students working from texts that are their own, particularly so that they can do close readings, bring their books to class, and annotate the texts. Professor George noted that open-book exams also necessitate that students have books in class. Professor O'Hara said that many students are uncomfortable asking for additional funds, even though they are entitled to them. The Dean said that he has observed that this is indeed the case. The President and the Dean noted that they and last year's Committee of Six had discussed developing a voucher or credit system at a local bookstore. The Dean said that he would inquire as whether a program of this sort has been implemented.

Committee of Six Minutes of Friday, December 14, 2007

61

Amended January 31, 2008

The Committee turned to personnel matters.
The meeting adjourned at 5:45 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
aguttmann@amherst.edu

8 December 2007

Dean Gregory S. Call Secretary,
Committee of Six


Dear Greg,

I have taught here for nearly fifty years and have had innumerable occasions to be grateful to the college's librarians for help, support, and encouragement that seems invariably to go beyond what I have any right to expect. I cannot think of a single time during all these decades when I've felt the need to protest against library policy, but I was dismayed to read yesterday that faculty are now requested to submit lists of required texts so that the library can purchase additional copies to be placed on reserve for students from economically disadvantaged families.

I applaud the motive--who at the college wouldn't?--but the new policy undermines our local bookstores and, what's much more important, it undermines our teaching. Every student should have his or her copy of every assigned book. To read, to annotate, and to bring to class so that everyone present is, as we like to say, on the same page. I assign readings from out-of-print books as seldom as possible because I recognize that sending students to the reserve desk is a poor substitute for asking them to acquire their own copies. I dislike using the language of our leaders in Washington, but suggesting to the students that they needn't acquire copies of required texts is sending the wrong message.

Am I discriminating against students from economically disadvantaged families? I think not. I believe that the college's financial aid includes money for purchasing required textbooks. If I am wrong about our financial-aid policy, or if the money earmarked for textbooks is inadequate, then providing sufficient money should be a top priority. It is, moreover, actually the library's new policy that discriminates against students from economically disadvantaged families. They will be sent to the library to read required texts while classmates from wealthier families can work in their rooms.

I've tried to express my dismay in restrained language, but I appeal to you and to my colleagues on the Committee of Six to reverse this new policy as quickly as possible. And, if you think it's appropriate, I'd appreciate the committee's appending this letter to its minutes.

Sincerely, 

Allen Guttman

Amended February 4, 2008

The eighteenth 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 Tuesday, December 18, 2007. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The Committee turned first to personnel matters.

The Committee returned to the discussion begun at the meeting of December 14, and prompted by Professor Guttmann's letter (appended to the minutes of December 14), about the library's policy that faculty members submit lists of required texts for their courses so that the library can purchase additional copies to place on reserve for students from economically disadvantaged families. Dean Call reported to the Committee what he had learned about the status of the suggestion made by last year's Committee of Six that a voucher or credit system be developed at a local bookstore to encourage students to use the additional funding that is available to them to purchase books. The Dean said that students receiving grant aid from the College are still asked to inform the Office of Financial aid about their book costs that are over the current \$1,000 allowance in their student expense budgets, so that the office can adjust students' budgets and aid awards. The office informs students of the practice during Orientation, via notes concerning their aid awards, and through newsletters, among other mechanisms.

The Dean was informed that, since faculty members use several bookstores, and because many students buy their books online or through the student-run Option, developing a charging program presents some obstacles, including a lack of staffing within the Department of Information Technology to support such a program. Dean Call was told that there have been conversations among the College and local bookstores, but so far no agreement has been reached about a charging procedure. He learned that the Jeffery Amherst Bookstore does open charge accounts with parent credit cards. Some concern has been raised that students who use grant aid or loans to purchase books might be restricted to one option, the Jeffery Amherst Bookstore, when using their financial aid funds to purchase books. Student Affairs Officer Rachel Cardona, who has explored possible ways to develop a book purchase program, recalled that she had organized last spring a meeting with faculty, students, and administrators to discuss alternative options for ordering books, with the goal of decreasing costs for students. As a follow-up to the meeting, Ms. Cardona and College librarians made a presentation during Orientation about the options that are available for purchasing books. The Dean said that it is his hope that the College will continue to explore ways to develop a program.

Dean Call next shared with the members a number of announcements. He said that he had recently made three appointments to formalize and further the work in which three faculty colleagues have been engaged on the College's behalf. The Dean noted that Professors Michèle Barale and Jyl Gentzler, under the auspices of the College's new Teaching and Advising Program (TAP), have created and led the Faculty Seminar on Writing Instruction, which facilitated an ongoing conversation about writing among eighteen faculty members this fall. In addition, they have each taught experimental writing-intensive courses for the last three years. Upon his invitation, the Dean said, these two colleagues have agreed to continue and expand their work surrounding writing instruction and writing support at the College. Dean Call

Amended February 4, 2008

informed the members that Professor Barale has agreed, beginning in July 2008, to assume the position of Acting Director of the Writing Center. She will also be named Thalheimer Professor, pending approval by the Board of Trustees. Professor Barale will teach half time, while serving half time in the administrative position of Director of the Writing Center. Professor Gentzler, who will be named William R. Kenan, Jr. Professor, pending approval by the Board of Trustees, will continue to lead and develop the Faculty Seminar, as well as other writing-related initiatives. The Dean said that it is his hope that these appointments will expand discussion of the needs surrounding support for writing across the curriculum.

Continuing his announcements, the Dean informed the members that, since the Registrar, Gerry Mager, will retire at the end of March, there will be a need for an Acting Registrar, as it is not expected that a new Registrar will be hired before summer at the earliest. Associate Dean Rick Griffiths has graciously agreed to serve as Acting Registrar, following Mr. Mager's retirement and continuing until the end of the 2007-2008 academic year, Dean Call said. The Committee, the Dean, and the President expressed gratitude for Dean Griffiths' willingness to take on this temporary assignment.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

The nineteenth 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, January 28, 2008. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

President Marx began the meeting by expressing his great sorrow over the death of Jenny Kim '08, and the Dean and the members also spoke of their sadness over this tragic loss. President Marx noted that a group of students, faculty, and staff had gathered to share their thoughts about Jenny at an informal service that was held in Johnson Chapel after the news of her death was shared with the community, and again the next day at the President's house. A memorial service on campus is being planned and will take place on February 9, the President said. He noted that College counselors and religious advisors are available to talk with students in dorm meetings and at extended drop-in hours in coming weeks. Professor Servos asked whether the services provided by the Dean of Students office are reduced in any way during Interterm, questioning, in particular, whether the Counseling Center is fully operational during this period. Dean Call said that he believed that services continue to be provided during Interterm and agreed to confirm with the Dean of Students office whether this is indeed the case. The Committee also discussed possible ways for the College to honor Jenny's memory.

President Marx informed the members that a search committee is now in place for the position of Special Assistant to the President for Diversity and Inclusion. Professor Ron Lembo will chair the committee, the members of which will include Professors Rhonda Cobham-Sander, who will be stepping down as Special Assistant to the President for Diversity at the end of this academic year, and David Cox; Demisha Lee, Associate Dean of Admission; Peter Shea, Treasurer; Barbara St. Onge, Manager of OAS/Mailing Center and Support Services; and Rylan Burns '09 and Catherine Chen '08.

The President next discussed with the members possible business for a Faculty Meeting early in this semester, noting that the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) has asked him to update the Faculty about progress that is being made on implementing the recommendations of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP), as well as associated fundraising. In regard to the campaign, President Marx said that he anticipates that the goal will be between \$400 and \$425 million.

President Marx informed the members that the results of fundraising efforts during the early phase of the campaign have been heartening and noted that the Board, at its meetings the previous weekend, had reiterated their support for implementing all of the recommendations of the CAP. The President noted that the Trustees had agreed to accelerate the schedule for phasing in new FTEs, in order to increase the size of the Faculty more rapidly than originally imagined, and to keep pace with the growth of the student body. He said that he anticipates that the Board would vote at its next meeting in April to implement 100 percent sabbaticals for the Faculty in 2009-2010 and need-blind admission for international students. Further, the Trustees have informed him that they would be responsive to considering additional needs that might emerge during the implementation of the CAP recommendations. He offered as an example, resources, including additional FTEs beyond the eighteen that the Board has already agreed to fund, that might be allocated to enhance the First-Year Seminar Program. While fundraising efforts thus

far have been very encouraging, President Marx said that optimism should be tempered with caution in light of the state of the economy, which is unpredictable.

Returning to the subject of the First-Year Seminar Program, the President said that Dean Griffiths and the First-Year Seminar Committee have found that, over the past several years, it has become more difficult to recruit the number of faculty members needed to teach these seminars. The First-Year Seminar Committee, in its memo (appended) of January 21, 2008, to the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and the Committee of Six, expressed the view that the program is “not sustainable in its current form,” citing the lack of a clearly articulated mission, the impending retirements within a core group of faculty members who have taught the seminars, and the difficulty of recruiting tenure-track professors to teach the seminars because of a lack of clarity about the benefits to them of doing so.

Professor Servos expressed excitement and enthusiasm in response to the President’s remarks regarding the forward movement on the CAP implementation front and the fundraising success so far. Professor Frank agreed that the news was very promising and asked whether there were plans to address the needs of the Arms Music Center. Dean Call replied that the building would undergo modest renovations this summer to address immediate needs, and that Arms would be considered as part of the academic facilities study, which will include an assessment of all academic facilities on campus. Dean Call said that an update on the academic facilities study would be given at the next Faculty Meeting. President Marx commented that a coherent process for prioritizing facilities needs will be essential moving forward, since only a limited number of facilities projects can and should be undertaken simultaneously.

Professor O’Hara asked the President if consideration has been given to how College facilities, as well as services, might enable Amherst College to contribute to the local community. President Marx, who said that this is an issue that he takes very seriously, responded that the revitalization of the Mead and the Dickinson Homestead and Amherst’s new natural history museum have already benefited the community greatly. He noted that the College’s investment in the Amherst Cinema and the upcoming renovation of the Lord Jeffery Inn are efforts to invigorate the local economy. President Marx informed the members that he has been working closely with Amherst’s Town Manager to develop ideas about ways to bring additional economic development to the town, thereby increasing revenues for the public schools. In addition, the President commented, the College’s new Center for Community Engagement has been designed to benefit the local community by providing local non-profit organizations, including the Amherst public schools, with much needed student-volunteers. Finally, the President said that the College, for the first time, has agreed to make a gift to the town to cover the costs of fire and ambulance services. In all these ways, Amherst is making efforts to be a good citizen of the town, and the President said that he will continue to explore ways to collaborate with local officials on the town’s behalf. Dean Call noted that the local community has responded very positively to Amherst College Portraits, the collaborative public art project sponsored by the College. It was also noted that the Frost Library serves local residents, as well as the College community.

In regard to the Frost, Dean Call noted that, at its meeting, the Board expressed support for the ongoing planning efforts to revitalize the library. He noted that two arms of the same

consulting firm (Shepley Bulfinch Richardson and Abbott) have been selected, through independent processes, to work as consultants with the Library Planning Committee and to the academic facilities study. Professors Sinos and Servos asked about the consultative process that would be used to make decisions along the way about these critical projects and inquired about the ways in which input from the Amherst community will be solicited and acted upon. The Dean said that an update on the work of both the Library Planning Committee and the larger academic planning effort will be provided at the next Faculty Meeting and that the Library Planning Committee would soon be contacting members of the Amherst community to solicit thoughts and responses. As these planning processes progress, the community will be consulted regularly, and there will be a continuing series of updates, Dean Call said. He informed the members that the planning for the renovation of the Frost and of Merrill would be substantial and should take between eighteen months and two years. Professor George asked if the branch libraries would be part of the library renovation project. The Dean said that issues surrounding the science, math, and music libraries are being considered as part of the library planning process, and that these “branch” libraries will be part of the ongoing discussion. The President said that much remains to be done before a library renovation moves forward, and he stressed that a period of intensive and thorough evaluation, planning, and decision-making must serve as the foundation of this very important and complex project.

The President noted that, in addition to the updates on the Library planning and academic facility planning processes, he hopes that the next Faculty Meeting would include progress reports by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and the CPR. Professor Jagannathan noted that it is unusual to have a Faculty Meeting when motions are not being brought before the Faculty. President Marx stressed the importance of having a meeting soon, in order to foster communication regarding important matters. The Committee agreed that a Faculty Meeting should be held on February 19 and that the agenda should include the progress reports, which had just been discussed, to be made by the President and various committees, as well as a report on the next steps in the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) reaccreditation process. It was noted that the NEASC evaluation team will be on campus March 2-5. The Committee agreed to discuss the specifics of the agenda at its next meeting.

The Dean next made a series of announcements. He noted that the Board has approved an enhancement to the phased retirement program that will be implemented in tandem with a program of faculty bridge appointments. The bridge appointments will be funded with a grant of \$860,000 from the Mellon Foundation over a period of four years. Dean Call said that he would soon be sending a letter to the Faculty that would outline the new program, which will provide new ways to encourage departments to plan for their futures, including the possibility of having new colleagues overlap for several years with senior members of the department who have entered the phased retirement program. Professor Frank asked if it would be typical, under the new program, for colleagues who are retiring to participate in the search for their successors. The Dean said that the degree to which retiring colleagues participate would depend on departmental practice and culture. He noted that a retiring colleague generally consults with his or her department, and that they determine together how the retiring colleague can be most useful in the search. Professor Jagannathan expressed concern that having a senior colleague play a

Amended February 14, 2008

substantial role in the search for his or her successor could lead to many difficulties. Professor Servos agreed and said that he believes that some institutions do not allow this practice. Professor Sinos commented that having the participation of the retiring colleague, who would be most knowledgeable about his or her field, might sometimes be essential for small departments. Professor George expressed the view that there are different levels of involvement, and perhaps the retiring colleague could assist with recruitment, while not participating in the selection process. President Marx noted that, in the case of small departments, colleagues from outside the department are often brought in to participate in personnel matters. He wondered whether this procedure could be followed for searches for bridge appointments, as well, perhaps in both small and larger departments, as a means of bringing in additional perspectives, including interdisciplinary ones.

The Dean next informed the members that the Health Professions Committee has agreed to relieve some of the burden of the Student Fellowships Committee by taking on, as a regular part of their charge, the review of Amherst's applications for Goldwater and Churchill fellowships. The Committee of Six agreed that this would be a useful change. The Committee turned briefly to personnel matters. At the conclusion of that discussion, Dean Call asked the members for their preference regarding a meeting time for the spring semester, and it was agreed that the Committee would meet from 3:30 to 6:00 on Mondays.

The members returned to the topic of the report of the First-Year Seminar Committee. Professor Servos said that, while he appreciated the need to look ahead, he does not understand the committee's sense of urgency about what is described as the declining state of the First-Year Seminars. Professor Jagannathan agreed that the program does not seem to be in any immediate jeopardy. The Committee discussed the fact that many of the criteria that were established initially to define what would constitute a First-Year Seminar have faded away. It was noted that these seminars are often no longer taught by faculty from at least two disciplines, as was originally envisioned. They can now count toward the requirements for a major. In short, there seem to be no defining characteristics other than having each faculty member teach fifteen first-year students per seminar.

President Marx said he feels that it would be useful to re-evaluate the only requirement that Amherst has for all students, particularly at a moment when more resources may be available to support a revised program. In his view, it would be worth debating whether Amherst students should have some commonality of academic experience during their first year, which might be accomplished by assigning a common book or readings for all seminars or by focusing on a shared theme for part of the semester. Professor Servos expressed concern about moving the program in the direction of uniformity. He agreed that the seminar program should be better organized and better defined, while expressing the view that there is value in the diverse nature of the seminars as a means of meeting a variety of student needs. The Committee agreed that the First-Year Seminars should be examined in the context of the first-year experience and the overall College experience and that specific recommendations to improve the program should be offered. After discussing whether the First-Year Seminar Committee should undertake this assignment, the Committee asked the Dean and the President to consult with the CEP and to

prepare a list of names of colleagues, be they members of the committee or not, who might be asked to consider ways to enhance the program.

President Marx next asked the members if they thought that the issue, which has been raised by students, of the diversity of political views represented within the Faculty, should be brought before the Faculty for discussion. Professor Servos, noting that, as a faculty member, he has found that Amherst is a place that is, generally, very tolerant of individuals' views, said that he does not think that this is an urgent issue. Other members commented that individual faculty members' political views are not even known, often, and that it would be difficult to define what a proper balance might be, though it was agreed that there is value in having a range of perspectives represented within the Faculty. In respect to the feelings expressed by some students that their political views are not being respected by faculty and other students, the Committee agreed that every student has the right to express his or her beliefs and opinions and to be treated with respect, as articulated in the College's Statement on Freedom of Expression and Dissent (voted by the Faculty, 1968) and Statement on Respect For Persons (voted by the Faculty, 1969).

The President thanked the members and reiterated both his firm view that a political litmus test not be applied to the process of faculty hiring, as well as his hope that ways might be found to encourage departments, when they make hires, to consider the aim of having a range of perspectives represented by their members.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

AMHERST COLLEGE

January 21, 2008

To: The Committee on Education Policy and the Committee of Six From: The First Year Seminar Committee,

Buffy Aries (chair)
Jyl Gentzler
Ethan Temeles
Rick Griffiths (ex officio)

We recommend that the CEP lead the faculty in a reconsideration of the FYS program, which is not sustainable in its current form.

The CAP report made no recommendations on the FYS program beyond charging the CEP and the FYS Committee to consider the program further (p. 26). Working in an anomalous period of high voluntarism (40+ per year; 29-30 are needed), the CAP did not anticipate how vulnerable FYS recruitment might be to other CAP initiatives or how quickly a generation of FYS stalwarts might retire. In recruiting for 2008, we are grappling with a shortfall that is likely to grow worse over time for the following reasons:

- **A demographic cliff.** The core group of FYS volunteers formed under the Introduction to Liberal Studies (I.L.S.) program (1978-96) is retiring; a fifth of the 2005 staff have gone on full or phased retirement. Since 1998 almost a quarter of the seminars have been taught by seven individuals, all of whom will be as of fall 2008 either retired or, with one exception, over age 65. Compared to this senior group, overall participation is thin. Only one-sixth of the whole faculty has taught more than once in the last five years; another one-sixth has taught one time. While FYS has steadily been invigorated by newcomers, they can rarely manage more than sporadic participation.

- **Mixed signals to untenured faculty.** Over the last decade, fewer than one-tenth of sections have been taught by untenured faculty. Apparently no one-administrators, Committees of Six, FYS Committees-can or will say whether it's meritorious or foolish for an assistant professor to teach a FYS. As a result, the FYS Committee in recent years has not recruited actively in these ranks. How can we advocate to junior colleagues, given the pressures they face, a program without a 'mission'?

- **CAP initiatives.** FYS supporters have been pivotal in developing new ventures: the writing-intensive courses (English 01 and Philosophy 01), Biology/Chemistry 03, and Environmental Studies. FYS can expect further competition from CAP-proposed courses (writing / Q / arts / global / interdisciplinary), for which departments can receive fractional FTEs, while FYS remains a staffing liability. Along the same lines, departments are making staffing-intensive efforts to bolster students' writing/research skills (e.g., the new required mid-level seminars in Psychology; the required senior

projects in UST). We're not guessing here; colleagues tell us what courses they are teaching instead of FYS.

There is a fourth issue that has been with us from the start of FYS:

- Any 30 will do. Our committee does not have a charge or any authority to select among proposed courses, even if we had a surplus of volunteers. FYS has no mission for us to interpret. In most years the committee struggles to keep science and the arts from being completely unrepresented—usually managing at most one seminar by a practicing artist but otherwise takes what is offered. As a result, the seminar options represent liberal studies at Amherst in lopsided ways: Students have had little chance to study with a musician (1 section since 1998), a mathematician (2), economist (3), geologist (3), chemist (4), computer scientist (5), or physicist (6). Students have a better chance to work with someone in Theater and Dance (10), Biology (11), Art and Art History (12, but no one in studio), Psychology (14), Political Science (17), Anthro/Soc (25), English (29), or History (56).

We hasten to point out that the seminars, despite the difficult prospects for 2008 and after, have been alive and well this past fall. In December we talked with current instructors (24 of 31), who were enthusiastic about the program and about the current crop of students, though concerned about the stragglers and about students with ESL difficulties. In the context of many necessarily large courses for first-year students,¹ a section with only fifteen students can play an important role for beginning students. The seminars, especially in their discussion-based pedagogy, seem to be well appreciated. In a 2005 COME survey of all enrolled students, 66 percent agreed that they would encourage other students to enroll in an FYS course, even if it weren't required. In a spring 2006 inventory of best practices,² four-fifths of first-years found that their seminar had been intellectually engaging. First-year seminars have gained popularity among our peer institutions, who often envy Amherst's ability to provide seminars for all students (see the appendix).

Those who have heard these annual discussions of FYS instructors over the last five years also noted in December a growing distance between colleagues who strongly feel that the seminars should all become writing-attentive and those who will leave the program if that happens. The staffing shortages in most departments, especially in addressing writing skills, have sharpened criticism of FYS as a missed opportunity, with particular complaints from departments (natural sciences, Math/CS, Psychology) that have to deal with the writing-avoiders as seniors. The

¹ In the fall of 2007, one course with 164 students had 90 first-years; one with 113 students had 72; and another with 93 students had 45.

² The inventory can be found on the FYS Committee page on the Dean of the Faculty's site: https://cms.amherst.edu/academiclife/dean_faculty/faccolnmittees/fvscommittee

newly explicit FYS brochure for incoming students makes clear that not all seminars aim to teach writing, but the complaints persist from students who feel cheated if their seminar doesn't help their writing. This is a familiar issue: Of students (all four years) surveyed in the spring of 2005, 56 percent found that FYS has not helped their writing; about the same number could not see how FYS provides an introduction to college study different from other courses. In the 2006 inventory of best practices in teaching FYS, writing skills were the area where students had the highest expectations and where reality lagged by the largest degree. That inventory showed the large disparity between a cluster of high-rated and low-rated courses, with 15 percent of the students in the high-rated seminars saying that the class did not help their writing; in the low-rated courses, 55 percent said that.

In all, the writing-attentive FYS issue that the CAP declined to resolve seems to be heating up, especially while other college-wide solutions have not yet emerged. Meanwhile, the rationale of not wanting to tamper with the FYS volunteer base fades as that base shrinks.

Seeking alternatives, we have looked at FYS programs in peer institutions.³ None strives for a common theme among all seminars, but two commonalities emerge:

- Either the seminars have a writing or research requirement (some of them with a speaking component as well) or there is a writing requirement that can be fulfilled otherwise (with most seminars being writing-intensive in any case). Amherst is the only school without a writing requirement either in the FYS program or elsewhere.
- All programs have faculty or administrative oversight. Some have regular programs to train faculty to teach the seminars.

As the appendix reveals, there are many permutations in the programs tied to the structure of other graduation requirements. Swarthmore is relatively casual about the seminars (not required of students—though 90 percent take them—and not required to be writing courses), but students are otherwise required to take three writing-intensive courses. At Grinnell, the First Year Tutorial is the only required course, as at Amherst, but with highly specific expectations for what the courses will accomplish, including independent research. Grinnell merits special attention, since the tutorials are the basis of the advising system and of incorporating new faculty into the college; nobody gets tenure without teaching one, and the evaluations of the seminars also address the advising system.

The extent of *laissez faire* in our FYS program is not only unique among peer schools, it is unique at Amherst. The seminars are outside of the regulatory mechanisms and peer pressures within departments that maintain the quality and appropriateness of courses in the context of our increasingly structured majors. Functioning in the place of a department, the FYS Committee sends courses forward for approval, but is also the only standing faculty committee without a charge. The committee lacks any powers to set standards, establish policy, avoid redundancy, or

³ Bowdoin, Carleton, Dartmouth, Grinnell, Pomona, Smith, Swarthmore, Trinity, Wesleyan, and Williams. Grinnell, Smith, and Wesleyan have open curricula. See the appendix.

address what we know (from the 2006 inventory and persistent reports from students) to be striking disparities among seminars in workload, interest, and perceived learning. Last year the FYS committee could not sustain its proposal to keep some seminars from counting toward majors while others do not. Even though FYS is our only required course (and students, once enrolled, can't vote with their feet), the seminars are the courses with least accountability.

That lack of accountability is part of their appeal to instructors, who often want to get outside of the constraints of department courses (including the pressure to teach large numbers of students). Many make brilliant use of that freedom. There are suspicions that others just seek a captive audience. Whatever the case, the seminars are untouchable in ways that no other Amherst courses are.

What is to be done? Much is contingent on how Amherst addresses the skills issues. Requiring "W" courses might alleviate the writing expectations for FYS, but would probably drain FYS staffing further and further isolate FYS as an amorphous program with unclear objectives. We have only parts of solutions to recommend:

- **Rationalize departments' contributions to the program.** The 7.5 FTEs devoted to the program every year are not charity, but a college resource and, a part of departments' individual missions- a variable part, but one not impossible to determine or negotiate. The current system of voluntarism allows committed colleagues to teach the seminars, but regularly shuts out equally interested colleagues in departments who can't spare them for FYS. (The 10 least-participating departments fielded a total of 34 sections in the last ten years; that is 1/3 of Amherst departments contribute just over 1/10 of the sections.) There are various models of attaching seminars to departments. At Dartmouth, the required (and writing-intensive) seminars are taught in departments, but not counted toward major credit. At Swarthmore, which has several other requirements, the seminars count toward majors and easily recruit faculty since, for example, scientists can use them to teach fast-track introductions into their fields and the humanists can use them to attract students into their disciplines. At Grinnell, all departments are required to teach them.
- **Resolve the implications of FYS for untenured faculty.** We keep these faculty in the dark about whether the savvy assistant prof will teach FYS or to steer clear. Pomona uses the program as a way to introduce new faculty into teaching at the college by letting them join the 2% day training workshop and consultation provided to all FYS teachers at the end of the spring semester. As mentioned, Grinnell has an active training program and requires all untenured faculty to participate. See below for details.
- **Clarify the objectives of the program and give someone-the FYS Committee, the CEP, a dean-some authority to screen courses, look for a balanced range of offerings, and monitor the overall effectiveness of the program.** We're not going to get away forever with "nobody in charge" when FYS has the considerable symbolic weight of being our only required course and the only one that students can't switch. If we can't agree on a writing requirement, then it might be reasonable to make the seminars all "W" or at least require that they all be labeled "W", "A" (arts), or "Q".

Appendix: First-Year Seminar Programs at Peer Institutions

Compiled by Nancy Ratner

Bowdoin College

Bowdoin has been offering first-year seminars to all students since 2005, although not all students are guaranteed a seminar during their first semester. Those who fail to get admitted to a seminar in the fall are guaranteed a seminar in the spring, and some students manage to take more than one seminar during their first year. The seminars are limited to 16 students and are designed to ground first-year students in the fundamentals of research, academic writing, public speaking, critical reading and analysis, all within a discipline. They all share the common goal of teaching writing, and all adhere to a few rough guidelines in that respect. For example, the instructors agree to offer 4 papers with some structure allowing for revisions; the actual form is flexible and can include multiple drafts, work-in-progress conversations, or other methods. Students can receive major credit for many of the first-year seminars. Recruitment of instructors this year is in the hands of a visiting assistant professor (David Hecht), who is in his second year at the college. He does not believe Bowdoin has had any difficulty recruiting faculty to teach in the program in the past.

Carleton College

Students are required to take at least one "writing rich" (WR) course and to submit a portfolio of essays. One-third of their courses must also be "distributional," that is, distributed among courses marked "humanities," "social science," and the like.

At the moment, first-year students have a choice of special courses that enroll only first-year students and limit enrollment. Students can take more than one during their first year but only one per term (with the exception of courses linked in pairs and triplets). Students choose between writing seminars, first-year seminars (11 of the 18 current courses are "writing rich"), introductory courses reserved for first-year students, courses in pairs and triplets, and an interdisciplinary science program that has a 3-course sequence (students take one course per term and a colloquium that meets all year long). These are basically clusters of seminars around quantitative reasoning, writing, and cross-cultural understanding, although almost all are writing-intensive. There are no other common themes.

Elizabeth Ciner, Associate Dean of the College and Professor of English, oversees the program. She says that the college is engaged in a curriculum review, which is likely to change the way the seminars are offered, advertised, and staffed. Currently every department contributes a seminar to the program. In the future, every department will have responsibility for providing seminars based on the number of faculty in the department. Small departments might only provide a seminar once every two years. She anticipates trading of credits as well.

Grinnell College

Grinnell requires a First-Year Tutorial, a one-semester, four-credit seminar program, which gives each first-year student the opportunity to work in a small group with the tutorial professor on a topic of mutual interest. Although not all Tutorial sections progress in exactly the same way, most include an introduction to college-level writing, oral presentation and discussion, critical analysis, and information literacy. Students then undertake independent study of the tutorial topic, working individually or in small groups and meeting regularly with the professor in and out of class.

As the first ongoing relationship between student and professor, the tutorial guarantees that from the beginning each student knows at least one professor well. The tutorial professor also serves as the student's academic advisor until a major is declared. Because the tutorial is limited to 12-13 students, the tutorial professor contributes to a close student-advisor relationship, which has been the basis of Grinnell's academic advising system for more than 30 years.

Each year, faculty members from all departments offer more than 30 tutorials on different topics, allowing students to choose a subject that interests them.

They work from the following specific guidelines:

1. All tutors will submit a short written description of the topic for approval by the Dean or Associate Dean of the College towards the end of the Spring semester.
2. Each tutor will require the equivalent of at least four formal pieces of written work. To promote an understanding of writing as a process, one or more of these assignments may include the preparation of drafts, revisions, outlines, etc. The tutor will also provide classroom opportunities for the development of oral expression of ideas. Some tutors may include a research component, but this is not required.
3. It is the responsibility of tutors to work with librarians to make sure tutees receive instruction in information literacy appropriate to the goals of the tutorial. If the tutorial contains a research component, instruction may focus on resources, both print and electronic; if there is not a research component, librarians may suggest other useful ways to introduce students to basic information literacy. Instruction may take place during one session or in briefer multiple segments over two or more sessions.
4. It is the responsibility of tutors to make sure that their tutees have discussed the rules for proper citation and for paraphrase and that they practice applying these rules in their written work. Tutors may use exercises on proper citation and paraphrasing approved by the Subcommittee on Academic Honesty of the Committee on Academic Standing or they may incorporate such practice in their own writing assignments for the tutorial in order to satisfy this requirement. Tutors must place in each student's file either the completed exercise or a note stating that the student has practiced applying rules for proper citation and paraphrasing.
5. It is exceptionally rare for students to be permitted to change from one tutorial to another. Such changes are permitted only within the first two weeks of classes and only with the permission of the Director of Academic Advising and the new tutor.

Grading:

A student must complete the tutorial with a grade of C or higher to meet the tutorial graduation requirement. Any student earning a grade of D or F in the tutorial will be automatically placed on probation. Students earning a grade of D or F in the tutorial will be required to complete an appropriate course determined by the Associate Dean and the Director of Academic Advising in order to fulfill the tutorial requirement. This course must be completed with a grade of C or higher during his or her next semester at Grinnell. After the completion of this course and removal from probation, the student will be eligible for a "Plus-2" or independent study project (297, 397, 399).

Endorsed by the Grinnell College faculty April 19, 2003

Pomona College

First-year students all take a critical inquiry seminar, an interdisciplinary seminar limited to 15 students, based on the same principles as Amherst's FYS but with an emphasis on writing in the disciplines. All meet at the same time each week (a time reserved every day from 11-12 for public lectures and first-year seminars). Dara Regaignon, English department (and Amherst graduate), runs the program.

Faculty recruitment is managed through a formula that requires departments to contribute a particular number of seminars, based on the number of faculty in the department. All seminars are now taught by tenure-line faculty (a change from some years ago). Small departments might only provide courses every two years.

This is a relatively new undertaking. Previously, all students took a writing placement exam and then, based on the result, took a writing course. In 2004 Pomona abandoned the placement exam and writing course and hired Dara to oversee this program of seminars. She provides a 2 % day workshop a few days after graduation which nearly all faculty teaching in the program attend (\$1000 stipend for attending). The workshop focuses on teaching writing for at least one of the two days. New faculty are encouraged to teach in the program and are flown in for the workshop which then serves as an orientation for new faculty and an informal way to begin meeting colleagues outside their discipline. (Dara notes that the workshop's timing, right after the end of classes, seems to attract faculty, who are eager to think and talk about educational issues.) She offers another workshop in late January for people new to the program to work on course development and on writing course descriptions. Dara also offers 3-to-4 workshops in the fall semester to discuss particular issues and strategies. And she is also available during the year for one-on-one consultations.

The faculty teaching in the program rely on a set of course guidelines (core parameters -- 25 pages of graded writing, discussion-based class, etc.), to which they all agree at the beginning of the semester. They also agree to a set of goals for the courses (feedback for writing, revision opportunities, etc.). This is now the only writing-intensive course requirement, but Dara believes other courses are becoming more writing intensive as a result.

Smith College

Smith offers about 10 seminars each fall, which are open only to first-year students, all limited in size and some interdisciplinary. Class size varies from 14 to 20 students. The seminars for first-years focus on the development of writing, public speaking, critical thinking, class discussion, group work, library and quantitative skills. Most also satisfy the college's first-year writing-intensive requirement and some offer credit towards the major. At the moment they can serve about half the class. They hope, three years hence, to be able to offer enough for about 90% of the students - not enough to make it a requirement, however. Tom Riddell, dean of the first-year class, oversees the program, but solicitations for teaching come from the Provost and Dean of the Faculty. All courses at Smith are evaluated, including the seminars, and the results go to the Dean of the College, who shares the evaluations with the faculty member and the department of the faculty member. The evaluations are maintained in a file in the Dean of the Faculty's office.

Swarthmore College

Swarthmore has a first-year seminar program that is not required for all new students. (All but 29 students took one last year, and those who did not tended to be students who had not received their first choice of seminar). The seminars are limited to 12 students per class and focused on developing constructive participation and effective communication skills. Students are required to take three writing ("W") seminars.

Swarthmore has not had difficulty recruiting instructors. This may be in part because depart twents have been allowed to design the first-year seminar program for purposes that meet widely varying needs. Most humanities seminars are writing -intensive, about a third of the social science seminars are also, but none of the science seminars are. Many departments use the first-year seminar as an alternative entry into the department in order to allow participation without detracting from the department's ability to cover core courses and sequences. Unlike the humanities and social sciences, the science departments have developed small first year seminars to serve the needs of their most advanced students. They function at a much faster pace and more advanced level than the regular intro-level courses.

The provost office has been collecting, but not reviewing teaching evaluations for both the first year seminar program and the writing courses. Lisa Smulyan (faculty member) is chairing the committee that is evaluating both the seminar program and the writing program, both of which are undergoing a fouryear review (required by the enabling legislation). She plans to review the teaching evaluation materials, with the help of a social scientist who is currently analyzing the responses, in an attempt to learn whether the programs are meeting their intended goals.

Lisa noted that the programs were initially implemented in as flexible a way as possible, to encourage participation, and anticipates that they may wish to tighten their criteria, especially for "writing-intensive" courses, once they have clarified the program goals. She expects to have more information to share in June.

Trinity College

The First-Year Seminars are academically rigorous, designed to introduce new students to the critical analysis, writing skills, and workload that Trinity demands from all of its students. Discussion and debate are a standard part of the First-Year Seminar, as are exploring similar topics from various disciplines. As first-year students acclimate themselves to Trinity's academic demands, they also learn to navigate Trinity's academic resources. Through their seminar, students are introduced to the Computing, Mathematics, and Writing Centers, and the research opportunities available in and through the library.

Trinity has a writing-proficiency requirement. A faculty committee reviews all entering first-year students and may require some to take English 101, Writing, a college-level introduction to the art of expository writing. The program is administered by the Director and Acting Dean of the First Year Program.

Wesleyan University

Wesleyan offers a First Year Initiative - seminars with limited enrollment (-20 students). These seminars, which are not required of all students, are focused on writing, analyzing, discussing, and critical thinking. Williams College

Williams offers a First-Year Residential Seminar (FRS) in which students in a single entry of first-year housing agree to take one course in the fall semester jointly with the other entry members. The course is designed to confront students with important and provocative concepts and questions and to stimulate lively and productive discussions. This mixing of the social and academic lives of the FRS participants is intended to help students establish comfortable and meaningful relationships with both classmates and professors during their first year, and to give them the opportunity to integrate intellectual interests with the rest of their pursuits. If oversubscribed, FRS participants are randomly selected. Williams students must complete two "writing-intensive" ("WI") courses.

Amended February 15, 2008

The twentieth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2007-2008 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, February 11, 2008. Present were Professors S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Frank was absent due to illness.

The meeting began with announcements from the President. President Marx informed the members that he had shared with the senior staff of the College the Committee's view that it would be best that students not be singled out for special recognition through awards that are presented during Commencement. Last year, the Woods-Travis Prize, the award given to the graduating senior who has the highest overall grade average, and 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," were given at Commencement. (In addition, Phebe and Zephaniah Swift Moore Teaching Award recipients were acknowledged at Commencement.) President Marx noted that some members of the senior staff felt that it was important that such awards be given at Commencement so the awards and their recipients have maximum visibility. They felt, in particular, that awarding the Woods-Travis Prize at the Phi Beta Kappa ceremony would not be a good idea, since only a small number of students, faculty, staff, and family members attend that event. Noting her belief that most faculty members feel that Commencement should be day for honoring all Amherst students equally for the accomplishment of earning an Amherst degree, Professor Sinos wondered if most faculty members would agree with the Committee that awards should not be given at Commencement. She wondered if it would be helpful to the President to have the Faculty vote on this matter. Other members felt that the Faculty's time should not be used for this purpose, while noting that they believe that other colleagues would feel as the Committee does.

Discussion turned to the related matter of whether the College should be awarding the chief academic award (the Woods-Travis Prize) on a strictly numerical (raw GPA) basis. All agreed that using this sole criterion often does not identify the most accomplished or well-rounded student, academically. Some members wondered whether it has been agreed that this is the chief academic award. The President reiterated that he too feels that a purely numeric calculation of academic performance may not be the best measure of academic excellence and suggested again that the Faculty might want to consider the criteria for the award in the future. Professor George suggested that the history of the Woods-Travis Prize be reviewed, and the President agreed to read the relevant minutes and legislation, as well as the current description of the award. He said that he would share his findings with the Committee at a future meeting.

Continuing his remarks, President Marx reviewed with the members the consultative process that took place over the past two years, which has resulted in a set of college-wide priorities that are serving as the underpinning of the upcoming comprehensive campaign. He noted that a planning committee was created (the Committee on Academic Priorities, a.k.a. the CAP) with a majority of faculty membership; the Faculty voted to have co-chairs of that committee; the Faculty reviewed the full report of the CAP, including its twenty-two recommendations; the Faculty voted to support in principle the CAP report and the accompanying sum and substance; and the Committee of Six helped to determine which

Amended February 15, 2008

committees would consider the implementation of individual recommendations, based on the charges of these committees and the substance of the recommendations. The members agreed that the purposefulness with which the Faculty was included in the process of setting the priorities that would inform the campaign was unprecedented.

The President noted that he and colleagues have been consulting with the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) about the costs of implementing the CAP recommendations. He commented that, while it may be important for donors to be given fundraising categories and numerical targets for particular priorities—such as increasing access (financial aid) or academic life—setting and meeting fundraising goals for these categories will not determine the implementation, or the timing of the implementation, of the CAP recommendations. President Marx noted that all of the CAP's proposals are now in the process of being implemented or are the subject of further consultation (for example, writing). By necessity, funding may shift, based on donor response and interest. Any changes in the fundraising goals for particular areas will not change the College's ability to fund all of the CAP proposals—through fundraising, as well as through other means such as the endowment, loans, and the operating budget. While the campaign goal will likely be between \$400 million and \$425 million, the costs of implementing all of the CAP recommendations will be higher, President Marx said. The President reiterated his and the Board's intention to proceed to implement the recommendations of the CAP, even before all funding has been secured. For example, he noted that he expects that the Board will vote to implement the 100 percent sabbatical program in 2009-2010 and need-blind admission for international students (beginning with the Class of 2013) at their next meeting in April. The President commented that the Trustees have agreed to allocate new FTEs more quickly than originally envisioned, as well, in keeping with advice received last year from the Faculty.

Continuing the conversation, Dean Call noted that, while the practices associated with fundraising were new to many members of the CPR—and that some members worried initially that the setting of fundraising goals for particular areas would have an impact on the resources that would be devoted to implementing particular CAP recommendations—he believed that the members were now feeling more comfortable with the purposes and process of establishing fundraising targets. The President reiterated that campaign funds will not be sought or accepted to support any goal that has not been part of the consultative process of the CAP or future faculty deliberations. He noted that, in his conversations with donors thus far, they have been very excited by the priorities of the campaign. Many are willing to offer general support for the recommendations of the CAP, rather than stipulating that their gifts be put toward a particular priority. Dean Call noted that, as it should, the CPR is playing an important role in the process of consulting with the administration about the campaign. In keeping with their role in the implementation process, the CPR informed the President and the Dean that the initial proposal for supporting student research did not fully reflect the extent of interest among the Faculty and the students. As a result, the CPR plans to recommend a significant increase in the amount of support for faculty-student collaborative research, Dean Call noted.

Several members of the Committee commented that the pace of change in recent years has surprised many colleagues, and that some colleagues may be feeling some unease or

Amended February 15, 2008

confusion about the implementation process because they have not yet had time to catch their collective breath. Some members felt that some colleagues might also be a bit suspicious of the CAP implementation process because of its scale and ambitiousness, resulting in the view that some CAP recommendations will be given higher priority, when it comes to implementation, than others. Professor Servos said that he could not have imagined several years ago how quickly the CAP process would move forward, nor that so much would be accomplished so quickly. He commented that he views the success of the CAP process as testimony to the energy and skill of the administration. Professor O'Hara said that she has felt, at times, that there is less of a consultative process now than in the past, when it comes to certain things. She noted that she sometimes feels that she finds out about changes after the fact, when it's too late to make her voice heard. She wondered if this state of affairs is a byproduct of the rapidity of the changes that the College has been experiencing. President Marx noted that, if systems—such as committee structures—are working properly, individuals should not feel disconnected in this way. He said that he remains committed to faculty oversight through established committee structures and that he is grateful for the Faculty's engagement and the way in which committees have sought to be all the more effective. The President also reiterated that it is his hope that any concerns about a lack of consultation would be anticipated or brought forward, and he said that the administration must remain cognizant of such concerns. Professor Servos noted that, for most colleagues, their scholarship and teaching come first, and the life of the College comes second. It has been, in fact, hard to keep up with everything that has been going on in recent years, he said, but the basics of faculty governance do appear to be working and to be up to the tasks at hand. Professor Sinos suggested that faculty concerns are not based on misunderstanding of the process so much as a concern that the College budget is not unlimited, so that priorities do matter.

The Dean made several announcements, including that Professor Benedetto has agreed to serve on the Student Fellowship Committee and that Professor Brandes will join the Ad Hoc Committee on Study Abroad. Vacancies on these committees were the result of leaves and changes in committee assignments, the Dean said. Professor Sinos asked if the Committee could discuss committee assignments earlier this year than it has done in the past, or at least have a list of eligible faculty members to consider. The Dean said that he is open to doing so, but some of the timing around the consideration of committee assignments is dependent on the completion of the Committee of Six election. The Dean next asked if the administrators, librarians, and students who are serving with faculty on the Library Planning Committee should attend the February 19 Faculty Meeting, since campus facilities planning is on the agenda and the library will be discussed under that rubric. The members agreed that it would be helpful to have the full Library Planning Committee present. In response to the Committee's inquiry at the last meeting, the Dean reported that he had confirmed with the Dean of Students office that the Counseling Center, Health Center, and Dean of Students' Office all have regular hours during Interterm.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Sinos asked the Dean if plans were in place to evaluate the new pet policy, which was implemented in July 2006. She

Amended February 15, 2008

suggested that a special committee be established for this purpose. The Dean and the President said that they would consult with the senior staff about this issue.

Professor George next raised questions about some of the recent practices and directions being taken by the College's Department of Information Technology (IT), and the other members also expressed criticisms of IT. These criticisms were directed primarily at policy decisions regarding the role of IT, particularly the balance between service and support to the academic work of the Faculty, versus innovation and production of software, and not at the work of the IT staff. The members agreed that staff in all areas of IT have been and continue to be responsive and helpful. At the conclusion of the discussion, the Dean suggested that there seemed to be a need to improve communication between the IT Department and the Faculty. As a first step, he asked the members if they would like to have an informal meeting with Peter Schilling, Director of Information Technology, and, perhaps, Lyle McGeoch, Chair of the Faculty Computer Committee. The members agreed that such a meeting would be helpful for gaining clarity on these matters.

At 5:10, the Committee was joined by Rick Griffiths, Associate Dean of the Faculty and coordinator of Amherst's New England Association of Schools and College (NEASC) reaccreditation review, to discuss the upcoming (March 2-5) visit to campus of the evaluation team. In preparation for the Committee's meeting with the reviewers, Dean Griffiths reviewed the procedures and expectations of the reaccreditation process and the standards by which the College will be evaluated. He also discussed with the members issues that might be of particular interest to the reviewers, given the matters raised by the last evaluation team a decade ago, and NEASC's recent revision of its standards and current emphases. President Marx stressed that what is most important to convey is that, rather than resting on its successes, the College is actively engaged in thinking about its work, challenging itself, and exploring important and complex questions that are not easily resolved. At the conclusion of the discussion, the members thanked Dean Griffiths for sharing his knowledge about the reaccreditation process.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended March 27, 2008

The twenty-first meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2007-2008 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, February 25, 2008. 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 announcements from the President. President Marx said that he would like to respond to questions that had been raised at the Faculty Meeting of February 19 about his comments in the Committee of Six minutes regarding the diversity of political views represented within the Faculty. At the Faculty Meeting, several colleagues conveyed concern about the President's statement in the minutes that, in his view, while a political litmus test should clearly not be applied to the process of faculty hiring, it was his hope that ways might be found to encourage departments, when they make hires, to consider the aim of having a range of perspectives represented by their members. President Marx reiterated that he did not mean to suggest, nor does he believe, that the faculty hiring process should be purposefully politicized through the use of a political litmus test or through any other devices. His concern, which perhaps was misunderstood because of the way it was worded, is that the curriculum could be constrained as a result of politics, even inadvertently, entering into the hiring process; he trusts that the Faculty would share concern about any such constraint. The President said that he plans to speak with Professor Alex George, the College's American Association of University Professors (AAUP) representative, about this issue. Professor S. George said that it is critical that faculty autonomy in the hiring process and academic freedom be preserved. The President and the Dean agreed that doing so is of the highest priority. Raising a related issue, the President reiterated that he plans to explore further and to address complaints made to him by some conservative students that their political views are not being respected by faculty and other students.

President Marx expressed concern about progress on the Faculty's implementation of several recommendations of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP). He first discussed the CAP's recommendation that the College "further refine the capabilities of our online resources, both for purposes of self-assessment and advising, e.g., in software that tracks course distribution patterns of each student's course work so as to highlight and draw advising attention to those areas that may be missing from the student's learning..." (p. 25, CAP Report). He noted that, in 2006, the Committee of Six had discussed the report's recommendation that the College use software that tracks patterns of each student's course selections for purposes of advising and self-assessment and to encourage (but not require) breadth in course selection. The Committee of Six reviewed the six broad areas (outlined on page 61 of the College Catalog) within which students are currently encouraged to select courses, and which were approved by faculty vote. It was agreed that they would be used as a starting point for the advising matrix. After some discussion, the Committee of Six agreed in 2006 that the wording of one category, "knowledge of culture and a language other than one's own and of human experience in a period before one's lifetime" contains too many parts to track accurately students' course selections within this multi-faceted area. It was therefore agreed that this category should be subdivided graphically for purposes of clarity. The Committee of Six, in 2006, said that further consultation (beyond the

Amended March 27, 2008

Committee of Six) would not be necessary to undertake this project. That year, the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) had agreed to ask members of the Faculty to determine where each of their courses fit within the broad areas. Since that time, the CEP has returned often to a discussion of this project and has determined that, on balance, the categories in the College Catalog would be unworkable in practice. President Marx said that it is his hope that this project, which is still under consideration by the CEP, will move forward. He asked how the “keywords” notion put forward by the CEP might or might not meet the expectations of the Faculty in helping to guide advising or to provide data that could be aggregated and charted. Professor Sinos questioned the utility of providing the Faculty with an advising matrix, while Professor Servos said that he felt that it might be a useful advising tool. The President said that the Committee of Six had agreed to implement this recommendation and is gratified that the CEP will do so, using whatever categories are agreed upon as most useful.

On a related issue, the President said that he is grateful for progress being made on the issue of writing, through faculty leadership by Professors Gentzler and Barale and through various efforts, such as writing intensive courses. The President suggested that the Faculty needs a clear plan for moving toward developing a writing requirement for faculty debate and vote, as requested by the Faculty. He stated his belief that, as a matter of faculty governance, the Faculty’s will is best served if proposals are developed and acted upon.

In relation to the advising matrix, Professor Servos suggested that it might be beneficial to take an incremental approach. The Faculty might first focus on assigning their courses to one or two of the most important categories, for example. He felt that it might be best to start with designating as *W* courses those courses that offer some significant attention to writing. Doing so would be very useful for students and advisors, Professor Servos said. He noted that, in his view, the criteria for *W* courses that were developed by the Writing Committee a number of years ago should be used. While there may be no perfect answer to this question, the President said that, in his view, it would be best to choose some criteria that make sense and to move forward with designating as *W* courses those courses that meet those criteria, even though the criteria may be imperfect.

In regard to the matrix, Professor George said that he feels strongly that faculty function best, and engage most effectively in their work as teachers and advisors, without a high level of bureaucracy. Professor Frank wondered about the value of the measurement that would be provided by the advising matrix. Professor Jagannathan said that he believes that, in the aggregate over the long term, data provided by such a matrix might yield some useful information. He sees value in the project, as long as it is not a drain on faculty time and does not increase the level of bureaucracy.

Returning to the issue of writing, Professor Frank noted that substantial progress has been made on this front, and that steps are being taken that will prepare the way for the development and possible implementation of a writing requirement. Dean Call agreed. Professor Frank pointed to the fact that all of the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Writing Committee are being implemented. Faculty are learning how to teach writing through the special faculty writing seminar, and she feels that, once colleagues are more comfortable doing so, there will be more

Amended March 27, 2008

interest in bringing forward a proposal for a writing requirement. Professor Jagannathan suggested that it might be useful to develop a schedule and process for developing a proposal for a writing requirement. President Marx agreed.

Continuing the discussion, Professor Servos said that, while progress on the writing front is moving more slowly than he might, like progress is, in fact, being made. Professor O'Hara noted that the President may be expecting that the pace of change should be faster than what is actually desirable, from her point of view. She pointed to rapid progress on many fronts—from the decision to adopt the new environmental studies major, to the current review of the First-Year Seminar Program, to the creation of new courses for less well-prepared students—and suggested that the President should recognize that change is taking place and should have patience with the process. President Marx agreed that important changes are occurring, and said that he respects the Faculty's efforts. The President thanked the members for the perspective and said that he would take into consideration their views on the pace and range of curricular change at the College.

The Committee turned briefly to personnel business. Under "Questions from Committee members, Professor Frank noted that not a single male faculty member, other than two colleagues who are both faculty members and administrators, had attended the Teaching and Learning Lunch that was held on February 15. The lunch, which was organized by Amrita Basu, Associate Dean of the Faculty, and led by Gretchen Krull, Assistant Director of Health Education/Sexual Assault Counselor, focused on teaching disturbing materials (for example, readings and films that are sexually violent) in classrooms in which it is possible that there are women students who have been sexually assaulted, and who are vulnerable to post-traumatic responses—a topic that was broached at the November 6 meeting of the Faculty.

The Committee next reviewed briefly its recent informal conversation with Peter Schilling, Director of Information Technology, and Lyle McGeoch, Chair of the Faculty Computer Committee. The meeting was held in response to the Committee's questions about some of the recent practices and directions being taken by the College's Department of Information Technology (IT). Recommendations that emerged as a result of the conversation were that Mr. Schilling should increase communication with the Faculty via reporting at two Faculty Meetings annually and through regular targeted communication with the Faculty that should be limited to IT issues that would be of faculty concern, for example, online registration. It was agreed that creating faculty focus groups to provide feedback about new projects while they are in the development stages would also be very useful. Mr. Schilling informed the members that, despite rumors to the contrary, Blackboard will be retained and supported as a course management tool until the Faculty agrees that the new content management system (CMS) is meeting the Faculty's needs. The Committee agreed that it can be difficult for IT to recognize the impact that changes in technology have on the Faculty and that it can be difficult for the Faculty to recognize College needs in the realm of IT. At the conclusion of the discussion about IT, Professor Sinos expressed concern that the library, too, is sometimes not consulting sufficiently with Faculty about areas that are within the Faculty's domain or addressing faculty concerns when such concerns are conveyed. Could the Dean and President be

Amended March 27, 2008

helpful, she wondered, in fostering a stronger understanding on campus that faculty input is critical to decisions affecting resources for teaching and research? The Dean noted that the Faculty sets academic priorities through long-range planning conversations, such as the CAP process and the adoption of the College's mission statement, and develops those priorities through the work of individual departments and faculty committees (notably including the CEP). He encouraged all of his colleagues to communicate with their representatives on faculty committees whenever questions or concerns arise and, in particular, to participate in the conversations to be organized by the Library Planning Committee and for the campus academic facilities study over the next year.

The members turned to personnel matters.

The Committee next discussed the report (appended) of the Ad Hoc Committee on Study Abroad. Among other things, the report recommends that the ad hoc committee become a standing committee of the Faculty and be re-named the Committee on International Education, beginning in 2008-2009. The President noted that study abroad is an important area and that the College is supportive of it, and of its further growth, while being mindful of the constraints that particular departments have in terms of enabling students to study away from Amherst. President Marx said that it is important that the College ensures that a diversity of opportunities exists for study abroad and that Amherst takes responsibility for the quality of the programs in which our students participate. Professor Servos noted that he had hoped to see the committee address the topic of how best to integrate students' study abroad experiences into their coursework at Amherst. President Marx agreed and said that Janna Behrens, Director of International Experience, has sent him some information about how other institutions address this and other study abroad issues and that he would share this information with the committee, after checking with Ms. Behrens. Professor Sinos expressed the hope that programs would not necessarily have to be accredited to be considered appropriate for Amherst students. She noted the importance of the Faculty's role in evaluating the study abroad programs in which their students participate. At the conclusion of the discussion, the members agreed that the Dean should draft a motion, on behalf of the Committee, to approve a draft charge to the committee, to endorse the committee's change from ad hoc to permanent status (beginning in 2008-2009), and to change the committee's title to the Committee on International Education.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Study Abroad

Following the Report of the Special Committee on the Amherst Education of May 2003 the faculty created a Global Comprehension Working Group, which set about examining current practice at Amherst and elsewhere with regard to the issue of studying and engaging in the world beyond the U. S. In 2004 the working group recommended five initiatives, the first of which was "To provide more institutional support for students, encouraging them to engage in overseas learning, including studying, working, interning, and volunteering abroad." Specific recommendations under this initiative included establishing a faculty committee on "overseas learning" to provide oversight of study abroad. The Dean of the Faculty responded in the spring of 2005 by appointing an ad-hoc committee on study-abroad to begin work in the fall, asking that we report to the faculty in the fall of 2007, at which time the faculty might decide whether or not to establish such a committee on a permanent basis.

Based on our experience of the past two and a half years, the ad hoc committee recommends that the faculty create a permanent committee on international education beginning in the 2008-09 academic year. This committee should consist of three faculty members, each from a different department, one of whom should serve as chair, together with the registrar and the director of international experience, ex officio. The committee should be charged with 1) maintaining and reviewing a list of approved study-abroad programs; 2) reviewing student petitions for study-abroad programs that are not already approved; 3) reviewing student evaluations of all international educational programs; 4) facilitating communication between the faculty and the director of international experience to aid in advising; 5) consulting with the director in the effort to identify new opportunities for international experience and facilitate student participation in them. In support of the recommendation to establish a permanent

committee, we offer a brief history of study abroad procedures, an account of our activities, and some specific recommendations concerning how the college might work through this committee to expand the global experience of our students.

History of Study Abroad Advising and Oversight

In the past, policy and procedure were in the hands of the registrar and a staff member in the Career Center under the Dean of Students office who served as the study abroad advisor. These two consulted informally with faculty concerning programs and courses about which they might have some expertise and some opinion. There was an approved list of programs, all of which were clearly liberal arts-oriented and provided a cultural context for the courses offered. Programs not already on this list were vetted by the study abroad advisor, who surveyed advisors at other liberal arts colleges about their experiences with those programs. When reports were favorable and the programs were judged to be sufficiently rigorous academically, the registrar usually granted those programs provisional approval and then scrutinized the students' evaluations when they returned. If several Amherst students had satisfactory experiences on a "provisional" program, it joined the approved list. Overtime more than two hundred study abroad programs were approved. When student evaluations indicated that a program had deteriorated academically or administratively, it was removed from the approved list.

Beginning in the 1980s, the study abroad advisor and the registrar sought input from faculty members and urged that a faculty committee be established to provide oversight. Some of the foreign language departments provided occasional input, but faculty involvement was minimal. Individual students and advisors who sought approval for untested programs often questioned the procedures. In 1998 an ad hoc committee on study abroad recommended a

number of new procedures designed to "help bring more shape and coherence to the process" used by students in planning study abroad. The recommendations included setting earlier deadlines for filing intent to study abroad, requiring students to declare majors and submit formal applications with signatures of their advisors, and establishing regular liaison between the study abroad advisor and appropriate departments. All of these recommended procedures were implemented, but an additional recommendation that "the *ad hoc* committee be reconstituted to consider their effectiveness in addressing both the academic and financial issues" appears to have been ignored.

In 2001 William Hoffa became Amherst's official study abroad advisor on a part time basis, bringing a new level of experience and expertise to the enterprise. Students were now invited to petition for acceptance of new programs with the support of an academic advisor. By the time the Global Comprehension Working Group began its study in 2003-04, it was clear that Amherst needed a better institutional structure to help integrate study abroad into the academic programs of its students. The procedures implemented after 1998 have helped in providing some "shape and coherence" to the process, but in so doing they have only clarified the need for more faculty attention to the academic issues involved in study abroad.

In the fall of 2005 the current *ad hoc* committee, consisting of three faculty members from three separate departments, the study abroad advisor and the registrar, was established and charged with "shaping policies and procedures for evaluating and approving study-abroad programs," as well as "working to expand the range of countries and linguistic opportunities offered." We understood this charge to follow upon the recommendation of the Global Comprehension Working Group that Amherst "provide more institutional support for students,

encouraging them to engage in overseas learning," and especially to take advantage of opportunities in non-traditional areas such as Africa, Asia, and South America. In addition, we continue to be informed of the administration's concern for balancing the number of students who study abroad in the fall and spring semesters.

Finally, on the occasion of William Hoffa's retirement in 2006 the college decided to create a new position - Director of International Experience - on a full-time basis, but with some additional duties in the Career Center under the Dean of Students office. During that fall we participated in the search for the new director. Janna Behrens was hired and began her work in February of 2007. It is only now - in the fall of the ad hoc committee's third year - that we are able to proceed with the full_ benefit of her expertise in this area.

Activities of the ad hoc committee on study abroad

In pursuing the ad hoc committee's charge we have been cognizant of concerns expressed by several members of the faculty about the academic merit of some varieties of the study abroad experience. While we strongly agree with the Global Comprehension Working Group's defense of the general academic value of study abroad, we feel that improved faculty oversight of study abroad might address possible problems and strengthen the general faculty's confidence in the enterprise. Accordingly, we have established procedures for our committee's oversight of student applications to study abroad, their proposed courses of study while abroad, and requests for college credit. We have also explored new procedures for adding and removing programs from the existing "approved list" and for encouraging and evaluating student petitions to participate in programs not on this list. More generally, we have sought to improve the information and advising that students receive from the administration and the faculty. We have been interested

in ways to help students prepare themselves for study abroad - for example, encouraging them to take courses in the relevant language, history, or culture of their region of interest - and to integrate their study abroad experience into their program of study at the College. To that end we have introduced very well attended sessions on study abroad at the departmental information sessions hold during Orientation. We also have thought about how to keep the general faculty informed about study abroad issues, deadlines, and procedures as they advise students.

The focus of our work in the fall of 2007 was on improving communications, streamlining procedures, and analyzing current data concerning how, why, where, and when our students choose to study abroad. With the committee's advice, Janna is redesigning the study abroad web site to make the variety of geographic, cultural, and linguistic opportunities clearer and easier to access. We are urging departments to discuss, clarify, and post their policies about credit for the major from study abroad programs and we are working to see that information about deadlines, etc., reach all second-year students and their advisors during the fall semester. We are implementing improvements in student evaluations of programs with regard to the value of specific courses, tutorials, field work, and linguistic opportunities and their integration into individual students' academic plans. These evaluations, which are available for viewing by students and advisors on the web site, are intended to encourage other students in planning for study abroad. We are also discussing ways to increase institutional commitment to study abroad and to international experience more generally. Such discussions inevitably extend to opportunities for language study, internships, summer programs, and other opportunities that might be linked to study abroad and have a positive impact on the local academic environment.

This committee should both represent the faculty as a whole with regard to such matters and provide information to the faculty as new opportunities and problems arise.

Specific Recommendations

1) The first step in providing "more institutional support for students, encouraging them to engage in overseas learning" is to make the institution's commitment clear and visible. A quick study of Amherst and nine New England institutions with whom we like to compare ourselves shows that in 2006-07 we were unique in having no faculty committee for oversight of study abroad (**Figure 1**). Perhaps the most influential factor in encouraging study abroad at other institutions are the roles of the study abroad advisor - now called on this campus the director of international experience - and the faculty committee. The advisor is generally charged with marketing the study abroad experience to the college community. The faculty committee facilitates communication with departments and reviews programs for *academic quality*. We recommend that the permanent committee work to provide all means to enhance the academic quality of study abroad for our students and encourage them to engage in it.

2) In addition, although a commitment to international experience does appear in our mission statement, on the college web site the entry point for information concerning study abroad and other opportunities is hidden behind "Offices & Administrative Services" > "Career Center".> "International Study & Work" > "Study Abroad". We recommend that the profile of study abroad change so that prospective students and current students, as well as faculty, are encouraged to understand that providing international experience is a significant part of the *academic* mission of the college.

3) The number of students studying abroad on programs for which they have petitioned the committee has increased from 14 in 2005-06, to 27 in 2006-07, and to 33 in 2007-08. Not all petitions are approved and not all of those who petition successfully follow through. Those who do end up studying abroad on these programs tend to be highly motivated and academically engaged. The study abroad advisor and the committee have focused not so much on increasing the numbers as on matching students to appropriate opportunities. The increase in numbers nonetheless suggests that our current procedures are succeeding in encouraging qualified students to pursue new opportunities. We recommend that the committee continue to develop the communications that encourage such petitions and, after sufficient review, to move the most academically sound programs to the approved list.

4) Working to "expand the range of countries and linguistic opportunities offered" necessarily requires encouraging foreign language study, both in preparation for and during study abroad. A careful reading of the statistics shows that, by and large, the number of our students who choose to study abroad in places where the primary language spoken is not English, and where study of the native language is either required or offered as an option, has increased in the past three years (**Figure 2**). Over the past three years an alumnus has donated funds for two summer fellowships for Chinese language study in China, providing six students with a variety of academic interests an opportunity to study there. Given the success of this model, we support the Global Comprehension Working Group's recommendation "*that the College establish and provide funding for ten Summer and five Post-Graduate Global Fellowships.*" Some of these Fellowships could be targeted for the study of languages that are not currently represented in the Amherst College curriculum, or for travel to those areas of the world that are not often visited.

" We believe the Chinese summer fellowships provide a model for an attractive and academically appropriate form of international experience and recommend that the college seek funding for summer language study abroad in connection with academic programs at the college more broadly. Such an effort would enhance both the visibility of language study opportunities and the commitment to international experience as a significant part of the college's *academic* mission.

5) A quick glance at the figures shows that the number of Amherst students who depend on financial aid and study abroad as part of their academic program has increased over the past five years (**Figure 3**). The decision to replace student loans with grants for financial aid means that some students may be able to afford continuing their education internationally after graduation. Support for summer language study before graduation would further enhance this opportunity. We recommend that the college make the connections among these developments a more visible part of its mission, and that the committee explore how they can be applied to expanding opportunities for study abroad.

If we truly wish to encourage our students to engage in overseas learning as an integral part of their academic experience we - the whole college community -- will need to address several issues over the coming years. First and foremost, we will need to encourage, enable, and provide support for intensive language study. Second, we will need to explore opportunities for overseas experience beyond those study-abroad programs that occur during the regular academic year. Third, we will need to highlight the importance of global awareness and overseas learning more clearly in recruitment, admission, orientation, advising, pre-registration, and support for advanced academic work. The director of international experience and interested faculty can

identify good programs and encourage students to apply to them. We can encourage students to study appropriate languages and make students aware that their experience will be greatly enriched by taking the language in advance and studying the language while there. Or we can help to find summer language programs and internships abroad. But we cannot simply assume that students are willing or able to commit themselves to such programs without institutional encouragement and support. It should be the job of this committee to facilitate efforts in this direction without burdening advisors unnecessarily with administrative tasks.

FIGURE 1.

Permanent faculty committee for study abroad?	
Amherst	No
Bowdoin	Yes
Brown	Yes
Harvard	Yes
Smith	Yes
Vassar	Yes
Wellesley	Yes
Wesleyan	Yes
Williams	Yes
Yale	Yes

* Not called a faculty committee on study abroad at all institutions. For example, at Williams College study abroad is reviewed by the Committee for Academic Standing.

FIGURE 2.

English-speaking and Non-English-speaking countries & European and Non-European Countries for Amherst College Study Abroad Students

	% of students from the total studying abroad			
	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
English-speaking Countries	40%	24%	21%	30%
Non-English Speaking Countries	60%	76%	79%	70%

FIGURE 3.

Study Abroad Summary 2002-2007[^]

	Total students abroad	Fall & Full Year Study Abroad Students with Aid	Spring Study Abroad Students With Aid	Total Study Abroad Students Aided	% of Aided Study Abroad Students	% Aided Overall
2006-07	155	46	37	83	54	50
2005-06	163	41	28	69	42	49
2004-05	148	27	44	71	48	48
2003-04	163	31	44	75	46	48
2002-03	155	23	30	53	34	48

[^]From Amherst College Financial Aid Office

Amended March 28, 2008

The twenty-second meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2007-2008 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, March 10, 2008. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

In preparation for a discussion planned for the next Committee of Six meeting, the Dean distributed to the members a report (appended) prepared by Rhonda Cobham-Sander, Special Assistant to the President for Diversity, on the current state of diversity and inclusion efforts at the College and recommendations for moving forward in this area. Professor Cobham-Sander will end her term as Special Assistant at the end of the 2007-2008 academic year.

Prompted by recent questions that have arisen about how best to coordinate the use of College performance spaces by members of the College and local community, President Marx suggested that Amherst should develop a coordinated set of principles and practices to guide the process of allocating College spaces for short-term use by internal and external groups. At present, he noted, access to facilities such as the gym, Buckley Recital Hall, and Kirby Theater is overseen by individual departments and/or faculty members. Dean Call said that he too is interested in finding ways to improve the system by which members of the Faculty, student body, staff, and local community reserve campus spaces. He feels that enhancing coordination in this regard would be particularly helpful in promoting collaboration in the arts. The members agreed, and the President said that he would consult with the senior staff and would organize a meeting with the following representatives from the Departments of Music, Theater and Dance, and Physical Education, and Facilities: Professor Jenny Kallick (Buckley Recital Hall); Peter Lobdell (Kirby Theater); Suzanne Coffey, Director of Athletics and Physical Education (athletic facilities); Irene Berwick, Summer Programs and Scheduling System Coordinator; and Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services. Professor O'Hara noted that she has had concerns about the lack of communication that she and her colleagues have experienced regarding the use of her department's teaching labs by outside summer programs. Some issues of coordination and safety have emerged as a result, and while these issues do get resolved on an ad hoc basis, she feels that it would be helpful at the planned meeting to discuss the use of campus facilities by outside groups during the summer, as well. President Marx agreed.

Discussion returned to the issue of teaching writing at the College. President Marx said that, while he continues to look for a plan or schedule for the ongoing efforts to develop a proposal for a writing requirement, he respects the dedication and hard work of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). He noted that he recognizes the progress that has been made thus far in the area of writing, as well as on other recommendations of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) about which the CEP has been deliberating. The President said that he had met with the CEP on February 29 and that he had found the conversation to be very informative, as was a subsequent email to him from CEP Chair Martha Umphrey, in which she summarized the CEP's work this year. President Marx told the members that he was preparing a response to Professor Umphrey's email and that he intended to ask her permission to share their correspondence with the Faculty, so as to inform future discussion. (The President later made this request, and Professor Umphrey agreed that the email exchange should be appended to these minutes.)

Amended March 28, 2008

Continuing the discussion about writing, Professor Frank noted that the CEP is trying to build faculty consensus on this issue, and that doing so requires time. The Dean noted that, on one hand, the CEP has devoted a great deal of thought to the issue of writing. On the other hand, a proposal for a writing requirement, which was requested by the Faculty, has not been brought forward. Professor Jagannathan suggested that, in regard to writing efforts, the problem might be that there are too many moving parts. These parts, in his view, do not seem to be coordinated, which might be complicating efforts to move toward the goal of developing a proposal for a writing requirement. He noted, for example, that, while Professors Barale and Gentzler had developed a worthy writing initiative (The Faculty Seminar on Writing Instruction), that effort was outside the formal governance structures that had been charged with working on the writing issue and was, in essence, a private initiative that was not constituted by the Faculty. At the same time, the CEP was at work on the writing question. Professor Servos said that he feels that rapid progress was being made on this issue for some time and that things then began to stall. He noted that the Special Committee on the Amherst Education (SCAE) had recommended that writing-intensive courses be developed and that writing-attentive courses be designated with a W. These recommendations, in turn, informed the recommendations of the CAP. Progress seemed to slow and momentum seemed to be lost, he felt, with the report of the Ad Hoc Writing Committee. On the other hand, he noted, perhaps there was the need, by the time that report was put forward, for colleagues to catch their breath, to take time to think, and to build consensus. He said that, while he was disappointed that the rapid advances on this issue slowed, he remains optimistic and feels that work is being done and progress is being made.

Returning to the issue of the consideration of the First-Year Seminar Program, Dean Call noted that the First-Year Seminar Committee had met with the CEP, President Marx, and him. The committee informed them that, if the First-Year Seminar Committee were to take the lead in developing a First-Year Seminar proposal that would be brought to the Committee of Six, and then brought before the Faculty as a whole, they would require a specific charge to define the parameters of this project. The Dean asked the Committee for their views on how encompassing such a charge should be. Should it, for example, encompass the first-year experience more broadly or be focused on recommendations surrounding the curriculum only? In terms of the seminar program, should the committee consider issues such as staffing, intellectual content, and a possible emphasis on writing? Should the committee be charged with shaping a longer-term charge for itself, thus defining its role in relation to its recommendations? The Dean also asked the members if they felt that membership on the First-Year Seminar Committee should be supplemented with additional colleagues for purposes of this assignment and, if so, for recommendations of colleagues. The members agreed that the committee membership of the First-Year Seminar Committee should be augmented with additional colleagues, at least two of whom have taught First-Year Seminars, and suggested specific colleagues.

Continuing the conversation, Professor O'Hara noted that, when she was on the First-Year Seminar Committee in 2006, Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research, had assisted the committee in administering (in the spring of that year) an in-depth survey to first-year students about their experiences in the program. She suggested that the survey results might be useful to the committee as it undertakes its work. The members agreed that the Committee of Six should develop a charge for the First-Year Seminar Committee and that the committee should focus on evaluating the existing First-Year Seminar Program and making

Amended March 28, 2008

recommendations on how to improve it, rather than on the first-year experience as a whole.

The Committee next considered whether a Faculty Meeting should be held on April 1 and possible agenda items. It was agreed that the meeting should be held, and that the Faculty should consider the following: the motion to create, as recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee on Study Abroad, a new standing committee of the Faculty that would be called the Committee on International Education, and course proposals. The update on campus facilities planning, which was postponed at the last Faculty Meeting, should also be on the agenda, the members agreed.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Sinos asked if the President would be willing to receive communication about the pet policy directly, rather than through the Treasurer. President Marx said that all members of the Amherst community are welcome to write to him about this and any other issues of concern to them. The Committee next asked whether the reaccreditation visiting team had given any feedback following their time on campus (March 2-5). President Marx said that the visit had gone very well and that the committee was very positive overall. In addition to offering a good deal of praise, the team, in their preliminary oral report, made a number of useful suggestions and raised some questions about the College’s ability to make progress on a number of curricular fronts. They were also interested in the current conversations about multicultural issues on campus. The team will send a draft of their report in early April, President Marx noted.

President Marx next informed the members that he was preparing a response to Senators Max Baucus and Charles Grassley, leaders of the U.S. Senate Committee on Finance. He explained that, in January, these senators had contacted Amherst and 135 other colleges and universities with endowments of \$500 million or more across the country. The legislators asked for clarification on the schools’ undergraduate tuition, spending on financial aid and endowment growth, among other matters.

Before turning to personnel business, the Committee reviewed course proposals and voted to forward them to the Faculty. At the conclusion of their personnel discussion, the Committee turned to the report of the FCAFA. In fall 2006, the Committee of Six charged the 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,” in order to compare the distributions of these measures among Amherst students. The Committee also requested 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.” The Committee noted that much of the information that is included in the report was disseminated to the Faculty at the December 5, 2006, meeting of the Faculty, during which the FCAFA presented a progress report.

It was noted that, in its current report, the FCAFA commented that, “While the [Committee of Six] charge focuses on faculty concern with meritocratic criteria for admission, the Committee of Six discussion leading up to the charge...was more explicit in focusing faculty concern on recent efforts to diversify the student body. Among other things, the Committee of Six wanted to ‘know whether these [particular] students on average are being well served’ by being able to take ‘full advantage of our open curriculum’ and ‘perform up to their potential.’” In

Amended March 28, 2008

this context, Professor O'Hara said that the Faculty should use this report as an occasion to have a conversation about the many positive aspects of having diversity on campus. Professor Servos agreed that, while the report does not bring forward any actionable items, a general discussion will be important because of the issues raised. Professor Frank also concurred, noting that the Faculty should not only articulate the benefits of diversity, but should discuss the difference between academic preparation and intellectual potential and ability. Professor Jagannathan said that he admires the spirit and tone of the report and that it is important that the Faculty be educated about how to serve the needs of less well-prepared students. He counts himself among colleagues who feel underprepared to deal with the emerging challenges in this area. Several members commented on the report's discussion of over-prepared or "over-packaged" students, which they found interesting, particularly when coupled with the report's focus on less well-prepared students. President Marx said it can be difficult to define or specify the "value added" of an Amherst education, but that this remains an important challenge that should highlight how far a student develops here, not just how strong he or she was upon entry.

Some Committee members expressed concern about sharing statistics included in the report that might lead to the identification of individual students, though it was noted that this information had already been shared with the Faculty in the FCAFA's progress report. Professor George noted some questionable uses of statistical tests in the report, that the charts devoted to reader rating and GPA groups did not include information about the sciences, and that the report contained duplicate charts for foreign languages and the social sciences. The Dean said that he would confer with Professor Lembo about these issues.

The Committee briefly discussed whether a motion might be brought before the Faculty to propose that a term limit be set on Committee of Six service. Professor O'Hara suggested that members of the Faculty who serve three or more terms on the Committee of Six should be given the option of removing their names from future Committee of Six ballots. President Marx said that, while a term limit might have the positive effect of distributing Committee of Six service among a greater number of Faculty, setting such a limit might also have the negative effect of eliminating from the pool available to represent the Faculty some of the colleagues whom they would most desire to serve in this role. Professor Servos also noted that, should a term limit be passed, greater burdens would fall on associate professors, who already struggle with chairmanships and other committee service. The members agreed to draft a term limit motion, to discuss it at their next meeting, and possibly to include it as part of the agenda for the April 1 Faculty Meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call

Dean of the Faculty

Diversity and Inclusion at Amherst College

I. Rationale for a Diversity Initiative

Amherst College leads its cohort in successfully diversifying the racial and socio-economic profile of its student body, but we lag behind other institutions in ensuring that broader diversity initiatives elsewhere at the College are clearly articulated. We lag, in particular, behind others in establishing and monitoring diversity goals for our faculty and staff. The US Supreme Court's ruling in *Grutter vs. Bollinger* gave notice to private colleges and universities that their best protection against legal challenges to race attentive strategies in admissions is to ensure that diversity matters beyond admission – in the institution's intellectual agenda, in its employment policies, and in its support of programming to educate the community about the contributions a college that values diversity can make to the wider society. For Amherst College to lead its cohort on all these fronts, it will need a full time, permanent Chief Diversity Officer, capable of implementing a coherent diversity agenda that is endorsed by its senior executive, embedded in the policies crafted by its standing committees, and seen by employees and students alike as an equalizing force that enables everyone to benefit from inclusion in a dynamic, productive learning community.

One formulation of the rationale that should inform our diversity goals is that **we seek to maintain a learning community in which everyone is informed about and responsive to all aspects of diversity.** This formulation harkens back to the educational reasons for which we value a diverse student body in the first place. A school that admitted Jewish students, or students of color, for example, but limited how they could fraternize with white or Christian students (as Amherst and other institutions of higher learning did in the past) would severely limit its ability to achieve the diversity goals the formulation above upholds. A school that encouraged its students to fraternize across racial and social lines, but did not introduce them to the various ways of knowing that such difference makes possible, would also fall short. Finally, a school whose faculty and students were encouraged to develop the full range of their cultural and intellectual strengths would have failed in its educational mission if its governance structures and employment policies did not also support the vital contributions that staff and administrators from a variety of backgrounds make to furthering these goals. All of these considerations inform the College's new mission statement, which takes the unusual step of explicitly including the contributions of administrators and students as well as of faculty and staff in its characterization of our academic enterprise.

The vision of a learning community in which everyone is informed about and responsive to all issues of diversity incorporates many of the ideals about social justice subtending affirmative action policies in previous decades. However, it goes beyond affirmative action in valuing the diverse needs and gifts of all members of our community. To achieve this level of inclusion, the College must ensure that each sector of the community – its trustees, alumni, faculty, administrators, staff, and students -- defines for itself the specific challenges it faces and the successes it has achieved in incorporating into its operations practices that support a diverse learning community. That process will be most effective if we can set clear goals for ourselves, supported by a transparent system for monitoring our progress towards them.

II. Characteristics of a Diverse Workplace

The literature about diversity usually identifies three stages in an organization's attempt to diversify: token representation, significant representation and full inclusion. In the first stage, isolated individuals who are members of historically under-represented groups achieve "token" status. Such pioneers succeed by performing significantly above the norm at whatever they do. Many become institutions in their own right, remembered, for better or worse, over generations, by the students or colleagues with whom they worked. One thinks, for example, of Amherst's first Japanese graduate, Henry Neesima; its famous black triumvirate, Charles Drew, William Hastie, and Charles Hamilton Houston; the College's first female Dean of the Faculty, Catherine Bateson; or, most recently, its African-American Associate Dean of Students, Onuwumi Jean Moss. Though the achievements of such pioneers may open doors for others, the institution rarely modifies its culture to accommodate them, and their professional or academic success may come at great personal cost.

Today, such token representation of people of color still characterizes many of the College's administrative offices. With the significant exceptions of the Office of Admission and the Dean of Student's Office, a single employee of color is often the only non-white person working in his or her department. Even within departments that have successfully diversified, racial diversity has been limited to African-American representation. There are no Latino employees at Amherst above the ranks of graded positions and only two employees at that level who are Asian-American. A similar limitation is true for the College's Board of Trustees, although other minorities besides African-Americans have served on the board in the past. In recent years, the College has taken steps to ameliorate this problem by drafting faculty of color into administrative service. Ironically, this strategy reinforces the "pioneer" status of such individuals, whose duties demand that they transcend race in multiple arenas, while being called upon to overachieve, precisely on account of their race.

An institution achieves significant minority representation when it can point to the presence among its members of significant cohorts from beyond the dominant group. The literature on diversity cautions that, although a community approaching these levels of representation may begin to "look" different, the diverse cultural assumptions and working styles new cohorts bring with them tend to be tolerated, merely, rather than becoming central to the culture of the institution. Unlike token individuals, whose very isolation allows others to imagine that they transcend racial or social categorization, minority cohorts often find themselves lumped together, their academic or job performance evaluated primarily in terms of their difference. The pressure on individuals within such cohorts to perform at higher levels than their majority counterparts may diminish, but the emphasis shifts to getting them to "fit in." Well-meaning supervisors may take it upon themselves to explain to the newcomers why their ideas or approaches to problems will not fly at the institution. Coworkers or fellow students may complain that making allowances for different cultural styles destabilizes the smooth workings of the institution in that it creates extra work for professors and supervisors, depresses standards of excellence, and sidetracks the policy-making process when newcomers pursue "their" minority agendas. Subject to petty forms of discrimination, as well as to systematic (if often unconscious)

forms of exclusion, members of significant minority cohorts may withdraw or become defensive over time, acquiring the reputation of being “thin-skinned,” “difficult,” or “poor team players.” Retention is often a challenge among employees and students who are part of a significant minority, leading others to wonder out loud why, despite our having done so much to bring them in, “these people” seem so resentful of the institution.

Historically, Amherst achieved significant minority representation for Jewish students in the 1950s, for women in the 1970s, and for “out” gay and lesbian students and faculty in the 1990s. With the presence of larger cohorts of minority students have come more demands for social and academic programs that address their needs and calls for full inclusion of minority perspectives across the curriculum. In the past few years a modest increase in the percentage of faculty, administrators, and staff of color has begun to inch us incrementally toward “significant minority” levels of racial diversity as well. Yet the percentage of faculty, administrators, and staff of color does not approach the 35% minority representation we have achieved among students (See Appendix 1). However, permanent and temporary employees of color made up over 23% of new staff hires in 2006-2007 and over 50% of faculty hires in the same period.

The community’s response to these demographic shifts has in some cases exacerbated tensions typical of this stage in an institution’s growth. Over the past three years I have been dealing with untenured women faculty who feel harassed by the casual sexism of their male colleagues; employees with children who feel unsupported by the College’s policies with respect to flexible hours; faculty, administrators, and staff of color who feel systematically excluded from planning processes or curricular discussions in their departments, or who become disheartened in the face of the petty cruelties contained in their colleagues’ thoughtless generalizations about blacks, Asians, or Latinos. To address such problems, my office has collaborated with HR to expand mandatory sexual harassment trainings for new faculty, staff, and administrators to cover a broad range of issues around tolerance and respect in the workplace. This year we plan to extend these workshops to include all college employees at least once every three years.

Many predominantly white institutions see significant minority representation and accommodation as their ultimate goal, but the literature on the subject points to a third level of diversity, at which full participation and inclusion become desired norms across the culture of the institution. Rather than merely tolerating, accommodating, or even formally celebrating diversity, institutions at this level strive to incorporate a range of working styles and cultural perspectives centrally into all aspects of their operations. The aim at this level is not merely to make room for token differences at the margins, or to manage the problems such heterogeneity brings with it, but to see diversity as a primary change agent for the institution. Such is the perspective that informs the definition of diversity I advanced at the beginning of this report; one that envisions Amherst as a learning community in which everyone is informed about *and responsive* to all aspects of diversity. Beyond token and significant minority representation, it demands change of everyone, not just those individuals whom we identify with minority cultures or perspectives. And it sees such change as contributing significantly to the institution’s capacity to remain competitive, creative, and productive in the future.

The emphasis here is less on numbers, although these are crucial, and more on perspective. One simple shift in perspective often observed in inclusive environments, for instance, informs the movement away from the practice of making selective allowances for parents with young families to come to work later or to be “excused” from meetings outside of regular working hours – allowances others may resent or consider inefficient. Rather than viewing these employees’ domestic responsibilities in terms of lack, the institution chooses to recognize the importance of having among its decision-makers faculty, administrators, and staff at various stages of their lives, with firsthand experience at negotiating a broad range of social responsibilities. It seeks creative ways to accommodate flexible work schedules for *all* employees, rearranging meeting times so as to allow as many employees as possible to benefit from the full range of practical and intellectual contributions its employees can make to the institution.

Similar shifts can inform the way a college deals with students whom it considers under-prepared for its academic challenges. Rather than taking them out of the mainstream, or leaving them to drown in its currents, the faculty finds ways to diversify its pedagogical approaches for all students, becoming more responsive to a wider variety of learning styles. Such changes ultimately benefit under-prepared students, as well as well-prepared students, by expanding the range of technical and analytical skills all students are encouraged to bring to the learning process. In hiring new colleagues, departments that value a wide variety of approaches to critical thinking are likely to pay closer attention to job candidates whose personal or professional experiences have made them particularly attentive to the variety of learning styles that a diverse group of students brings to the classroom. That shift in perspective may help direct a department’s attention towards candidates from racial or social groups that, historically, have had to grapple most directly with the pedagogical challenges now facing the student body as a whole.

At Amherst, only the Office of Admission can be said to have fully embraced this level of commitment to diversity, both in its internal organization and its external recruitment goals. It is the only office on campus that officially uses as a central measure of its success its ability to set and achieve specific diversity goals – whether these be racial, cultural, intellectual, or socioeconomic – and for whom a failure to achieve such goals would be considered a failure of its mission. By contrast, the faculty as a whole has yet to move beyond viewing such diversity as a mixed blessing. The point is not that Amherst’s faculty does not consider the diversity of its student body a “good thing.” In the wake of the CAP report, many departments have welcomed my suggestions about how to include diversity rationales in their requests to the CEP for new FTEs. However, when it comes to evaluating job candidates, most professors still see creative intellectual responses to the diversity of the student body as a secondary good, separable conceptually from such academic ideals as “inspired” teaching, “rigorous” research and “informed” advising. Few departments, for example, would consider an absence of expertise around issues of diversity or an absence of racial diversity among its job applicants compelling enough reasons to extend a tenure track search over a second year. Many departments have yet to answer for themselves the question I regularly pose to job candidates: how do they define the challenges and goals around diversity in their fields and what would they do to address these challenges?

Beyond the Offices of Admission and the Dean of Students, a handful of administrative departments have begun to consider changes in their department cultures that support the College's diversity agenda. This year, the chairs of the Library's search committees attended sessions about diversity at their professional conferences. They came away with valuable insights about what employees of color most wanted from their mentors within the profession. The Advancement Office has created a diversity plan that begins to articulate how changes in the race and gender of the College's alumni will impact its operations. It also has begun to evaluate candidates for new positions in terms of their ability to help the entire office respond to cultural and demographic shifts in the alumni body. The Office of Human Resources has made its capacity to address the needs of a diverse workforce a high priority by enhancing the foreign language skills and cross cultural competence of several of its employees. All three departments have made modest gains in diversifying their employee base.

III. Diversity at Amherst – The Admission Model

In thinking about what it would mean to implement a coherent set of strategies for fostering diversity at all levels, I have taken the success of our admission office in diversifying the student body as the benchmark for what we might hope to achieve more generally. Once we understand the extent of the philosophical challenges, the strategic risks, and the range of resources it has taken to obtain racial, socioeconomic, and intellectual diversity among our students, we will be able to assess more realistically the resources required to implement a diversity plan.

Over the last decade, the admission office has diversified its staff, such that one-third of the admission officers are African-Americans, whose portfolios extend well beyond minority recruitment. The office's twelve diversity interns and its two "Green Deans" run the full gamut of economic, racial, sexual, and gender identities, providing prospective students with a variety of perspectives on an Amherst education. Collaborative models of decision-making include faculty, students, administrators, and staff with different backgrounds and expertise. These models have created a culture of transparency around the admission process so that our diversity goals and track record can be understood easily by faculty, trustees, and potential applicants. The office has developed links to organizations and school districts that help take Amherst's "brand" beyond its traditional recruiting base, and it has learnt to manage the risk that recruiting students unfamiliar with the liberal arts entails by developing quantitative and qualitative assessment tools to track the success of all matriculants over their entire undergraduate career.

Amherst's Office of Admission and Financial Aid is by no means perfect when it comes to diversity. On occasion, the Faculty has called into question the department's judgment in managing risk in the admission process. The Office of Financial Aid has yet to achieve significant levels of racial or linguistic diversity, although the office serves a disproportionate number of low income, bilingual, and racially diverse students. Nevertheless, the time, money, human resources, and creative thinking have paid off. In the incoming class in 2007-08, 38% were students of color and 20% came from families in the lowest socioeconomic quintile in the nation. Moreover, students of all ethnicities now occupy the entire spectrum in terms of economic resources and academic preparation.

Despite significant levels of investment in material and human resources, it has taken the Office of Admission the better part of a decade to make significant changes in the social and racial profile of the student body, even though the student population turns over completely every four years. Viewed from this perspective we can expect that it will take at least a decade for the College as a whole to make similar progress in diversifying its staff, administration, and faculty. But even that goal will only be achieved if we invest the resources necessary to overhaul department cultures, modify employment practices, and create assessment and monitoring strategies to support diversity efforts among faculty, administrators, and staff.

IV. Diversity Initiatives at Amherst since the 1980s

Since as far back as the 1960s, when the first woman was appointed to the Faculty and the first significant cohorts of students of color were recruited, deans and presidents at Amherst College have encouraged efforts to diversify the College's educational and human resources. In the 1980s, the Assistant to the President was the College's first Affirmative Action Officer, and the Dean of the Faculty himself spearheaded non-traditional hiring strategies that significantly boosted the numbers of women and minorities on the Faculty. Such strategies included authorizing multiple offers when more than one viable candidate of color emerged in the search process, hiring women and faculty of color at the tenured level in departments where there was special need or particularly strong resistance to change, and introducing handpicked candidates from under-represented groups into applicant pools when such individuals came to the attention of the administration. At the same time, the administration reinvigorated the Black Studies department through an infusion of funds and new appointments, and established a new department of Women's and Gender Studies. However, the mechanisms that made these strategies successful were never fully incorporated into the charges to the College's standing committees. Once FTEs became scarce, it became difficult to pursue an explicit diversity agenda around faculty hiring, despite support from subsequent deans and presidents.

In 1989, responsibility for affirmative action passed from the Dean of the Faculty's office to the Dean of Students' office, where Onuwumi Jean Moss became the College's Affirmative Action Officer, while continuing to carry a full portfolio as a class dean. Working at a lower level than the Assistant to the President, Dean Moss' work focused on compliance issues – such as disability provisions, and employee grievances -- as well as on diversity issues affecting students, where her influence remains visible today in the success of the Moss Quantitative Center. In response to student sit-ins in the wake of the 1991 LA riots and student demands for greater representation of faculty of color, the College appointed Hermenia Gardener as its first full-time Affirmative Action Officer. Although she enjoyed greater autonomy than the part-time officers who preceded her, the new scope of the position and the mechanisms by which it was integrated into existing governance structures were never fully defined. Lacking clear lines of authority and recourse within the administration, the office garnered limited support among faculty members and senior administrators, many of whom did not understand the Affirmative Action Officer's role or welcome her interventions.

To her credit, the Affirmative Action Officer found ways to establish a meaningful role as a trusted ombudsperson for faculty, administrators, and staff, and as an unofficial dean of multicultural affairs with respect to LGBT students and students of color. She created an

affirmative action committee, which provided motivated staff, administrators, and faculty with a forum in which to share their goals for the community, and her office funded opportunities for employees to attend diversity and antiracism workshops. Staff, students, and parents of color remember Mrs. Gardiner as an inspiring presence (the African-American Bi-Semester Worship Service she initiated was named in her honor after she retired), but her impact on hiring practices at the faculty and administrative level remained negligible.

After Mrs. Gardiner announced her retirement, President Gerety commissioned an external committee to examine how the office should be restructured. The committee's report was submitted just before President Marx came into office and did not receive wide circulation. To bridge the transition, the new president made two interim appointments – of an Acting Affirmative Action Officer to handle staff issues and a Special Assistant to the President to handle issues relating to faculty diversity. Once the interim Affirmative Action Officer returned to his primary responsibilities, I lobbied to include all the functions relating to staff, administrators, and faculty within the portfolio of Special Assistant to the President for Diversity. I was concerned that if diversity initiatives among the faculty were separated from those affecting the rest of the community, long-range planning to support diversity goals would not be centrally coordinated.

V. Diversity at Amherst – Future Directions

After three years as Special Assistant to the President for Diversity, I am more convinced than ever of the value of keeping the College's diversity initiatives within a single portfolio, held by a senior administrator. The College needs a single, coherent, diversity agenda that is seen by all its employees as an equalizing force, capable of breaking down bureaucratic hierarchies in ways that enhance the ability of everyone involved to profit from inclusion in a dynamic, productive learning community. As long as race-attentive admission and employment strategies continue to attract legal scrutiny, affirmative action policies that focus exclusively on race will remain difficult to support. If racial diversity is to remain an important goal for institutions such as Amherst in this legal climate, it must be seen as one of several forms of diversity to which the institution is committed, including race, gender, sexual, and religious diversity, to name only a few of the salient categories.

The position of Chief Diversity Officer should also be a full-time job. Apart from the amount of work the position involves, the appointment of another part-time officer from within the institution would merely deplete the College's present resources with respect to diversity. Any individuals whose current service to the College would make them strong internal candidates for this position are probably already fully engaged in serving the College's diversity agenda in some other capacity. To remove such people from their present offices and ask them to acquire a whole new skill set in order to make a short-term commitment to these responsibilities would compromise the diversity office's ability to plan for the long term. It would also deprive the individual's current department of a valuable and scarce resource with respect to diversity.

It's tempting to think that only someone who already knows Amherst well could do this job, but insider status or knowledge of the institution need not be a primary consideration if the chief diversity officer is perceived as occupying a position of access and administrative authority, on the one hand, and working, on the other hand, to further an agenda that is securely

anchored within existing governance structures. A well publicized national search for a Chief Diversity Officer would do more for raising the profile of the office and an understanding of diversity goals than the low-profile reassignment of a familiar face. The search process would bring together representatives from across the College to lead public discussion about the role of the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. It would eventually bring to the campus a series of finalists who could challenge the community with a fresh vision for what institutional diversity could make possible.

Similar to the Office of Admission, the Office of Diversity and Inclusion should not be responsible for setting the diversity agenda for the institution; that agenda must be embedded in the governing policies of the institution, laid down and enforced, like admissions goals, by the relevant faculty and administrative committees. The task of the Office of Diversity and Inclusion should be to lead the College in implementing that agenda, to educate and advise the relevant committees and departments about how best to integrate diversity goals into their policies and practices, to facilitate curricular and extra-curricular programming aimed at nurturing a culture of inclusivity, to provide departments with information and strategies that help them locate and recruit a diverse range of employees, and to assist supervisors and employees as they grapple with the challenges that the introduction of significant numbers of new colleagues of diverse backgrounds are sure to present. Like the Office of Admission, the Office of Diversity and Inclusion should also play a significant role in monitoring and reporting on the College's success in achieving its diversity goals. Once appointed, the Chief Diversity Officer will need to have clear lines of communication to other administrative departments, enhanced administrative support, and the resources necessary to keep abreast of developments in the field and to share best practices with professionals at other institutions. What follows here is a list of the duties I performed as Special Assistant to the President for Diversity and Inclusion (Section VI), a list of other duties essential to the future success of the office (Section VII), and a list of resources (both human and material) that the office will need in order to be effective (Section VIII).

VI. Duties of the SAPD

My time on the job has been devoted primarily to the groups of tasks listed below. At the end of each group of tasks I have also listed duties that I did not take on, due to the limitations on my time and resources, but which I consider essential to this office:

Recruitment – What Has Been Done

- 1) Met with academic and administrative departments to discuss searches.**
- 2) Approved ads for faculty and administrative searches.**
- 3) Interviewed all finalists for faculty and administrative searches.**

Apart from 20-30 faculty searches per year, each of which brought 3-5 finalists to campus, I worked on another 30 searches at the administrative level with the Library, the Advancement Office, the Dean of the Faculty's Office, the Office of Admission and Financial Aid, the Information Technology Department, the Athletics Department, the Mead Art Museum, and the Comptroller's Office. Opportunities to interface with departments and candidates during the recruitment process constitute the backbone of the SAPD's responsibilities. This is how the SAPD learns to navigate departmental cultures; how departments learn to articulate and evaluate the importance of diversity within their

hiring criteria; and how candidates establish their first understanding of the priority given to a commitment to diversity in Amherst's expectations for them.

Recruitment - What Remains to Be Done:

1) Start work with departments earlier and widen the scope of that work. Academic departments need to start working with the Office of Diversity and Inclusion **at least two years** before a department puts in an FTE request, and administrative departments should be working with the office on an ongoing basis. The Diversity Office needs to be able to provide incentives to departments to send members of their staffs to meetings at which they can develop relationships with minority scholars or professionals within their fields. To ensure that such consultation takes place, HR and the CEP should require all departments to produce a diversity plan that identifies the areas each department considers important for enhancing its ability to serve a diverse community. The SAPD's role would then be to facilitate rather than to enforce this process by helping departments identify their priorities, providing departments with resources to assist their recruitment efforts, assisting departments in researching professional and intellectual trends in their fields that track diversity initiatives (e.g. clustering of women and scholars of color in emergent interdisciplinary fields in the sciences; models for administrative roles that attract new groups into higher education administration, etc.), and supporting departments wishing to host conferences and job fairs at Amherst College for professionals of color in a range of disciplines, especially conferences aimed at promising undergraduate and post-graduate students. Many of the most effective organizations involved in the professional development of faculty and administrators of color are based in the South and Southwest. To gain access to these networks and make their members aware of job opportunities in the Northeast, the College will need to become actively involved in hosting some of their activities.

2) Establish and maintain links to local and regional communities of color. The Office of Human Resources, in collaboration with the Five College Community Outreach Coordinator, has shouldered much of the responsibility for supporting regional recruitment efforts to attract employees of color into graded and mid-level positions. However, here again, regional communities of color need to understand themselves as playing a vital role in the College's diversity agenda, and the SAPD will need to work with HR to demonstrate the College's commitment at the highest level to including the wider community in its diversity efforts.

3) Collect and analyze AA/OE data returned by job applicants in a timely manner. At present we lack the tools and manpower to gauge the diversity of applicant pools while searches are still in progress, so as to use that information to extend searches, or to redirect outreach strategies when the pool of candidates of color is meager.

Retention -What Has Been Done

1) Co-facilitated workshops on "Respect for People" for new faculty, administrators, and staff and co-facilitated workshops for supervisors to help them deal with issues of diversity as they affect job performance and relationships within their departments.

The College is legally obligated to update sexual harassment workshops for all its employees at regular intervals. We have expanded the content of these workshops to

address a broad swathe of issues relating to diversity, inclusion, and respect for people. Co-facilitators were Stephen Butler, the trainer in the Office of Human Resources, and Kent Faerber, one of the attorneys retained by the College. By integrating faculty, administrators, and staff in these sessions, we hope the workshops will also serve as a first step in breaking down caste barriers between academic and nonacademic employees.

2) Initiated conversations, together with HR, to help administrative departments consider creating a diversity plan tailored to their specific needs.

Conversations with other administrative departments are still going on, but only the Advancement Office actually got to the point of writing up such a plan, and then, only in response to a specific administrative directive.

3) Liaised with the Human Resources Office and the Dean of the Faculty's Office to help resolve personnel matters related to diversity and acted as a confidential resource for faculty, administrators, and staff dealing with a range of issues related to diversity.

In at least half of the searches with which I was involved, the successful candidates took me up on my offer to continue our conversations once they arrived on campus and to help them in navigating their relationships to the College and the wider community. I helped employees establish contact with service providers beyond the College (churches, ethnic hairdressers, childcare facilities, support groups, clubs and affinity groups) and assisted all employees with issues related to spousal job opportunities and housing. New faculty members sought my assistance in establishing contact with colleagues beyond their departments with whom they shared academic or other interests and in working out how to launch new research projects and pedagogical initiatives related to diversity. A range of employees sought my help in sorting out how to respond to challenges related to issues of race, gender, or sexuality. The ombudsperson also referred individuals to my office when she thought their concerns might have a diversity dimension. Conversely, supervisors, especially those who had recently brought female employees into predominantly male environments, or who had hired new employees of color, occasionally consulted the office for help in trying to work out how best to mentor their new employees. Such interactions have helped create relationships of trust between the SAPD and a wide variety of employees and supervisors and strengthened their support for the College's broader diversity goals.

Retention – What Remains to Be Done

1) Establish a baseline for measuring progress towards diversity goals and a system for monitoring outcomes.

The regular campus climate survey mentioned under "Material Resources" will be an essential tool in this regard. The office also needs to gather periodic feedback from new employees about their progress in pursuing the diversity goals they established for themselves in their initial interviews, as well as their perception of how they themselves have fared with respect to diversity and inclusion.

2) Extend the "Respect for People" Workshops to include all personnel.

3) Offer all supervisors (including the chairs of academic departments) training in how to interpret new legislation about discrimination and harassment and ensure that they understand the College's policies and procedures in this regard.

4) Revitalize the work of affinity groups as requested by faculty, administrators, and staff. Members of several racial and ethnic groups have expressed a wish that the office

convene meetings that would help them get to know faculty, administrators, and staff with whom they share commonalities of descent. Other groups (LGBT employees, junior women faculty, parents of preschoolers, employees concerned about issues of class, civic engagement, etc.) also have turned to the office to broker connections among themselves. While it should not be the office's responsibility to mandate these groups, the SAPD should support them where they exist, encourage their formation when a perceived need arises, and supply them with resources, funding, training and executive access, as requested.

5) Facilitate the work of departmental/divisional diversity committees. The Advancement Office is considering establishing an internal committee on diversity and inclusion. It may be helpful to encourage other large administrative units to establish similar "branch" committees that would work independently on agendas of their own devising but consult as the need arises with the SAPD.

VII. Governance Issues

Over the last few years, the Office of Diversity and Inclusion has functioned without the assistance of an appointed college committee and without formal access to other faculty committees other than an internal working group. The office will be most successful if it has the support of the following governance structures:

- 1) A standing college committee for inclusion and diversity** that includes faculty, administrators, staff, and student representation. If the SAPD is hired from outside the faculty, it will be very important to have "divisional" representation from across academic and administrative departments on this committee.
- 2) Regular interactions with the CEP**, as well as consultations with the Dean of the Faculty over the use of "diversity FTEs" for faculty appointments.
- 3) Access on an invitational basis to meetings of the President's Executive Council, senior staff, ACP, CPR, the Committee of Six, and inclusion in CCAFA reviews of the incoming class.** Although the office of the SAPD should be perceived as having an identity separate from the administrative executive, it is important that discussions of diversity goals involve major committees and senior administrators directly and that these goals are formally reviewed at least once a year, or before major policy decisions about new diversity initiatives are put into practice.

Human Resources

- 1) A full-time professional as Special Assistant to the President for Diversity and Inclusion who has senior administrative status and professional and/or academic credentials.**
- 2) A full-time administrative assistant to the SAPD**, capable of (1) handling all the scheduling for the office; (2) creating and maintaining a website; (3) locating and updating resources to help academic departments keep track of diversity opportunities within their fields and to supply them with updated lists of potential applicants; (4) liaising with the Office of Institutional Research around assessment and monitoring resources that support diversity initiatives; (5) coordinating conferences, receptions, and workshops aimed at educating members of the community on diversity issues.

3) An additional FTE in the Office of Human Resources for someone with bilingual skills and multicultural professional expertise who can help the department manage the College's relationships with the wider local community of color, identify minority applicants for graded positions, and work closely with supervisors of graded employees to support their efforts to hire and fully integrate employees of color into their ranks. The HR Office has begun to develop mechanisms for addressing these issues but these have been hampered by a general shortage of personnel.

4) An additional half FTE in the Office of Human Resources to support diversity training for employees and/or funding to contract out such work. At present most of these workshops are co-facilitated by the half-time trainer and the SAPD who handle about six such workshops involving approximately 150 new employees and administrators per year. The need to expand such efforts to cover all 825 of the staff and faculty will stretch the resources of the present part-time facilitators beyond capacity.

Material Resources

1) Funds to sponsor faculty, administrators, and staff to attend conferences and workshops that focus on diversity issues within their areas of expertise;

2) A Website with links to the Office of Admission, the Dean of Students, the Dean of the Faculty, Human Resources, and the President's Office that gathers in one place information about all the diversity resources at the College and within the Pioneer Valley that a parent, student, employee, or prospective employee may wish to review;

3) An office located in a neutral space that is easily accessible to faculty, staff, administrators, and alumni;

4) Assessment Tools: The ability to mount, in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Research and Planning and/or outside contractors, regular campus climate surveys that establish a baseline for assessing where each department and each protected class of employees at the College now stands with respect to the College's diversity goals.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Amherst College leads its cohort in the racial and socioeconomic diversity of its student body. It boasts a curriculum in which issues of race (at least with respect to people of African descent), gender, and sexuality are concentrated in strong interdisciplinary departments as well as widely integrated into the general curriculum. Qualifying such markers of success, it is also the case that the faculty is still experimenting with new ways of addressing the educational needs of its diverse student body. Issues of class and caste remain a salient, often divisive matter among students, between faculty and administrators, and between staff and administrators. Students of all backgrounds continue to clamor for greater representation of Latino and Asian-American issues within the curriculum, and, with a few notable exceptions, most of the progress in diversifying the faculty, administration, and staff has been made at the level of visiting appointments or in the lower ranks of graded appointments. As more departments begin to move past token levels of minority representation, so too, have areas of friction and uncertainty grown -- around differing styles of interaction, about how best to mentor newcomers, and about how much of a role to give to diversity considerations in assessing professional competence. Although many departments seem to agree that their conversations with the SAPD over the last three years have challenged them to think more concretely about the role diversity could play in

their operations, there is as yet no clear set of guidelines about how or when such conversations should proceed or what weight the College as a whole has agreed to give to such considerations in the formal evaluative process.

My three years as Special Assistant to the President have given me a unique opportunity to understand how Amherst College runs. I will come away from these duties with a new appreciation of how hard Amherst employees at all levels work and how much goodwill there is across the board for diversity initiatives. But I have also come to understand how complex the trade-off between job openings, candidate availability, and hiring deadlines can be, and how time-consuming the integration of new diversity-related criteria into the recruitment and evaluation processes can seem to a busy department. For the Office of Diversity and Inclusion to help departments respond to these challenges and play more than a token role as an agent of change, it needs to have constant, visible support at the highest level – in the allocation of resources, in its staffing, and through the embedding of diversity policies into broader governance structures.

The College is set to launch a major capital campaign as well as to embark on several ambitious new programs around socioeconomic diversity, civic engagement, and pedagogical assessment in the months ahead. All of these initiatives enhance its appeal to an increasingly diverse group of students, alumni, employees, and donors. But the complex shifts in institutional culture needed to make these agendas successful will not happen swiftly or automatically. Faced with the disruption and disorientation – not to mention the extra work these shifts will entail -- many members of the Amherst community who genuinely support its diversity goals will become discouraged or disaffected. Department heads and supervisors will be ill-disposed to support an institutional culture that goes beyond the mere tolerance of difference, if they are asked to respond to demands that they embrace diversity without adequate preparation and support. The employees of this College take great pride in the work they do. They will have little patience for bureaucratic changes unless these changes help them do more effectively what they already do well.

The will is there. Yet all of us have felt the need for leadership – for someone whose sole responsibility would be advancing the diversity agenda to which so many of us ascribe – who has the vision and drive to lead the College in articulating a coherent diversity agenda, who has the training and experience to anticipate and defuse predictable or unexpected roadblocks as we move towards our goals, and who has the professional track record and personal qualities necessary to earn the respect and trust of the students, faculty, administrators, staff, and alumni of this institution. In this interim period of assessment and refocusing, my own contribution to this effort has been to start a moderately open-ended conversation about diversity and inclusion and to use the credibility and authority I bring with me from other assignments to get people who would not normally do so to participate in that exchange. I think I have had some success in this regard. The community now is ready to move from talk to action.

Rhonda Cobham-Sander
Special Assistant to the President for Diversity, Amherst College
September, 2007

Appendix 1: Faculty, Administrators, and Staff, as of 2007-08

	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Mixed	Totals	Disabled	EE Totals	Minority Percentages
Faculty*	9	7	9		25		169	14.8%
<i>Visiting Faculty</i>	2	1	4		7		25	28.0%
Lecturers/coaches (<i>Visiting Lecturers, coaches</i>)	1	4	10		15	0	43	34.9%
Administrative	12	0	2	1	15		127	11.8%
Staff	1.5	12	14		41	1	461	8.9%
Totals (Regular EEs only)	37	23	35	1	95	1	800	11.9%
<i>Totals (Visitors only)</i>	2	1	4		7		25	28.0%
Grand Totals	39	24	39	1	102	1	825	12.4%

* Faculty includes the PRO's and Post 70 counts

Percentages

Faculty*	5.3%	4.1%	5.3%	0.0%
<i>Visiting Faculty</i>	8.0%	4.0%	16.0%	0.0%
Faculty/TA	2.3%	9.3%	23.3%	0.0%
<i>Visiting Lecturer</i>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Administrative	9.4%	0.0%	1.6%	0.8%
Staff	3.3%	2.6%	3.0%	0.0%
Totals (Regular EEs)	4.6%	2.9%	4.4%	0.1
Grand Totals (Including Visiting)	4.7%	2.9%	4.7%	0.1

Acknowledgements

In the course of the last three years, I have been overwhelmed by the generosity with which my colleagues across the College have responded to my requests for assistance: Bill Barlow, Jaqui Bearce, Irene Berwick, Jim Brassord, Linda Bisi, John Carfora, John Carter, David Cox, Charri Boykin East, Sherre Harrington, Michael Hawkins,, Bekki Lee Ron Lembo, Marian Matheson, Katie O'Hara Edwards, Nancy Ratner, Ron Rosbottom, Peter Shea, Joy St. John, and Ruth Thornton, as well as successive officers of the ACPP, all have shared with me their considerable institutional experience in dealing with various issues of diversity. Stephen Butler, Katie Bryne, Mica Eberbach, and Pat Long have made it their business to shoulder new responsibilities and to acquire new expertise in order to enhance the ability of the Human Resources Office to address diversity goals. The College also employs a number of faculty, administrators, and staff members of all races, whose professional expertise with respect to diversity goals is underutilized at present. Several of these individuals have indicated their interest in sharing with other employees the diversity training they have benefited from on the planning boards of their home communities, or in the working groups organized by my predecessor, Hermenia Gardiner. Many of our newest colleagues, especially the recent hires in math and science and in the Advancement Office, continue to astonish me with their grasp of the ways in which diversity concerns affect their fields and the energy with which they have taken the initiative to address these concerns within their departments. I'm confident that all these individuals will support the efforts of the next Diversity Officer.

Original Message

From: Martha Umphrey

Sent: Monday, March 03, 2008 4:51 PM To: Anthony Marx

Cc: Robert Sweeney; Susan Niditch; Patrick Williamson; Leah Hewitt; Nancy Ratner; Benjamin Bishop 09; Rohit Raj 08; Stephanie Gounder 08; Martha Umphrey

Subject: CEP update

Dear Tony -

In light of our conversation at Friday's CEP meeting, I thought it might be useful to clarify for you where our CEP work has taken us so far this year in the areas of writing and the First-Year Seminar.

Writing generally:

In light of the recommendations we received from last year's Ad Hoc Committee on Writing, which as you know explicitly recommended against proposing a College-wide writing requirement at this moment, we have worked closely with Greg to move forward with an expansion and intensification of writing instruction at the College. In particular, we have initiated and enabled conversations with Jyl Gentzler and Michele Barale about how to build a culture of writing here in ways that can enhance the already remarkable work they and others are doing with faculty and students. We're very excited and grateful that Greg was able to find resources to put behind their efforts and continue to work closely with them in a number of areas, and we're happy to see that the Writing Center is on the cusp of reorganizing its operations and mission and look forward to working with Michele as is appropriate.

We have also consulted with Michele and Jyl at some length about defining writing attentive and writing intensive courses, and are working at least provisionally with the definitions they developed in conversation with faculty in their writing seminar and with other colleagues teaching 01 courses:

Writing Attentive Courses: Any course in any discipline can define itself as Writing Attentive (W) if it has as one of its conscious and stated objectives the improvement of students' critical writing, whether that writing is highly discipline-specific (e.g., a lab report) or broader in its application. Whether a course counts as a W course is determined not so much by the number of pages of writing students produce as by the uses to which that writing is put. In particular, writing assignments should be used at least in part for the purpose of improving students' writing skills rather than solely as evidence of their mastery of course content. Accordingly, in W courses, students can reasonably expect to receive extensive feedback not only on the content but also on the form of their writing. This feedback might be given in a variety of ways, e.g., written comments, one-on-one paper conferences, and/or classroom discussion of samples of student writing.

Writing Intensive Courses are designed specifically to meet the needs of students whose secondary education did not adequately prepare them for writing at Amherst College. Students who take these courses will be taught the fundamentals of academic writing: thesis development, the use

and citation of secondary sources, cogent argumentation, effective organization, the construction of coherent and unified paragraphs, and the crafting of complex yet clear sentences whose grammatical structure accurately mirrors the logical relations between the ideas they express. Though a significant amount of class time will be devoted to writing instruction, these courses are based squarely within a particular discipline and will count toward the major in the department in which they are taught.

We intend to use the latter to guide us as we recommend new FTEs in line with CAP priorities, and the former to guide faculty who will attach keywords to their courses once the online registration system has come online.

Online Registration:

We spent quite a bit of time this past fall discussing how best to use the new capabilities of an online catalog and online registration to enhance advising and augment the CEP's knowledge of curricular activity. After consulting with department chairs, and with IT and IR, we have decided to move forward in a two-step process.

- this spring, develop a set of practical keywords, generated both by faculty and out of current practices, that advisors can use to help students find courses that can move them beyond their comfort zones, improve their writing, and so forth. That list is essentially ready to go now that we have completed the new course approval process. "W" courses will most likely be listed as "writing" in the keywords dropdown list, and will be defined as indicated above.
- augment that core list next year once we see how it works both practically and conceptually, as faculty accustom themselves to the new technology and both advisor and College needs become clearer.

We thoroughly discussed ways that we might construct a set of more general rubrics that would help to map the entire curriculum in accord both with the six liberal studies areas listed in our catalog and with stated CAP priorities (e.g., interdisciplinarity, global comprehension, etc.). Having generated a preliminary list on that basis, we all concluded that the catalog categories were designed without regard to the practical activity of sorting through the wide variety of courses offered here, and were impossible to translate effectively into an online system. Further, we are not as yet convinced that it would be either useful or wise to devise a general curricular mapping system - especially a normative one that would require that we police a variety of definitions (i.e., come up with a concrete definition of "quantitative literacy" or "interdisciplinary" and then decide which courses do or do not qualify). That is a very labor intensive and tricky process that would require a strenuous and ongoing commitment. Certain keywords, particularly "writing" and perhaps others, will require such a commitment, though, and we should and will take on that circumscribed task.

First-Year Seminars

We received the report from the First-Year Seminar Committee on January 23, not knowing it would be placed on our agenda this spring, and took up the question substantively at our first meeting of the semester, on Feb. 1. To accommodate your schedule, we postponed meeting with the FYS committee until last Friday, at which point I had hoped we could jointly craft a process to move forward expeditiously with a review and reconceptualization of the First-Year Seminar regime. Frankly, we did not accomplish as much as I had hoped at that meeting; but after you left we did ask Greg to request that the C6 charge the FYS Committee with the task of proposing changes to our current system, and Buffy and I agreed to meet this week separately to be sure the two committees stay in touch as they begin their work. I'm confident that they and we on the CEP will take up this project with imagination and energy.

Of course all this activity is ongoing, even as we move into FTE season and on top of other tasks (reviewing the honors system, proposing revisions to the drop-add process, meeting with departmental external reviewers, preparing for reaccreditation and the April trustee meeting, entertaining proposals for new majors, reviewing FIF proposals, and so forth). Knowing that it can be difficult for any of us to keep track of the high level of activity occurring at the College these days, I hope this update is useful to you. If you would like to discuss the particulars in more detail or have further questions or concerns about any of these subjects or about faculty governance more generally, I might suggest that you contact me directly, since I believe that chairs are the appropriate and most effective relay of first choice between the administration and facultygoverned committees. Certainly such conversations can help avoid misunderstandings and open up space for negotiation, planning, and generous engagement.

I hope the reaccreditation process we are undergoing is fruitful for all of us as we continue to address some very difficult curricular questions, and look forward to continuing our work on these and other issues.

All best, Martha

Martha Merrill Umphrey

Associate Professor
Department of Law, Jurisprudence and Social Thought

Amherst College
PO Box 5000
Amherst, MA 01002
413.542.8206
413.542.2207 (fax)

From: Anthony Marx
Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2008 10:21 AM
To: Martha Umphrey
Cc: Robert Sweeney; Susan Niditch; Patrick Williamson; Leah Hewitt; Nancy Ratner; Benjamin Bishop 09; Rohit Raj 08; Stephanie Gounder 08; Gregory Call
Subject: RE: CEP update

Dear Martha:

Thanks for your helpful email. I know there is a lot going on for both of us, and I am most grateful for all your efforts on these fronts. I also appreciate the efforts of the CEP and of the faculty as a whole, respect the faculty's crucial role in curricular matters, and do see the progress that is being made. There is no doubt that we are moving, as we must, though I also see the difficulties and complexities. I also agree that being in touch with the CEP is essential, which is why I was glad to come to the meeting, and grateful for your further update and clarification. In the same spirit of keeping lines of communication open and working, I thought it might be useful for me to share some further thoughts, which I present simply as my own views.

In terms of writing, again I appreciate the on-going efforts of many committees and colleagues to work through this issue, mindful of faculty concerns that I not overstep on this particular front. I understand that the Ad Hoc Committee last year did not put forward a writing requirement, but I do worry that has caused something of a governance conundrum. As you know, the recommendations of that committee have largely all been acted on, leaving us still with the need for the proposal that the faculty requested in the first place and on which they cannot act until a process brings such a proposal forward. We need a clear plan, within our governance structures, to get the faculty what it requested for further deliberation, even as we continue to build up our capacities.

I am glad to learn we will go ahead with the W designation, though I do think we need to be as specific as we can be about what qualifies for that designation. Being clear seems only fair to the students who will be so advised by this designation and to the faculty seeking to give helpful advice. I thought Jyl and Michele put forward a workable proposal for what would qualify more specifically.

I agree that the intensive writing courses are important, though I am concerned about the large number of students who have been advised to take them but then don't. This presents a serious challenge for us as educators. And while the FTEs for writing were meant, in part, to help staff such courses, the FTE allocation was justified by the notion of a more extensive and complete approach to writing as discussed by CAP and the faculty. As much as I want to support the writing intensive courses, and I do, I worry about allocating crucial FTE resources without having a sense and agreement on the larger approach of which writing intensive courses will surely be a part, but only a part. At a minimum, I need to understand better what the process is for developing that more complete vision/plan, even as we consider how to staff writing intensive courses.

I also appreciate the effort to develop a keywords system to help advising, but here I also am not sure of the way this might develop. The Committee of Six said we should just go ahead using the categories in the catalogue, approved by the faculty. I understand and appreciate that the CEP found those wanting, but I do worry about a solution that has no particular guidelines for such categories. Keywords, if I understand that notion correctly, are not the same, for there will be huge variation depending on what words faculty use in course descriptions. I don't think the solution requires a general curricular mapping system. If we don't want to note humanities, social science, etc. as being too blunt a measure and, in any case, too obvious to be very helpful, that is fine. But I thought we were headed toward categories such as: arts, languages, foreign cultures, quantitative, and/or lab, in addition to writing. Those would help us advise students who are avoiding these areas of the curriculum (without requiring any distribution, but further raising the issue to inform advising) and allow us to track which students and how many are avoiding each area or combined areas. Perhaps a compromise would be to offer a list of keywords we are all focused on, as per above, so that faculty can be sure that they are or are not signaling when particular areas or skills are being addressed in their courses.

I look forward discussing next steps on First-Year Seminars with the Committee of Six.

I hope you also find it helpful for me to be as clear as I can be about my concerns.

Yours, Tony

Amended March 28, 2008

The twenty-third meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2007-2008 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, March 24, 2008. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Dean began the meeting by asking the members if they would be able to meet with Shelley Storbeck of Storbeck and Pimintel, the search firm that is assisting the College with the search for the Special Assistant to the President for Diversity and Inclusion. Professors George, Frank, and O'Hara agreed to meet with Ms. Storbeck. The Committee then turned briefly to a personnel matter.

Dean Call informed the members that he had written to the six departments that rotate their chairs annually to see if they might consider extending their chair's term, for the sake of continuity. Some departments expressed willingness to do so, but said that taking this step had been impractical recently because of the small number of senior faculty among whom their chair rotates. One department agreed to experiment with having a two-year term, the Dean said.

Dean Call next reported back to the Committee about the history of the Woods-Travis Prize. The Faculty voted in 1986 to combine the Woods and Travis prizes and to award the prize to the student with the highest academic standing in the class. The prize has continued to be awarded on that basis since that time.

Professors Sinos and Servos reiterated their view that it would be desirable not to single out students with awards at Commencement, in keeping with the tradition of egalitarianism at that event. President Marx suggested that a committee of the Faculty, perhaps the Committee on Student Fellowships, should consider the criteria for awarding the Woods-Travis Prize and the venue for presenting this award, as well as for the Obed Finch Slingerland Memorial Prize, which is also given at Commencement. That prize is awarded "to a member of the senior class who has shown, by his/her own determination and accomplishment, the greatest appreciation of and desire for a college education." The Committee noted that, according to College Catalog language, the Woods-Travis Prize is awarded for "outstanding excellence in culture and faithfulness to duty as a scholar."

With regard to the criteria currently used to determine the winner of the Woods-Travis Prize, the members agreed that it would be preferable that the top academic award at Amherst not be based on GPA alone. President Marx concurred, noting that the criteria for this award should convey the values of the College. Professor Jagannathan suggested that the Committee on Student Fellowships might review the records of students with the top ten GPAs in the senior class and use a set of broader criteria to select the winner of the Woods-Travis Prize. Professor Servos commented that it might be difficult to gain consensus about such criteria. Professor Jagannathan responded that the criteria should not be very specific, in order to allow the committee to have flexibility in the selection process. Professor Servos noted that it would be important to review the original language, from the time that the gifts that funded these awards were made, to learn the donors' intent and any parameters that were set. Dean Call agreed to do so and to report back to the Committee. President Marx, while expressing his support for considering changing the criteria for the award and for considering a different venue during Commencement Weekend for awarding both student prizes, said that, for practical reasons, things should remain unchanged for this year while this issue is explored.

In connection with the conversation about Commencement awards, the Committee returned briefly to the topic of recent changes that were made to Commencement Weekend.

Amended March 28, 2008

Professor Frank asked about the reasoning behind abolishing Class Day. President Marx said that attendance at Class Day events was poor. The format also necessitated singling out one honorary degree recipient to deliver a speech, an approach that limited the ability of the community to interact with the other honorees. In the new format, the honorary degree recipients' talks are spread among multiple time slots, allowing members of the community the opportunity to hear more of the recipients speak than in the old format. Other changes, such as presenting awards to staff members at the Senior Dinner and changing the format of Senior Assembly, seem to have been well received, President Marx said. Professor Jagannathan noted that the Dean of the Faculty now delivers a speech at Senior Assembly, when, in the past, he or she typically gave a short welcome. Dean Call said that he had followed the recent tradition established by his predecessors, but that he would certainly be willing to forego giving a speech, if that was the preference. Other members did not express an opinion. In a final comment relating to Commencement, Professor O'Hara expressed concern that students often catch their robes on a handrail on stage and trip. She suggested that the rail be modified to ensure safety, and Assistant Dean Tobin agreed to inquire about this issue. The Committee then turned to a personnel matter.

The Committee reviewed the motion to create a standing faculty committee on international education. Professor Sinos wondered why the committee would not be called the Committee on Study Abroad. Dean Call said that it is his understanding that it is the current ad hoc committee's recommendation that the permanent committee be called the Committee on International Education. That title, according to the current committee, reflects the work that it has done, and will continue doing, on other opportunities under the larger umbrella of international education, rather than just semester- or year-long study abroad. President Marx noted the increasing importance for students, as global citizens, to have educational experiences that are international in scope. An increasing number of students wish to study away for a year, rather than a semester. In addition to having students benefit educationally from extended immersion in a foreign country, the prospect of having additional students study abroad for a year will enable the College to enroll more students overall, but not to increase the number of students on campus at any given time. Professor George expressed a preference for having exchange students, who come to the College for one year, rather than international students who enroll for four years. In his experience, many international students of the latter kind are unfamiliar with the liberal arts and often have difficulty adjusting to the American system, he said. President Marx disagreed, noting that most international students who come to the College for four years are as engaged as most American students in the liberal arts curriculum. The other members and the Dean agreed that having both exchange students and four-year international students is most desirable.

Professor Jagannathan suggested that the faculty members of the new standing committee should not be limited to faculty who teach foreign languages, but should include a variety of disciplines. In addition, he noted that perceived barriers to study abroad in the sciences do not exist, with the exception of issues surrounding the language of instruction. Students in the sciences who are not fluent in a language other than English are limited to studying in English-speaking countries, but otherwise should not find it a problem to study abroad, he said. Professor O'Hara noted that there is a trend toward international collaboration in the sciences, and she noted that many students are interested in having research experiences abroad in the summer. She wondered if funding would be available to support such activities, and the Dean

Amended March 28, 2008

said that the proposal to increase support for student research, which is being put forward by the Committee on Priorities and Resources, would encompass support for such summer research experiences abroad. The Committee then voted six in favor and zero opposed on the substance of the following motion and six in favor and zero opposed to forward it to the Faculty:

The Committee of Six recommends that the Ad Hoc Committee on Study Abroad be re-named the Committee on International Education, that the committee move (beginning in 2008-2009) from ad hoc status to permanent status as a standing faculty committee, and that the following draft charge be adopted:

Charge to the Committee on International Education

The Committee on International Education is composed of three members of the Faculty (each from a different department), one of whom will serve as chair, and the Director of International Experience and Registrar, ex officio. The term for the faculty members of the committee is three years. Members of the committee and the committee's chair are appointed by the Committee of Six. The committee shapes policies and procedures for evaluating and approving study-abroad programs for Amherst students. The members maintain and review a list of College-approved study-abroad programs, review student petitions for study-abroad programs that are not already on the College-approved list, review student evaluations of all international educational programs, facilitate communication between the Faculty and the Director of International Experience to aid in advising, and consult with the Director to identify new opportunities for international experiences and to facilitate student participation in them.

Discussion turned next to a draft of a charge for the First-Year Seminar Committee. After some discussion and revision, which focused on the need for specificity, flexibility, and clarity, the members approved, by a vote of six in favor and zero opposed, the following charge to the committee:

Charge to the Ad Hoc Committee to Review
the First-Year Seminar Program

The Ad Hoc Committee to Review the First-Year Seminars is charged by the Committee of Six to deliberate with the campus community and to investigate the practices of peer institutions in order to develop proposals for non-departmental first-year seminars. The Ad Hoc Committee is asked to consult with the Committee on Educational Policy and to submit its recommendations to the Committee of Six by November 30, 2008. These proposals should address the educational needs of students without regard to the logistics of staffing the program.

In recent decades, the Faculty has periodically reviewed and reconstituted seminars for first-year students. Since the First-Year Seminar (FYS) program

Amended March 28, 2008

began in 1998, we have come to understand the needs of our changing student body in greater depth through the extensive process of evaluation and planning that began with Special Committee on the Amherst Education (SCAE) in 2002. The recent accreditation review has brought into focus the need for greater clarity in explaining the workings of our curriculum and for vigorous and systematic attention to the range of preparations and talents that incoming students bring to Amherst.

Among the questions the Committee might address are the following:

- What should be the mission of the FYS program and how can that mission be communicated to first-year students and to faculty members?
- Is there a need for each student to take more than one required seminar to accomplish this mission?
- Are there certain academic skills that we want our students to develop in the first semester to prepare them to take advantage of the open curriculum?
- Should there be common expectations of pedagogical approaches, such as regular conferences?
- Should there be expectations or guidelines about the subjects of the courses? Should there be any common themes or readings?

In its deliberations, the Committee may also wish to consider the responsibilities and authority of the FYS Committee in selecting faculty to teach in the program, in shaping the particular seminars, and in maintaining balance and range in the offerings overall; what forms of training and support should be provided for the instructional staff and what kinds of mentoring should be incorporated into the program; and the membership of the FYS Committee or its successor (Should the committee include the Dean of New Students? Should there be an Associate Dean of the Faculty as coordinator of the program?).

The Committee next reviewed its motion on term limits for service on the Committee of Six, which read as follows:

Revision (in bold caps) of *Faculty Handbook*, section IV. Faculty Responsibilities, Academic Regulations, Meetings and Committees, S. Committees, 1. Committees of the Faculty, a. The Committee of Six, paragraph 6:

All professors, associate professors, and assistant professors appointed to regular, part-time or part-time tenure-track positions are eligible to serve on the Committee of Six, except: 1) the President and the Dean of the Faculty; 2) those

Amended March 28, 2008

newly appointed during their first year at Amherst; 3) those who will not be at Amherst for one or both semesters of the year following the election; 4) members of the Committee on Educational Policy; 5) members of the College Council; 6) retiring members of the Committee on Educational Policy and the College Council (who are also ineligible for one year for election or re-election to either of these committees); 7) retiring members of the Committee of Six and those who retired from it in the previous three years (i.e., retiring members cannot be reelected for four years); **8) THOSE WHO HAVE SERVED THREE OR MORE TERMS ON THE COMMITTEE OF SIX AND THEN EXERCISE THE OPTION OF TAKING THEIR NAMES OFF THE BALLOT EACH YEAR BY CONTACTING THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY'S OFFICE BEFORE THE ELECTION BEGINS;** 9) and under extraordinary personal circumstances, after petitioning the President or the Dean of the Faculty, those individuals for whom service on the Committee would be a particular hardship.

At the members' request, the Dean reviewed the number of active faculty who could potentially remove themselves from the ballot if the motion passes. Thirteen faculty members who have served on the committee three or more times could do so, he noted. Professor Servos reiterated his concern about putting the burden of Committee of Six service on associate professors and newly promoted full professors, which would be an effect of passing this motion, he believes. Professor Frank expressed concern for those colleagues, and for the costs to their careers, who have been elected repeatedly to the Committee of Six. She has found the burden of service on the Committee to be tremendous, hurting not only her research, but her teaching as well, and she has served only one year. Professor O'Hara agreed and noted that there is a personal cost for these colleagues, as well, because of the time demands that the Committee imposes. She also feels strongly that departments are better served if members have experience with reappointment, tenure, and promotion reviews as Committee members. Professor O'Hara said that there currently is not enough breadth, in terms of the range of departments, represented on the Committee of Six.

President Marx said that he is keenly aware of the burden that service on the Committee places on colleagues, and he believes that, given the importance of the work that the Committee does, the Faculty as a whole would want the best possible colleagues to serve. Professor Jagannathan expressed gratitude for the President's positive characterization of those who get elected as the "best possible colleagues," but wondered if in reality there might not be a more negative impetus in how colleagues vote. The Committee then voted on the motion. The members voted six in favor and none opposed to forward the motion to the Faculty and four in favor, one opposed (Professor Servos), with one abstention (Professor Sinos) on the substance of the motion.

Amended March 28, 2008

The Committee next reviewed the Faculty Meeting Agenda for the meeting of April 1 and agreed that the motions regarding the Committee on International Education and the Committee of Six term limits for service should be included on the agenda. It was decided that questions remained about the best way to present the report of the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid, and that discussion of that report by the Faculty should be postponed until the next Faculty Meeting. The members then approved the agenda by a vote of six in favor and zero opposed.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call

Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 28, 2008

The twenty-fourth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2007-2008 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, March 31, 2008. 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 announcements from the Dean. Dean Call distributed to the members two letters (appended) from Professor Ferguson, Chair of the College Council. The first letter outlined the committee's review of the Honor Code and included their recommendation that the Committee of Six forward to the Faculty a motion to renew the Honor Code for an additional four-year period. The other letter described the College Council's consideration of a draft of a three-year college calendar that would take effect in 2009-2010, and included a recommendation that the Committee of Six forward the draft calendar to the Faculty for approval. The members agreed to discuss these issues at their next meeting. The Dean next asked the members to consider whether there was sufficient business to have a Faculty Meeting on April 15 or May 6. The members agreed that the report of the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) and the report of Professor Cobham-Sander, Special Assistant to the President for Diversity, on diversity and inclusion at the College should be discussed at the next Faculty Meeting. The Dean said that he had consulted with Professor Lembo about how best to distribute the FCAFA's report to the Faculty and about the concerns regarding confidentiality and statistical procedures that had been raised by the Committee of Six. The Dean and Professor Lembo agreed that, once these issues have been addressed, the report should be posted on the Dean of the Faculty's Web site with password protection, so that the report can be accessed only by the Faculty and administration of the College.

Dean Call next informed the Committee that, as the members had requested, he had reviewed the endowment fund descriptions for the Woods and Travis Funds, as well as the language of the bequests that established the Woods and Travis Prizes. He then read to the members from the will of Charles B. Travis, which dates from 1914, and from a 1959 letter from the College Treasurer of the time, Paul Weathers, that alludes to the criteria that should be used to select the winner of the then Woods Prize. He noted that the Faculty voted in 1986 to combine the two prizes and to award what became known as the Woods-Travis Prize to the student with the highest academic standing in the class. Currently given at Commencement, the prize has been awarded on that basis since that time. The members reiterated their view that it would be desirable not to single out students with awards at Commencement and that it would be preferable that the top academic award at Amherst not be based on GPA alone. It was agreed that the original language allows for flexibility and interpretation in regard to the criteria that are used to determine the recipient of the prize. Some members were struck by the absence of the expression 'highest academic standing' (or any equivalent) in either document and by references in both to the recognition of 'improvement.'

Continuing the conversation, Professor O'Hara suggested that, if one wished to move away from the model in which GPA alone was the determinant for the Woods-Travis Prize, a senior honors project might be required. The Committee of Six, when it reviews the theses and transcripts of students who have been recommended by their departments for the designation of *summa*, could possibly choose the winner of the award from among these talented, intellectually engaged, and accomplished students. Other members suggested that departments or individual faculty members might nominate students for the award. Some members felt that it would be best to remain faithful to the original criteria for both awards, which place an emphasis on students demonstrating improvement as individuals and as scholars during their time at Amherst. Professor Servos noted that the "*summa* group" might not demonstrate such improvement, since it is difficult to make the GPA cutoff for the top 25 percent of the class (a requirement for

Amended April 28, 2008

summa), if students have anything other than excellent grades throughout their time at Amherst. The members then wondered if the winners of the award might be selected from the group of students who are nominated for the designation of *summa* by their departments, on the basis of their thesis work, but who cannot receive the designation because they do not meet the GPA threshold for the top twenty-five percent of the class. In the end, the Committee, the President, and the Dean decided that it would be valuable to consult with the Dean of Students and the Committee on Student Fellowships about this issue and to consider their advice. The Committee then turned to a personnel matter.

The Committee reviewed course proposals and voted six to zero in favor to forward them to the Faculty.

Dean Call next informed the members of his plans to write to the chairs of departments with tenure-track faculty members to remind the chairs of the importance of having annual conversations with assistant professors to offer feedback about teaching and to discuss progress on scholarship. The Committee agreed that, at the time of tenure review, it is invaluable for the Committee of Six to have letters from senior colleagues who have observed and evaluated the candidate's teaching. It was noted that, while it is not required that senior colleagues convey their impressions of classroom visits to the Committee of Six, having this information, in addition to student teaching evaluations and retrospective letters, is very useful to the Committee, and therefore to the candidate. President Marx noted he would like to discuss the process by which the teaching of tenure-track faculty members is evaluated by students. His impression is that the volume and production of the evaluations is overwhelming and that the current system might be improved.

Under "Questions to the Administration," Professor Sinos noted that the minutes of the February 25 meeting include a response from Dean Call that suggests that she had not been clear in stating her concern that faculty members are sometimes not consulted about matters related to teaching and the intellectual life of the College. She was referring not to planning for future building projects, but rather policy matters. The Committee of Six recently felt the need to meet with the Director of Information Technology to address faculty concerns about decisions in that department. The library recently implemented a policy to put all course books in the reserve room despite objections from some faculty members, and the Dean of Students office has been permitting students to drop classes without discussion with the professors. She expressed concern about this pattern and said she feels that it is the job of the Dean and President to set a tone on campus that respects faculty interests in decisions that affect their teaching and research, without requiring the Faculty to intervene to resolve administrative difficulties of this sort. President Marx responded that, in the case of certain administrative matters, for example, the Faculty's concerns about the practices of the Department of Information Technology, it is important that discussion take place to explore what is working and what is not. The Dean concurred and noted that Mr. Schilling had found it very useful to speak with the Committee directly to learn more about the Faculty's needs and concerns.

Continuing the conversation, President Marx said that, at an institution such as Amherst, where faculty governance and faculty involvement in the full range of activities of the College is central, it is important both to protect faculty governance rights and to preserve the Faculty's time so that they can focus on their most important roles—teaching and scholarship. A balance must be found between asking for faculty involvement in everything that goes on at the College and not consulting the Faculty when it is critical that they be consulted. He wondered, for example, whether it was desirable that members of the Committee of Six were asked to spend time meeting with a search firm that is assisting with an administrative search, as was requested just recently. President Marx suggested that the Committee discuss at a future meeting a

Amended April 28, 2008

threshold for determining when faculty members should be asked to be involved in College matters that appear to fall outside the purview of individual faculty, departments, and faculty committees.

Professor George next asked the Dean if the Committee would soon begin the process of committee assignments for the next year. Dean Call said that it is his intention that the Committee begin work on other committee assignments once the Committee of Six election is completed. He noted that the final review of the ballot for the Committee of Six election would soon be completed. The Committee then turned to personnel matters.

At the conclusion of the personnel discussion, the Committee turned to Professor Cobham-Sander's report on Diversity and Inclusion at Amherst. The members agreed that the report raises important issues that should be considered by the Faculty. Professor Jagannathan praised the value and insightfulness of the report overall, while commenting that he found its tone to be overly inclusive in regard to one issue. He got a sense from a particular section of what might be described as excessive egalitarianism, that is, a suggestion that it is all right for everyone to be involved in everything at Amherst. While he believes this to be the case when it comes to certain matters, he feels strongly that it is clearly not the case when it comes to who should teach academic courses at Amherst. Professor Jagannathan said that he has noticed a disturbing recent trend at the College that some Trustee-appointed staff members, once they are working at the College, feel that they should be allowed to move into the classroom, in addition to performing their other duties. While he believes that it is acceptable for such individuals to guest-lecture in classes on occasion and even to co-teach for a specified period of time, upon the invitation of a faculty member, he feels that it is important to make clear that the classroom is the domain of the Faculty. Some of the language of the report might suggest otherwise, he noted. Dean Call said that the College has resisted making any administrative appointments that are coupled with teaching appointments (with the exception of regular Amherst faculty who are subsequently appointed to administrative positions).

Professor Frank noted that the diversity report and the FCAFA's report should encourage the Faculty to consider fundamental questions. What is the value of diversity? Why do we aspire to have a diverse community? It's worthwhile to make sure we know why, she said, because both reports argue that not only should minority students and faculty have to adapt to the College, but we should consider how they might *change* the College. The members agreed that the College should consider new approaches to achieving diversity goals when it comes to hiring and retaining faculty of color. The members discussed how issues of diversity might be incorporated into the curriculum, as well as the need to develop a common language that would enable the community to discuss issues of diversity in clear and unambiguous ways. It was agreed that currently, a lack of specificity in this regard hampers open communication. The members said that they look forward to continuing this important conversation with 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 Black Studies

March 27, 2008

Gregory Call
Dean of the Faculty
Secretary to the Committee of Six AC # 2209
Amherst College

Dear Greg,

I write to request that another motion be brought to faculty vote before the end of the current semester. As you know, four years ago both the student body and the faculty voted in a new Honor Code, with the provision that it be re-approved every four years - or once during each student's stay at the College - by both bodies. The College Council has spent a substantial amount of time this year discussing the Honor Code with a variety of constituencies, including representative students, faculty and deans. We concluded that the institution of the Honor Code has had positive effects on our community: there has been a steady decline in the number of reported cases of cheating or plagiarism from an all-time high of 34 in the year before the Honor Code was implemented to a total of 10 in the 2006-07 academic year. We therefore voted unanimously to forward the Honor Code to both the student body and the faculty without modification for reapproval for the next four years. Shortly before spring break, the students held a referendum on the Honor Code, and 91% of the students who participated voted to renew it.

We therefore ask that the Committee of Six forward to the faculty a motion to renew the Honor Code for another four years, until September 2012. Please let me know if you have any questions about this request.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Ferguson
Chair, College Council

AMHERST COLLEGE
Department of Black Studies

March 27, 2008

Gregory Call
Dean of the Faculty
Secretary to the Committee of Six AC #2209
Amherst College

Dear Greg,

As you know, every three years the faculty must approve a new three-year calendar. I write on behalf of the College Council to forward to the Committee of Six the enclosed draft of a new calendar, prepared by the registrar and scheduled to take effect for the 2009-10 academic year. The new calendar follows the same general template that our calendar has followed for the last decade or so, with the exception that the usual three-day reading period in the fall semester has had to be shortened to two days in two of the three years as a result of the lateness of the date on which Labor Day falls in those years. The College Council spent a considerable amount of time discussing possible ways in which to extend the reading period in those two years, but in the end we agreed that the disadvantages of those alternatives outweighed the advantages of the longer reading period. As a result, we voted unanimously to forward the calendar proposed by Mr. Mager to the Committee of Six for approval by the faculty before the end of this semester.

Please let me know if you or the Committee of Six has any questions about the enclosed calendar.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Ferguson
Chair, College Council

JF/kk
Enclosure

Amherst College Calendars 2009-2012

Event	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Classes Begin	Tues., Sept. 8	Tues., Sept. 7	Tues., Sept. 6
End of Interchange Registration	Wed., September 16	Wed., September 15	Wed., September 14
Mid-Semester Break	Sat., Oct. 10-Tues, Oct 13	Sat., Oct.9-Tues, Oct 12	Sat., Oct.8-Tues, Oct 11
Pre-Registration for Spring	Thur., Nov. 12-Wed., Nov 18	Thur., Nov. 11-Wed., Nov 17	Thur., Nov. 10-Wed., Nov 16
Thanksgiving Vacation	Sat., Nov 21-Sun, Nov. 29	Sat., Nov 20-Sun, Nov. 28	Sat., Nov 19-Sun., Nov. 27
Last Day of Classes	Wed, Dec. 16	Wed, Dec. 15	Wed, Dec. 14
Reading/Study Period	Thur., Dec 17-Fri., Dec 18	Thur., Dec 16-Fri., Dec 17	Thur., Dec 15-Sat., Dec 17
Examination Period	Sat., Dec. 19-Wed., Dec 23	Sat., Dec. 18-Wed, Dec 22	Sun., Dec. 18-Thu., Dec 22
Grades Due	Mon., Jan. 4	Mon., Jan. 3	Tue., Jan 3
January Term	Mon., Jan 4-Fri., Jan 22	Mon., Jan 3-Fri., Jan 21	Mon., Jan 9-Fri., Jan 27
Classes Begin	Mon., Jan.25	Mon., Jan.24	Mon., Jan.30
End of Interchange Registration	Wed, Feb., 3	Wed., Feb., 2	Wed., Feb., 8
Spring Recess	Sat., Mar., 13-Sun., Mar. 21	Sat., Mar., 12-Sun., Mar. 20	Sat., Mar. 17-Sun., Mar. 25
Pre-Registration for Fall	Mon, Apr.,5-Fri., Apr. 9	Mon, Apr., 4-Fri., Apr. 8	Mon, Apr. 9-Fri., Apr. 13
Last Day of Classes	Fri., May 7	Fri., May 6	Fri., May 11
Reading/Study Period	Sat., May 8-Sun., May 9	Sat., May 7-Sun., May 8	Sat., May 12-Sun., May 13
Examination Period	Mon., May 10-Fri., May 14	Mon., May 9-Fri., May 13	Mon., May 14-Fri., May 18
Grades Due --Senior	Mon., May 17--9:00a.m.	Mon., May 16--9:00a.m.	Mon., May 21--9:00a.m.
Other	Wed., May 19	Wed., May 18	Wed., May 23
Commencement	Sun., May 23	Sun., May 22	Sun., May 27

*Mon. Classes on Wed., Sept. 9 *Mon. Classes on Wed., Sept. 8 *Mon. Classes on Wed., Sept. 7

Amended May 5, 2008

The twenty-fifth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2007-2008 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, April 7, 2008. 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 announcements from the President. President Marx said that, in light of the recent vote by the Faculty to add another standing committee (the Committee on International Education) to the roster of faculty committees, knowing that some proposals for other new committees are already under discussion, and recognizing the burden that committee service places on the Faculty, he would like to discuss ways to re-configure the committee architecture at the College. The goal would be to ensure appropriate faculty oversight, while improving efficiency and thereby reducing the time that faculty members must take away from their teaching and scholarship to devote to committee service. Past attempts to eliminate or combine committees have not enabled the governance process to overcome encumbrances and have not provided the Faculty with relief from the demands of committee service, he noted. President Marx suggested that the Dean and he, taking a broad perspective, consider how committee structures might be re-conceived and re-structured, and that they develop a proposal that would be brought to the Committee of Six for discussion.

While in favor of the idea of enhancing the efficiency of faculty governance, some members cautioned President Marx that possible solutions, such as combining committees, might make matters worse, particularly if issues such as committee workloads, rather than the number of committees, lie at the heart of the problem. Professor Sinos commented that she is not in favor of eliminating, or combining with other committees, all committees that are not active right now. If, for example, an issue of concern to the Faculty regarding housing arises, a housing committee should be in place, she said. Professor Servos noted that it is difficult to predict the workload of committees. While a certain committee might have a light workload for an extended period, if a major issue comes up that falls within its purview, the workload may increase dramatically and abruptly. He noted, for example, that, up until 1997, when the Faculty Committee on Admission on Financial Aid (FCAFA) was asked to review the role of athletics in the admission process, service on the FCAFA was not too demanding. The workload of that committee increased in response to that assignment, and it has continued to have a heavy workload since that time. Professor Servos commented that the workloads of other committees, such as the Fellowships Committee, have simply grown over time in response to the needs of students—in the case of fellowship applications—or the College. Professor George said that chairing a department can present more of a burden than committee service. Professor Jagannathan commented that the number of faculty members who are available for committee service has been reduced as more faculty colleagues join the administration, and he questioned the necessity of taking so many colleagues out of the classroom for this purpose. President Marx responded that, despite recent and much-needed additions, Amherst's administration remains the leanest among the College's peers, and highly integrated with the Faculty, which is a strength. Professor O'Hara said that she thinks it would be beneficial to consider how committees might be re-shaped, particularly in the context of the College's new programs and new directions. With the Committee's support, President Marx said that the Dean and he would consider the College's committee structure. The other members agreed.

President Marx next raised concern about the number of students in classes at the College that have enrollments of more than fifty. The President noted that, in the current

Amended May 5, 2008

academic year, some 12.5 percent (fall) to 15.5 percent (spring) of Amherst's enrollments were in courses of this size. It is open for debate as to whether having students learning in too many large courses is consistent with the aspirations and values of a small liberal arts college, and he wondered if capping the enrollments of Amherst courses at fifty might be a step that should be considered. President Marx said that, if all courses had enrollment limits of fifty, only about 4.4 percent of students would not get in to courses that they want to take because of enrollment caps, but a greater breadth of the curriculum would be available to students.

Continuing the conversation, Professor George asked if the statistics that the President had cited about the total enrollment in Amherst courses with enrollments of more than fifty students included the lab sections of classes in the sciences that combine lectures with lab sections. He noted that, while lectures may be given to a class of many students, the lab sections typically have small enrollments. President Marx said that the numbers that he quoted did not include large introductory science classes that were then broken down into smaller lab sections. The President wondered whether some students might be taking a disproportionate number of courses with large enrollments. Professor Jagannathan suggested that it would be useful to track this information, by student, to get a sense of the distribution of large and small courses within a student's portfolio over four years at Amherst. Dean Call noted that, a few years ago, the Registrar's office conducted a study that was aimed at getting a sense of the student experience by examining the number of large and small classes being taken by individual students. Professor Servos commented that, as an advisor, he feels confident that students will have an excellent experience in some large classes, just as they will in some small classes, and he feels comfortable recommending both kinds of classes. He believes that the quality of the course is not a function of its size. Professor Jagannathan commented that there are some popular large classes that have become part of the fabric of the Amherst experience. Students who have taken these classes share a bond, and these classes, for this reason, serve the institutional purpose of providing a common experience that unites students and alumni. President Marx argued that there is no reason that students cannot have a similar sort of bonding experience in small discussion classes, and agreed that large courses can be excellent, though trade-offs remain.

The Committee next discussed the need to return to some remaining agenda items for the year. Professor Frank said that she is interested in returning to the topic of the future of the humanities at the College. President Marx reiterated his interest in reviewing the current system of teaching evaluation for tenure-track faculty. At the Committee's request, the Dean agreed to review the unfinished business list with the members at the next meeting as a means of prioritizing agenda items for the remaining meetings.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor George asked about long-term plans for the directorship of the Writing Center. Dean Call said that Professor Barale has agreed to serve as the director for one year. He noted that a long-term plan is not yet in place, and that the administration is open to considering different models and proposals. Professor Frank commented that the Department of English plans to invite experts in the field to come to campus to discuss a variety of approaches to structuring writing centers and to teaching writing. The Dean noted that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has been, and will continue to be, a part of the conversation about writing instruction. President Marx noted that some hybrid models have been proposed that would involve having a small number of compositionists support the Faculty in the teaching of writing. If such a model is adopted, faculty would be involved in the selection process for such individuals.

Amended May 5, 2008

Professor O'Hara next asked whether the administration plans to assess the outcomes of the President's Initiative Fund for Interdisciplinary Curricular Projects (PIF), a program that has now come to an end. The Dean noted that, while the PIF projects covered a wide spectrum of topics and encompassed a variety of approaches, he feels that all of the projects were valuable and brought new energy into the curriculum.

The members reviewed seven course proposals and agreed that they should be included among the courses for pre-registration, with the notation that faculty approval of them is pending. They also voted to forward the proposals to the Faculty.

Dean Call next asked the members to discuss two letters from Professor Ferguson, Chair of the College Council, which were distributed at the last meeting. The first letter outlined the committee's review of the Honor Code and included their recommendation that the Committee of Six forward to the Faculty a motion to renew the Honor Code for an additional four-year period. The other letter described the College Council's consideration of a draft of a three-year college calendar that would take effect in 2009-2010, and included a recommendation that the Committee of Six forward the draft calendar to the Faculty for approval. The College Council noted that the new calendar includes shortened reading periods (from three days to two) in the fall semester in two of the three years, as a result of the lateness of the dates on which Labor Day falls in those years. Dean Call noted that the calendar also includes a shortened add/drop period (to about ten days), a change that was recommended by the CEP and supported by the Five-College Deans and Registrars.

Professor George expressed concern that, in the fall of 2009, the proposed schedule included examinations through December 23. Bad weather resulting in delayed or cancelled flights could lead to some students not being able to leave campus by December 25. As a possible solution, the members wondered if the final exam schedule could, perhaps, be condensed, or the fall break shortened, to provide more of a cushion. Professor Jagannathan wondered if the College might begin the fall semester before Labor Day if Labor Day is very late. Providing additional information, the Dean said that, as has always been the case, an attempt would be made to schedule as few exams as possible on the final day of exams. He noted that the University may begin nearly two weeks earlier than the Five College Consortium's colleges in Spring 2012. President Marx said that he would like to learn the full details of UMass's plans before the Amherst Faculty votes on the calendar, although, he noted that Amherst could always approve the calendar this year and then vote revisions to it at a later date, if necessary. The Dean noted that, in 2006-2007, Professors Barale and K. Sweeney, as representatives of the College Council, were part of a four-college group that was charged with informing the university, before its faculty voted on the calendar question, of the views of the other members of the consortium regarding the calendar issue.

President Marx reiterated that he would be interested in confirming UMass's intentions and to know whether shortening Interterm might be under their consideration. Amherst might also wish to consider this option, he noted. Professors George, Jagannathan, and O'Hara noted that having an extended period of time in January to focus on thesis work is essential for students who are doing honors theses in the sciences. President Marx wondered about the adverse effects for such students if a week were cut from the Interterm period and added to spring break. An alternative might be to shorten Interterm and end the year a week earlier. Professor Frank said that she relies on the long break during January to recoup energy and to prepare for the spring semester. After some discussion, the Committee asked Dean Call to bring their concerns about

Amended May 5, 2008

the calendar proposal back to the College Council for additional consideration. He agreed to do so. The members next voted five in favor and zero opposed, with one abstention (Professor Jagannathan) on the substance of the College Council's motion that the Faculty renew the Honor Code, without modification, for another four years, until September 2012. The Committee voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the motion to the Faculty. The members also agreed that the next Faculty Meeting should be held on May 6. The members spent the time remaining for the meeting on a personnel matter.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call

Dean of the Faculty

Amended May 5, 2008

The twenty-sixth 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 Wednesday, April 16, 2008. 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 noting that discussions are continuing at the Five-College level about changes to the Five-College calendar that the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, is contemplating, including reducing the length of Interterm by six days. President Marx, who noted that the College and other members of the consortium have an interest in schedule coordination, said that he plans to discuss this and related calendar matters with the Five-College presidents. The Committee next reviewed course proposals and voted to forward them to the Faculty. Under "Announcements from the Dean, Dean Call reviewed with the members remaining Committee of Six agenda items for this academic year. He noted that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) is considering a proposal to modify the honors system. If the CEP develops a proposal, it will be forwarded to the Committee of Six, the Dean noted. A question brought to the attention of the Committee by Professor Gentzler is also on the docket, the Dean noted. Professor Gentzler raised concern that, given the socioeconomic diversity of the student body, the institution should be cognizant of the ways in which economic hardships faced by students from less economically advantaged backgrounds may create difficulties for them academically. She pointed out that these students may be less well prepared academically and may need to spend more time on their assignments, but may also have less time available to spend on their academic work than their more privileged peers because of their need to work to help support themselves and, sometimes, their families. Professor Gentzler suggested that the College consider ways of offering students additional time to complete academic work, offering as a proposal that the College make available to Amherst students, who, because of demonstrated financial hardship have "compelling employment responsibilities," the option to carry a reduced course load. She noted that this option is currently open to students who have a physical disability or a compelling family responsibility (see Amherst College 2007-2008 Catalog, page 68). To inform the future conversation about this issue, the Committee asked the Dean to ask Ben Lieber, Dean of Students, about the frequency with which his office grants petitions for this option and the typical circumstances, and for Dean Lieber's view of the idea of extending this option to students who meet the criteria described by Professor Gentzler. The Dean agreed to do so. The Committee said that it would also consider whether this matter might be referred to the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCFA) or the College Council.

Returning to other possible agenda items for the Committee to consider, the Dean mentioned the issue of the format and manner of collection of course evaluations for tenure-track faculty members. The members agreed that it would increase efficiency during the tenure review process if departments would develop online forms for students. To ensure full student participation, the members suggested that a student's grades be withheld until he or she completes and submits course evaluation forms. They also agreed that each department should continue to develop its own forms. The Dean said that he would be pleased to work with

Amended May 5, 2008

departments to determine the best way to move to an online system and to provide the necessary support for doing so.

The members returned briefly to a discussion of ways in which faculty committees might be re-structured. The Dean and the President wondered if having a small number of committees might be preferable to the current structure of having many different committees with narrower charges. While service on such committees would be a substantial commitment, such service would be limited to a relatively small number of faculty members each year. Members of the committees could serve two- or three-year terms, and would then be free from committee service for a number of years, as service on the committees rotated among the Faculty. Professor Frank pointed out that there is often a learning curve of several years for the current, more important committees, noting that colleagues would cycle off the committees just as they had mastered their roles. The Dean commented that members' terms would be staggered, as they are now for many committees. In any case, the dilemma of the learning curve is something that is faced under the current system and is a situation that will remain no matter what system of committee service is put in place. Professor Sinos asked if the faculty members have the sense that many of our colleagues feel that committee work is a problem at the College. She noted that, while some committees have heavy workloads, others do not, and furnish a way for faculty to come to know new colleagues. Professor Servos noted that many faculty members' feelings that they have been over-burdened over the past four or five years do not stem from complaints about committee service, but rather from the burdens imposed by activities such as the following: teaching intensive courses, serving on working groups, developing and participating in President Initiative Fund projects, and participating in numerous faculty searches, particularly for visitors. President Marx said that the activity over the past four or five years has indeed been extraordinary, but noted that the outcomes of these efforts have been substantial and positive, and that curricular development and scholarship should remain the focus of faculty efforts. He said that it is his hope that, once the new tenure-track faculty members have been allocated, there should be fewer searches for visitors. Dean Call noted that he has tried to be generous with visiting appointments to meet as fully as possible the needs and requests of Amherst departments. The Committee agreed that the President and the Dean should continue exploring the inefficiencies of the current committee structure with the aim of making improvements.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Jagannathan asked if the Dean planned to consult with the Committee of Six about any changes that he might anticipate in how the position of Associate Dean would be structured once Dean Griffiths steps down from this administrative post at the end of this academic year. Dean Call said that he has not made any appointments yet. Dean Basu will continue in her role as a half-time Associate Dean, he noted. Dean Call said that he is considering how best to use Dean Griffiths's position, which is a full FTE, and that he may appoint two half-time Associate Deans. In addition, Professor O'Hara (as of July 1) and Sarat will serve as Senior Advisors to the Dean for Academic Life. Professors Jagannathan and George expressed some concern that changing the full-time Associate Dean's position to two half-time positions would remove one additional colleague from the classroom and would necessitate hiring two visitors instead of one. The Committee, the President, and the

Amended May 5, 2008

Dean agreed that it is important that faculty members who enter the administration have a broad, College-wide perspective. The Dean said that, once he has firm commitments regarding the Associate Dean positions he would inform the Committee and the Faculty. Professor Jagannathan expressed the hope that in the future, as in the past, the Committee of Six would be consulted about such appointments as well as about the structure of the positions.

Turning to plans for the Faculty Meeting scheduled for May 6, Professor Frank noted that she had spoken with Professor Cobham-Sander, Special Assistant to the President for Diversity and author of the “Report to the President on Diversity and Inclusion at Amherst,” about ways to structure the Faculty’s discussion of that report, as well as of the report of the FCAFA, which is titled “A Complicated Success? Assessing Academic Qualifications and Their Place in the Intellectual Life of our Students, with Special Attention to Diversity Initiatives.” Professor Cobham-Sander felt that it would be beneficial to discuss the two reports as a single agenda item, since the two documents focus on related issues. The President and some Committee members felt that it might be confusing to structure discussion this way and recommended that the Dean discuss this matter with Professors Lembo and Cobham-Sander. He agreed.

The members then turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended May 5, 2008

The twenty-seventh 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, April 28, 2008. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Committee began the meeting by addressing a personnel matter. Under "Announcements from the President," President Marx expressed interest in exploring ways to shift the timing of some of the College obligations that occur on the Labor Day holiday, so that members of the Faculty can enjoy the holiday more fully. Convocation and the first Faculty Meeting of the new academic year are currently held on Labor Day, and Faculty have advising responsibilities, from 1:30 to 3:30, on the holiday, as well. The Committee discussed suggestions that included moving Convocation to a time after classes begin, re-scheduling the Faculty Meeting from the morning to the afternoon or evening of Labor Day, and re-scheduling the Faculty Meeting early in the semester other than Labor Day.

Professor Servos expressed strongly the sentiment that Convocation be held prior to the beginning of classes. He noted the ceremony's symbolic significance as the first time that first-year students gather to be welcomed formally to the College, as well as the fact that the speech given at Convocation is sometimes the subject of conversation at the first meeting of First-Year Seminars. Other members, the President, and the Dean agreed that Convocation should remain on Labor Day. The Committee expressed support for changing the time or day of the Faculty Meeting. President Marx noted that the only business that might necessitate having the meeting on Labor Day would be the late approval of fall courses. If a Faculty Meeting is held on Labor Day, the Committee agreed that it should be brief, and that it could be moved to 4:00 P.M.—soon after advising sessions for first-year students end at 3:30—or to the evening, right after Convocation, for example. The President thanked the members for their suggestions and said that he would consider this matter further and would report back to Committee.

Continuing his remarks, President Marx informed the Committee that he has been in discussions with attorney Paul Murphy '73, who has agreed to serve as a consultant two days a week at the College. The President said that he would like to experiment, on a limited basis, with the model of having in-house legal counsel at the College. He informed the members that he would like to invite Mr. Murphy to attend Faculty Meetings as an invited guest, and they agreed that doing so would be informative for this consultant.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the members that he has appointed Professor Courtright to be Associate Dean of the Faculty, half-time, beginning July 1, 2008. Professor Basu will continue as Associate Dean, half-time, as well. He said that plans to appoint an additional (half-time) Associate Dean in his office in the near future. The Dean also informed the members that he and Dean Lieber have appointed Professor Gentzler to be Interim Associate Director of the Writing Center. Professor Barale is Interim Director of the Writing Center.

Amended May 5, 2008

The Dean next reported back to the Committee about research he had done to follow up on Professor Gentzler's suggestion, and the Committee's discussion of her proposal, that the College make available to Amherst students, who, because of demonstrated financial hardship have "compelling employment responsibilities," the option to carry a reduced course load. This option is currently open to students who have a physical disability or a compelling family responsibility (see Amherst College 2007-2008 Catalog, page 68). The Dean said that he had learned from Dean Lieber that two or three students a year (over the past ten years) have been allowed to carry a reduced course load under the option. Dean Lieber said that he would support extending the option to students who meet the criteria described by Professor Gentzler. After discussion, it was agreed that the current Catalog language is broad enough to allow the option to be extended, without making any changes in the wording. The Committee agreed that only a very small number of students should be allowed to carry a reduced course load, and that it could become problematic if the numbers grow too much beyond current levels. Professor Servos suggested that a faculty committee, perhaps the Committee on Academic Standing and Special Majors, should be made aware of the number of students whose petitions for a reduced course load are granted each year. Dean Call said that Dean Lieber, or perhaps the Registrar, could certainly provide a faculty committee with this information on an annual basis, and that a faculty committee could thus provide oversight for this process.

The members noted that Professor Rosbottom has raised concern (in an email that is appended to these minutes) that membership continuity on important faculty committees is being threatened because balloting for the Committee of Six "trumps" all other committee appointments. Professor O'Hara commented that the exemptions in regard to other committee service that are currently in place in regard to inclusion on the Committee of Six ballot—being a current or retiring member of the College Council or the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) during the election year (in addition to exemptions for current, retiring, and a specified group of retired Committee of Six members)—are no longer reflective of the demands placed on faculty who serve on these and other committees. The Committee agreed that the workload of the College Council was more demanding at the time the exemptions were established, for example. The workload of the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) has increased since that time, and an exemption should perhaps be established for the current and retiring members of that committee, Professor O'Hara suggested. The members agreed to discuss this issue in the context of a broader conversation about faculty committees.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Jagannathan asked the Dean when information about next year's faculty salaries would be available. The Dean replied that salary information would be provided in May, after the Commencement meeting of the Board. In regard to staff salaries, President Marx noted that the College will be providing larger-than-usual salary increases to all staff, and additional raises to the lowest paid, in light of recent economic difficulties. The grades of some staff positions are also being adjusted. Professor Sinos said that she is pleased to see that Amherst is taking the lead in regard to raising staff salaries, and she expressed support for decreasing the compensation gap between faculty and non-faculty salaries at the College.

Amended May 5, 2008

The Committee next discussed a matter relating to a course proposal. Prompted by the members' discussion about a colleague's decision to include a warning about the inclusion of sensitive material as part of the content of the colleague's proposed course, the members agreed that faculty members should exercise their own judgment when it comes to warning students about sensitive material in a course, and that such warnings should not be mandated. The members agreed on revised language for the course. Professor George noted that providing warnings of this nature might be particularly important for First-Year Seminars, since students register for the seminars over the summer before they come to Amherst, without the guidance of the Faculty, and because it is very difficult for students to switch seminars once they enroll in one. Professor Jagannathan said that sensitive material is a "misplaced euphemism" and said that warnings of "potentially disturbing" content would be preferable. Professor Frank agreed. Continuing the conversation, Professor O'Hara noted that students expect to be challenged when they come to college, but that faculty should think carefully about the line between reasonable challenge and potentially explosive and disturbing content. She feels that, if the content of a course has the potential to be very disturbing, a warning about that content is appropriate. In regard to course proposals more generally, Professor Frank commented that descriptions seem to be getting longer. Professors George and O'Hara noted that faculty members who teach First-Year Seminars have been asked to provide as full a description as possible about course content, since students select the seminars without the benefit of faculty advising. The members then voted to forward the course proposals before them to the Faculty.

Returning to a discussion of the College Council's consideration of a draft of a three-year college calendar that would take effect in 2009-2010, Dean Call noted that he has been consulting with Professor Ferguson, Chair of the College Council, and Dean Lieber about the concern that the Fall 2009 term might end too late and that the University may begin thirteen days earlier than the consortium's colleges in Spring 2012. (As was noted during the Committee's discussion of this issue on April 7, the proposed schedule in Fall 2009 includes examinations through December 23. Bad weather resulting in delayed or cancelled flights could lead to some students not being able to leave campus by December 25.) Dean Call noted that he had been invited to attend the next College Council meeting to discuss a proposal that fall break be shortened by one day so that an extra day would be provided at the end of the Fall 2009 term. The first Tuesday of the semester would also be re-defined as a Monday. Professors George, Jagannathan, and O'Hara expressed some concern that, if this re-definition occurs, the opportunity to offer labs Tuesday through Friday, during the first week of classes would be lost. Dean Call pointed out that the proposal would not entail re-defining the first Wednesday of the semester, as all recent College calendars have required, so regular Wednesday classes and labs would be held during the first week. Professors George, Jagannathan, and O'Hara agreed that, with enough forewarning, the lab schedule could be adjusted, and that doing so was preferable to retaining the current schedule for the fall semester of 2009.

Turning to plans for the Faculty Meeting scheduled for May 6, the Committee discussed how best to structure the discussion of the "Report to the President on Diversity and Inclusion at Amherst" and the report of the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCFA),

Amended May 5, 2008

which is titled “A Complicated Success? Assessing Academic Qualifications and Their Place in the Intellectual Life of our Students, with Special Attention to Diversity Initiatives.” The Dean noted that he had consulted with Professor Cobham-Sander and Professor Lembo, who felt that it would be beneficial to discuss the two reports as a single agenda item in a committee-of-the-whole format, since the two documents focus on related issues. Professor George asked whether any recommendations or action items might emerge from a committee-of-the-whole discussion. The members agreed that the reports raise very important issues that should be discussed by the Faculty. At the Committee’s request, the Dean agreed to speak with Professors Cobham-Sander and Lembo about how they envision coordinating the discussion of the two reports and about having them each provide brief and informal summary statements about their reports at the Faculty Meeting, before discussion begins. It was agreed that the committee-of-the-whole discussion should conclude by 9:15 P.M.

In the course of the conversation, it was also stressed that the FCAFA’s report contains sensitive and confidential information, and the Dean noted that the report had been posted online with password-protection, and that the Faculty had been informed that the report was posted online and that they could receive a hard copy of it, upon request. In addition, it was communicated that hard copies would be available at the Faculty Meeting. Several members noted that the FCAFA’s report was quite substantial and asked that the Dean send an email reminder to the Faculty that it was posted online and that hard copies were available. He agreed to do so.

The members next reviewed and voted to approve the following motion, which reflects and formalizes their earlier vote (six yes, zero no, to forward to the Faculty; five yes, zero no, one abstention (Jagannathan), on content) in regard to the honor code:

As recommended by the College Council, the Committee of Six moves that the Faculty renew, without modification, the Honor Code for the next four years (until September 2012). The Honor Code (Student Handbook, beginning on page 23, under “Student Rights and Policies”), which was first approved by the Faculty in December 2004, is appended [to the agenda].

The Committee next reviewed the full agenda for the Faculty Meeting of May 6 and voted six in favor and zero opposed to approve it.

The Committee turned to a discussion of committee assignments and ways of possibly restructuring faculty committees. Conversation focused first on a proposed new standing committee to advise the Center for Community Engagement (CCE). Currently, an informal advisory group serves this role. The members agreed that the committee should continue as an ad hoc group for another year. The members, the President, and the Dean stressed that the decision to delay the formation of a standing committee is by no means meant as a signal that the College is not supportive of the center or that the Faculty is unwilling to take on an oversight role in relation to its activities. On the contrary, the Committee felt strongly that a standing committee should ultimately be created and charged, but that the proposal would be

Amended May 5, 2008

strengthened, and the CCE would be better served, if next year was spent regularizing procedures and gaining experience with the center's aspirations, operation, and activities.

Dean Call next put forward a number of proposals regarding committees. He suggested that the current Housing, "Green," and Wildlife Sanctuary committees be abolished, and that their responsibilities be assumed by the CPR, which has already taken on an expanded role in planning surrounding campus facilities and campus resources. The Dean also suggested that the Health and Safety Committee, which hasn't met in ten years, be abolished, and that the Ad Hoc Committee on Parking, which hasn't met in two years, also be eliminated. It was noted that the responsibilities of the faculty Health and Safety Committee are now shared among administrators at the College, who meet when necessary. President Marx and the Dean stressed that, if necessary, ad hoc committees could be re-formed if a significant issue emerged that could not be addressed by the CPR.

Professor Sinos expressed concern that absorbing the Housing Committee's responsibilities into those of the CPR would mean that there would no longer be a requirement that a certain number of colleagues who were charged with overseeing housing issues would, themselves, live in College housing. The Dean pointed out the Housing Committee has not met regularly in recent years, so the make-up of the committee has not been influential. Professor Jagannathan noted that he has long been aware of complaints about the housing system. He said that College housing is an important faculty benefit and has played a role in Amherst's ability to recruit faculty. If the College is reconsidering this benefit, the administration should do so openly, rather than taking the less overt route of abolishing the Housing Committee. He acknowledged that the Housing Committee may not be the most effective vehicle to address day-to-day concerns and complaints from faculty who enjoy that benefit. If that is the case, a more transparent and effective administrative mechanism should first be established before abolishing or absorbing the committee. Professor Sinos agreed and noted that there is a perception among the Faculty that housing is not addressed in a systematic manner, but that the benefit instead seems to be provided in an ad hoc manner, depending on the circumstances of individuals. The Dean noted that, by having the CPR address faculty housing issues, housing would be within the purview of a committee that meets weekly and that includes the Treasurer (who oversees the Housing Office). He noted that housing concerns largely involve relations between tenants and the housing office, and that most of these concerns, of which there have not been very many in recent years, are forwarded to him. He would much prefer having the CPR, a broader group of colleagues who focus on resource allocation, address housing questions and concerns.

Professor George said he didn't understand the level of concern being expressed that service on less time-consuming committees is a serious detriment to teaching and research. Faculty are expected to shift even larger amounts of time away from teaching and research, compared to the time commitment of serving on some less weighty committees, when they are asked to chair a department, prepare tenure cases, participate in searches – both departmental and sometimes college-wide – or work on planning documents, e.g. for outside reviews or, recently, CAP and PIF. He said that faculty serving on specialized committees often do so willingly

Amended May 5, 2008

because they have a significant interest in the work of the committees. Since these faculty members consider their service to be worthwhile, he wondered why the President and the Dean seem to be focusing on eliminating these committees to serve the goal of reducing the overall number of committees. President Marx responded that he has heard many complaints from faculty members who see the volume of committee service as onerous and inefficient and as a distraction from their teaching and research. He reiterated his view that having a smaller number of committees might be preferable to the current structure of having many different committees with narrower charges. While service on such committees would be a substantial commitment, such service would be limited to a relatively small number of faculty members each year, with efforts to ensure rotation and sharing of this burden.

He believes that, in terms of faculty governance, generally, committees can be more effective at oversight if they are considering an array of interconnected issues and making informed decisions based on a broad charge and broad view. Pressing or more specific issues can be addressed in such committees, but, when necessary, ad hoc groups can be formed.

The Dean continued with his proposals surrounding committees. He suggested that the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Support should become a Dean's task force. He noted that, at present, administrators, including faculty, work on these issues, and that the committee brings other colleagues into their discussions as needed. A task force would be a better structure for the work of this group, he believes. Dean Call also suggested that the Ad Hoc Environmental Studies Committee had evolved into the advisory committee for the new Environmental Studies Program and major, and that that the Ad Hoc Film and Media Committee might similarly evolve, if a Film Studies major and program are established. He noted that a proposal for a Film and Media Studies major, which is currently being reviewed by the CEP, will likely be forwarded to the Committee of Six in the fall. In addition, the Dean proposed eliminating the Doshisha Committee and charging the Department of Asian Languages and Civilizations with that committee's responsibilities. The Dean said that, after consultation with Deans Lieber and Hart, he would like to propose that the College Council take on the responsibilities that currently rest with the Orientation Committee, which could then be dissolved. After some discussion, and with the understanding that new ad hoc committees could always be formed if necessary, the members agreed that the Dean's proposals, which do not require faculty votes, should be implemented.

President Marx asked if there was interest in any further restructuring of committees. One option, he suggested in light of the recent faculty vote on a term limit for the Committee of Six, would be to consider term limits and enforced rotation of committee work among the faculty, and a smaller number of committees that are charged with a broader array of interrelated responsibilities. For instance, with some re-assignment of responsibilities based on coherent thematic areas, the CEP, the CPR, the FCAFA, the College Council, and a new committee that would focus on faculty issues could be the primary faculty committees.

Professor Servos expressed concern that having committees assume broader charges would mean that faculty would be overseeing areas outside their own familiarity. Subsuming the Archives Committee and Committee on Research with Human Subjects into omnibus

Amended May 5, 2008

committees, he suggested, may dissociate expertise from oversight. The President expressed confidence that members of Amherst's faculty would not have difficulty mastering whatever issues were brought before them, and he viewed having heterogeneity of fields represented on these committees, and broad expertise, as a healthy and desirable approach to faculty governance. Professor Sinos suggested that the smaller committees might be retained and that they meet together to cover a broader array of issues. The Committee agreed to return to this discussion at its next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

From: Ronald Rosbottom
Sent: Tuesday, April 15, 2008 11:12 AM
To: Gregory Call
Cc: Anthony Marx; Sean Redding; Sarah Turgeon
Subject: Balloting for the C6

Dear Greg, Tony, and Colleagues:

On the penultimate ballot for election to the Committee of Six Sean Redding, Sarah Turgeon, and I were listed.

Suppose all three of us had been elected? Would you have been concerned that all faculty members of the present CPR would've had to move from that Committee to the C6? Sean is current chair (has had two years, and should have a third on the CPR), I will be the incoming chair (having had two years of preparation), and Sarah has had one year on the CPR.

I bring this up because I worry that continuity is often interrupted on important committees because balloting for the C6 trumps all other appointments. In terms of the CEP and the CPR especially, learned expertise would in effect be lost should such turnover occur.

I don't want to open a can of worms, but since you were concerned about colleagues serving too often, I ask if you considered other ramifications of our balloting procedures.

Best, Ron

Ronald C. Rosbottom
Winifred Arms Professor in the Arts & Humanities
Professor of French and European Studies

Amherst College
AC# 2255
PO Box 5000
Amherst, MA 01002-5000

Amended May 19, 2008

The twenty-eighth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2007-2008 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, May 5, 2008. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Marx began the meeting by noting, with sorrow, the passing of Douglas C. Wilson '62, longtime public affairs officer and editor at the College, who died May 5. The members and the Dean expressed their sadness at Mr. Wilson's loss.

The President informed the members that he plans to share with the Faculty at the May 6 Faculty Meeting that, as an experiment, the Labor Day Faculty Meeting will be held this fall in Johnson Chapel, soon after Convocation concludes. The meeting will be brief and will focus on approving new courses and, if time permits, introducing new faculty members. Several weeks later, another Faculty Meeting will be held (in Cole Assembly Room) with a full agenda. The members agreed that this plan should be implemented to free up the morning of Labor Day. It was decided that this year's Committee of Six will approve the agenda for the Labor Day Faculty Meeting, since the Labor Day-morning Committee of Six meeting would no longer be held.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the members that, in addition to appointing Professor Courtright Associate Dean of the Faculty, he has appointed Professor Cheney to the same position. Both of the new Associate Deans, who will have half-time appointments, will begin on July 1, 2008. Professor Basu will continue as Associate Dean, half-time, as well. Dean Basu will continue to lead the Teaching and Advising Program and to assist with the coordination of the Copeland Colloquium. She will also take on an oversight role for issues surrounding study abroad and academic credit and campus-wide facilities planning. Professor Cheney's responsibilities will revolve around planning for the renovation of the Merrill Science Center, athletics, and information technology. Professor Courtright will focus her work on the library planning process, the Arts, and the First-Year Seminar Program. The members turned briefly to a personnel matter.

The Dean distributed to the members two letters (appended) from colleagues. The first, a response on behalf of the Faculty Computing Committee to Professor Kaplan's question (raised in a letter appended to the Committee of Six minutes of January 29, 2007) about the potential loss of anonymity when faculty elections are conducted electronically, was written by Professor L. McGeoch, chair of the committee. The Committee was satisfied with the information provided by Professor McGeoch in his response. The second letter, which was written by Elizabeth Barker, Director and Chief Curator of the Mead Art Museum, outlines plans to regularize and expand the Mead's oversight bodies. These changes emerged from the museum's accreditation process, the Dean noted. Professor Servos expressed support for the changes, and the other members agreed that the plans seem well conceived. The Dean next discussed with the members a cooperation agreement between the University of Barcelona (Spain) and the College for the purpose of securing one teaching assistant a year from the University of Barcelona to teach at Amherst. Professor O'Hara asked if there are similar agreements with other foreign institutions that have been developed for this purpose. The Dean said that the College has

Amended May 19, 2008

longstanding arrangements to bring teaching assistants from France and Germany to Amherst each year.

Continuing with his announcements, the Dean shared with the members the following proposed changes (which are indicated in bold caps) to the *Faculty Handbook* (III, H., 1.):

Leave Policy, Fellowships, Research and Professional Support

1. Sabbatic Leaves and Leaves of Absence

Amherst College gives great weight to the continuing scholarly growth of faculty members **IN SUPPORT OF ITS MISSION TO EXPAND THE REALM OF KNOWLEDGE AND TO MAINTAIN THE HIGHEST STANDARDS OF INSTRUCTION IN THE LIBERAL ARTS.** Research, publication, and creative work are considered important indications of such growth. The College's sabbatic leave program is designed to provide time for research, study, writing, or other creative work contributing to the professional growth and effectiveness of the faculty member as a scholar and teacher. **THE COLLEGE RECOGNIZES THAT THE CONTINUED SCHOLARLY GROWTH OF OUR FACULTY PLAYS A VITAL PART IN THE EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS OF THE COLLEGE AND THE ULTIMATE SUCCESS OF ITS STUDENTS.**

The Dean noted that this language was developed to provide a fuller description of the already-defined purpose of sabbatic leaves at the College, in order to satisfy financial reporting requirements, as defined by the Financial Accounting Standards Board. Since the new language is descriptive of the philosophical underpinnings of current policy, it does not require a vote of the Faculty. The members agreed that the new language should be incorporated into the *Faculty Handbook*.

The members next reviewed seventeen course proposals and voted to forward them to the Faculty. The Committee noted that a large number of faculty members seem to prefer twice-a-week time slots for their courses, while recognizing that this structure does not work well for languages and the sciences, in most cases. As a result, Amherst's course schedule can make it challenging for students to take courses across disciplines. President Marx reiterated his desire for the Committee to examine the problem of course-bunching and scheduling. He noted that he has asked his colleagues to gather data to inform such a discussion. The Dean noted that he is interested in considering ways to develop additional twice-a-week slots as a way of lessening the problem of bunching. Professor Sinos noted that the twice-a-week schedule can be challenging in terms of workload for faculty and students. Professor Frank said that such a schedule is particularly desirable for faculty members who commute long distances.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor George asked the President for his views about the Massachusetts House of Representatives' recent discussion, which occurred during debate over the state's budget for the 2009 fiscal year, about imposing a 2.5 percent tax

Amended May 19, 2008

on assets exceeding \$1 billion in any college's endowment. The President first noted that this idea did not win approval; in the end, the House of Representatives decided to ask the Massachusetts Department of Revenue to study the proposal. However, it is clear from the efforts at the federal level of Senators Grassley and Baucus (who led recent efforts to direct 136 colleges with endowments over \$500 million, including Amherst, to report on how they were spending those funds) the President said, that this is a moment of increased public scrutiny about how educational institutions—particularly those with significant resources—spend those resources.

Dean Call reported that, at the invitation of the College Council, he had joined their meeting on May 1 to discuss the Council's recommendation regarding the College calendar for 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012. The Dean said that the College Council is considering whether to make a new proposal for Fall 2009, in light of concerns that the proposed schedule in Fall 2009 includes examinations through December 23. Whatever the decision, it is essential that a calendar for 2009-2010 be approved at the Commencement Faculty Meeting.

The Committee returned to a discussion of committee assignments and re-structuring. Professors Sinos and Frank argued that the faculty Housing Committee plays an important role in representing the Faculty and should be retained, rather than having its responsibilities incorporated into the charge of the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR). Professor O'Hara pointed out that other benefits are frequently considered by the CPR and that it might be useful to consider housing questions in the context of other faculty benefits. Dean Call reiterated his view that the interests of the Faculty would be best served if housing issues fell under the purview of the CPR. Professor George suggested that individuals who live in College housing elect a representative, who could communicate the special interests of this constituency to the CPR. Professor Frank said that it is particularly important to have a Housing Committee right now, when the College does not have an administrator to oversee the Housing Office. It was agreed that the Housing Committee should remain intact for 2008-2009, and that its members should be asked to make a recommendation about the future of the committee. President Marx reiterated the College's commitment to faculty housing and noted that, until a new housing director is hired, housing will be overseen by Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services, to whom the future housing director will report.

In the context of the conversation about the possible re-structuring of committees, President Marx conveyed to the members the need to designate a committee to consider proxy voting and shareholder responsibilities. Committees that might be considered include the Committee on Honorary Degrees or the CPR. The members felt that the CPR would be the best body to consult on such issues. The President thanked the Committee for their advice.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

AMHERST COLLEGE
Department of Mathematics and Computer Science

The Committee of Six
c/o Dean Greg Call
Dean of Faculty
Amherst College

May 1, 2008

To the Committee:

I am writing on behalf of the Faculty Computing Committee about an issue that was referred to us by last year's Committee of Six. Please accept my apology for the length of time it has taken us to respond.

Professor Scott Kaplan wrote to the Committee of Six to express his concern about the potential loss of anonymity when faculty elections are held electronically. (A copy of his letter is attached.) He noted that a future administration could pressure members of the IT department to modify its software to permit the votes for the Committee of Six of individual faculty members to be secretly recorded and reported. He argued that even a remote possibility that this could occur might affect the way that untenured faculty members vote.

The current electronic system offers some obvious advantages over our previous paper ballot system. Participation in C6 elections is up (partly because faculty members away on leave can easily vote), the time required for multi-round elections has been reduced, and less paper is used.

While there is no absolute guarantee of anonymity, the system does offer a significant level of security. The task of authenticating voters is totally separate from the task of counting votes, and the two tasks are carried out on different computers. There are only three staff members in IT whose administrator privileges might permit them to access logs and modify software in a way that could allow them to break the anonymity.

While it would be best to have a system offering a guarantee of absolute privacy, we are not aware of a way of doing this without complicating the election process or introducing some other significant problem. (Professor Kaplan proposed two alternative systems, but we do not agree that they are better.) Given the sensitive nature of so much of the data that we already entrust to the IT department, we do not believe that there is reason to be greatly concerned about the integrity of the voting process, and we do not think that the system should be changed at this time.

Yours truly,
Lyle A. McGeoch
Professor of Computer Science Chair,
Faculty Computer Committee

Scott F. Kaplan
Dept. of Mathematics and Computer Science Amherst College
Amherst, MA 01002-5000 sfkaplanecs.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

From: Elizabeth Barker
Sent: Thursday, May 01, 2008 3:23 PM
To: Gregory Call
Subject: Mead proposal for the Committee, of Six

Dear Greg,

Will you please share the information below with the Committee of Six? It concerns the Mead Art Museum's acquisitions committee, which (although not technically a responsibility of the faculty, since it's ad hoc and reports to you) does involve substantial time commitments from several members of the faculty. Thank you.

The outline below is intentionally brief; I would be delighted to provide more details to anyone who might be curious to learn them. My direct extension is 2295.

Thank you again,
Lizzie

Mead Art Museum Committee Changes

In keeping with the Mead's new strategic plan, and with encouragement from our re-accreditation reviewers, the Mead will be regularizing and expanding its oversight bodies. The end result of this process will be to free several faculty members from the obligation of sitting on a committee that largely rubber-stamps proposed museum acquisitions and to allow an unlimited number of faculty to engage meaningfully in regular, optional discussions about curricular/collections/programmatic collaborations. Fuller details follow.

In summer 2008, the Mead proposes to dissolve its one existing advisory body, the acquisitions' committee, and to replace it with three consultative/advisory/advocacy groups:

1. A Museum Forum open to faculty, students, and the public in which museum staff and key museum constituents will share information and ideas about exhibitions, events, and services. Open to all (but required of none), these brainstorming sessions will begin in September 2008, and will be led by the incoming museum educator (i.e., the museum/curriculum coordinator) and myself. We anticipate holding monthly late afternoon (catered!) meetings during the academic year, but would welcome suggestions about potentially convenient times and formats. This group will provide a way for all parties to share information about forthcoming projects, and develop meaningful collaborations around points of contingency with sufficient lead time.
2. An Advisory Board comprised of trustees, major donors, alumni collectors, regional museum professionals, expert faculty, and senior administrators to oversee major acquisitions, de-accessions, and loans, and to review significant policy changes. Limited to 25 members, it will meet once a year on campus and once a year off-site. The draft charter (to be considered by the board at its May meeting) is attached. This group will ensure that experts in art collecting and museum governance continually scrutinize the museum's high-stakes, sometimes confidential decisions.
3. A Friends of the Mead Art Museum group comprised of supporters capable of making a modest donation (student memberships will begin at the \$5 level), and envisioned as a semi-autonomous, largely self-governing group, whose volunteer leadership (probably to be comprised, at least initially, of enthusiastic retired alumni eager to put their time and expertise to work for the college) would arrange events based upon the interests of the membership, possibly to include behind-the-scenes tours, special trips, etc. Funds raised by the group would be applied to special projects, such as improvements to the gallery's lighting systems and support for publications. This group, like the Friends of the Library, Music and Athletics, would provide a way for any museum supporters to assist its operations and participate in its activities.

DRAFT CHARTER

Advisory Board of the Mead Art Museum

Article I. Establishment and Purposes. In accordance with the bylaws of Amherst College, the President and Board of Trustees hereby charter the Advisory Board of the Mead Art Museum. The Advisory Board will function as an advisory and advocacy body and shall review acquisitions, deaccessions, and loans with particular attention to transactions involving objects valued at or above \$25,000; shall review and assist in drafting museum policies; and shall assist in various efforts to achieve the Museum's mission and to realize its vision.

Article II. Membership.

Section 1. Number. The number of Advisors constituting the entire Advisory Board shall be not less than five (5) nor more than twenty-five (25), and shall be fixed by resolution of the Board. At any time, no fewer than two (2) Advisors shall be members of Amherst College's Board of Trustees. The Advisory Board, by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of all members, may resolve to increase or decrease the number of Advisors, subject to the approval of the President of Amherst College, and provided that no decrease shall shorten the term of any incumbent Advisor. The names of these members will be published in the Annual Report of the Mead Art Museum, and posted on the websites of the Mead Art Museum and Amherst College.

Section 2. Nomination and appointment of initial members. In consultation with the Dean of the Faculty, Associate Dean of the Faculty, and Director and Chief Curator of the Mead Art Museum, the President of Amherst College shall select and appoint fifteen (15) Advisors to serve on the Advisory Board of the Mead Art Museum. Of this number, no fewer than two (2) Advisors shall be members of Amherst College's Board of Trustees

Section 3. Election. After the first year, Advisors shall be elected by the Advisory Board at the Annual Meeting of the Board. Each Advisor shall serve until his or her successor is elected and appointed, unless said Advisor's membership should theretofore be vacated.

Section 4. Officers. The Advisory Board shall elect a Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary. Each such officer shall be elected from among the Advisory Board at the Annual Meeting of the Board for a term of three (3) years. Any vacancy in the above offices shall be filled by the Advisory Board as soon as practicable. At any meeting of the Advisory Board duly called, any Officer may, by a vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the entire Board, be removed from office for good cause shown, and another may be elected by the Board in the place of the Officer so removed, to serve until the next meeting of the Board. The Officers, together with the Director and Chief Curator of the Mead Art Museum, shall comprise the Executive Committee of the Advisory Board. The Executive Committee

shall have and may exercise between the meetings of the Advisory Board all the authority of the Board, and shall report all its actions to the next meeting of the Advisory Board.

a. Chair. The Chair shall preside at all meetings of the Advisory Board and of the Executive Committee.

b. Vice-Chair. At the request of the Chair or in his or her absence, the Vice-Chair shall perform the duties and exercise the functions of the Chair.

c. Secretary. The Secretary shall be responsible for the keeping of Minutes of all meetings of the Advisory Board. He or she shall see that all notices are duly given in accordance with the provisions of these bylaws. The Secretary shall be responsible for the custody of the records of the Advisory Board, which shall be held at the Mead Art Museum.

Section 5. Ex-Officio members. The President of Amherst College, Dean of the Faculty, Associate Dean of the Faculty, Director of Development and Advancement, and Director and Chief Curator of the Mead Art Museum shall serve as ex-officio members of the Board.

a. Director's reports. The Director and Chief Curator shall provide the Advisory Board at each of its regular meetings with statements on the permanent collection, exhibition programs, publications, and physical plant of the Mead Art Museum.

Section 6. Terms. Each Advisor shall serve a term of three (3) years, except as provided elsewhere in this Charter. For the purpose of staggering their terms of office, the Advisors shall be divided into two (2) classes, as nearly equal in numbers as may be, and the term of office of one class shall expire each year in regular rotation. In case the number of Advisors in any class becomes unequal to the other classes, the Advisory Board may elect one or more Advisor(s) to terms of one year.

Section 7. Vacancies. In case of any vacancy in the Advisory Board, a majority of the remaining Advisors may elect a successor to fill the unexpired term, and to serve until his or her successor shall have been duly elected and qualified. In the event of increase in the number of Advisors, additional Advisors may be elected to terms of one or two years as may be necessary to maintain equality in numbers among the classes of Advisors. Additional Advisors so elected shall serve until their successors shall have been duly elected and qualified.

Section 8. Absences. If any Advisor shall fail to attend three (3) consecutive meetings of the Advisory Board without excuse accepted as satisfactory by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Board, such Advisor shall be deemed to have resigned and the vacancy shall be filled.

Section 9. Removal. At any meeting of the Advisory Board duly called, any Advisor may, by vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the entire Board, be removed from office and another person may be elected by the Board to fill the unexpired term of the Advisor so removed.

Article IV. Function. The Advisory Board shall:

- a. Review all new acquisitions to, and proposed deaccessions from, the permanent collection;
- b. Approve or deny any object proposed for de/accession valued at \$25,000 or greater;
- c. Assist in developing a long-term strategy for developing the permanent collection;
- d. Review all outgoing loans insured at a value equal to or greater than \$25,000;
- e. Review all official museum policies and procedures;
- f. Assist in drafting certain governance documents as requested by the Director and Chief Curator of the Museum and Senior Administration of Amherst College;
- g. Assist in realizing the mission of and vision for the Mead Art Museum laid out in its January 2008 strategic plan;
- h. Stimulate membership in the Friends of the Mead Art Museum;
- i. Assist the Director and Chief Curator and Office of Advancement in soliciting and securing donations to the Museum of art and funds;
- j. Otherwise act to strengthen the quality of the Museum's permanent collection, publications, and programs;
- k. Adhere to the highest professional standards and strictest ethical guidelines observed by accredited art museums in all actions.

Article V. Meetings.

Section 1. Frequency. Two (2) meetings of the Advisory Board shall be held per year on such dates and at such times and places as may be fixed by the Advisory Board and named in the notice. One such meeting shall be the Annual Meeting. Special meetings of the Advisory Board may be held at any time, on call by the Chair of Board, or by the Secretary upon on the request in writing of any three (3) Advisors.

Section 2. Notice. Notice of the time and place of every meeting of the Advisory Board shall be mailed not less than ten (10) days before the meeting to each Advisor at his or her address as set forth in the records of the Board.

Section 3. Agenda. The agenda or order of business for each Regular, Special, and Annual meeting shall be developed by the Director and Chief Curator of the Mead Art Museum in consultation with the Chair.

Section 4. Attendance. Any one or more Advisors or the Executive Committee may participate in a meeting with the consent of all the members present in person by means of a conference telephone or similar communication equipment allowing all persons participating in the meeting to hear each other at the same time. Participation by such means shall constitute presence in person at the meeting.

Section 5. Quorum. A majority of the entire Advisory Board shall constitute a quorum at any meeting of the Board, and a majority in number of those present shall decide any question that may come before the meeting, except for matters requiring a two thirds vote as provided elsewhere in this Charter.

Article VI. Action taken outside of meetings. Any action required or permitted to be taken by the Advisory Board or the Executive Committee at a duly held meeting may be taken without a meeting if all Advisors or Executive Committee consent in writing to the adoption of a resolution authorizing the action. Such resolution and the written consents thereto by the Advisors or Executive Committee shall be filed with the minutes of the proceedings of the Board. Such consents may be delivered in the form of e-mail messages.

Article VII. Duration. This charter shall be subject to review by the President and Board of Trustees of Amherst College in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty, Associate Dean of the Faculty, and Director and Chief Curator of the Mead Art Museum one (1) year from its date of establishment, and each year thereafter. At any such time, the President and Board of Trustees reserve the right to:

- a. Amend this charter in accordance with the best interests of the Mead Art Museum and Amherst College;
- b. Terminate the Advisory Board of the Mead Art Museum.

Amended May 21, 2008

The twenty-ninth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2007-2008 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, May 12, 2008. Present were Professors Frank, S. George, Jagannathan, O'Hara, Servos, and Sinos, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Dean began the meeting by distributing to the members a cover letter and two proposals (appended) sent by Professor Umphrey, Chair of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). The first proposal is to shorten the drop/add period by two days, and the second, which the CEP asked to have included on the Committee of Six's agenda next fall, focuses on changes to the system for awarding Latin honors. As Professor Umphrey noted in her letter, the first proposal has ramifications for the College calendar that will be brought to the Faculty for a vote at the Commencement Faculty Meeting on May 22. The current proposal for the calendar (appended) includes a shortened drop/add period, as the CEP has proposed. The Committee also received a letter (appended) from Professor Ferguson, Chair of the College Council, in which he informed the Committee that the College Council had voted to change the College calendar for the year 2009-2010 by subtracting one day from the mid-semester break. This change to the Council's original proposal is designed to lessen the possibility of students being forced to stay on campus through December 25, if bad weather should prevent them from traveling home immediately after the originally proposed last date of exams, which was December 23. President Marx noted that he plans to discuss the issue of Five-College calendar coordination at his next meeting with the Five-College presidents. While agreeing that the change seems to be a necessity for 2009-2010, both Professor Frank and the College Council expressed the desire to maintain the traditional length of the break in the coming years. The members agreed that the CEP's rationales for reducing the length of the drop-add period were sound, and Professor Servos noted that consideration had been given to the difficulty that the change would bring for those students who enroll in once-a-week seminars that meet on Wednesdays, whose class meeting run past 4:30 P.M. In that case, as the College Council noted, an exception to the Wednesday deadline could be made without penalty for affected students.

The members then voted six in favor and zero opposed on the substance of the proposed calendar and six in favor and zero opposed to forward the calendar to the Faculty. The Committee agreed that this vote is reflective of their support for the CEP's proposal to shorten the drop/add period.

President Marx next suggested that the Committee decide on the topics that the members should discuss in the time remaining this year. He reiterated his desire to have a conversation about developing a system that would allow students to complete teaching evaluations using an online form. For tenure cases that will be reviewed in fall 2008, it has been agreed that departments will provide typed teaching evaluations (transcribing those that students hand-write in class), and the Dean's office is providing support for Academic Department Coordinators to facilitate this work. President Marx said that he would also like to discuss whether a working group should be established to explore the topic of grade inflation at the College. Class bunching remains an issue of concern, the President noted. The Committee discussed ways of possibly alleviating this problem. The Williams College approach of having each department schedule a

Amended May 21, 2008

course for every available time slot once before using any time slot again might be one idea, the President said. Some members noted that such a system is not compatible with the science departments' coordinated schedule of course meeting time rotations, which already achieves the goal of avoiding hour conflicts for students wishing to take introductory courses in those departments. Professor Jagannathan said that he would like to see additional eighty-minute time slots opened up. Professor Sinos said that doing so might have negative repercussions for language and other departments that teach on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday mornings, should those times become available to eighty-minute classes.

Continuing the discussion, several members wondered whether the College should re-think its time slot structure. President Marx said that he would like to learn more about the relationship between the slot structure and course bunching. Professor Frank commented that it is her impression that, if a few more options for meeting times were developed, bunching would be alleviated. Professor George noted that it is particularly important, from a pedagogical point of view, that introductory science courses meet several times spread out over each week, so that there are no long gaps between class meetings, such as happens, for example, in courses that meet Tuesdays and Thursdays. Professor Frank suggested having evening meeting times for courses. The members discussed the ramifications of such a change, taking into account that many co-curricular activities take place in the evening. The Arts often make use of the evening for rehearsals and performances, it was noted. Professor Servos supported the idea of opening up one or two evening slots, commenting that some overlap between course times and the hours traditionally given to extracurricular activities may be necessary to ease the congestion in the teaching day and associated course conflicts.

Continuing the conversation, Professor O'Hara noted that, in the past, when anticipating the reaction to changes in meeting times, dire predictions were often made that do not come to pass. For instance, when 8:00 A.M. labs were introduced, it was thought that the students would not attend them. Both the morning labs, as well as evening labs (from 6 to 9 P.M.) turned out to be successful innovations, she said. Morning labs, in particular, are popular with athletes, and evening and Friday afternoon labs have smaller enrollments but tend to foster a high esprit de corps. Several members noted that the current policy is for evening labs and classes to be optional. Professor Servos said that he has been pleased with the participation and response of students in the classes (including one that is required for the Department of History's major) that he has taught at 8:30 A.M. He has noticed that enrollments are down a bit, however, when he offers classes in the early morning. The Committee noted that Psychology 11 remains over-subscribed, even when offered at 8:30 A.M.

President Marx asked if the members wished to consider the question of limiting enrollments so that classes at Amherst would not exceed fifty students. The members noted that additional faculty would be needed to implement this initiative. Professor Servos commented that it would be difficult to predict the shifts in enrollments that would drive the allocation of FTEs, if they were to be allocated for this purpose. He noted that students have positive experiences in classes with enrollments that exceed fifty students, just as they do in smaller

Amended May 21, 2008

classes. The other members agreed, and it was decided that the Committee would not discuss this question further at this time.

The President next queried the members about the possibility of soliciting nominations from the Faculty for the John Woodruff Simpson Lectureship and the John J. McCloy '16 Professorship of American Institutions and International Diplomacy. President Marx said that, if the members supported this idea, he would ask the Committee of Six to review nominations of leading scholars for these visiting appointments. After reviewing the documents that established these positions, the President found that the original intention was for the McCloy to be "a rotating appointment to be held for one to six years," rather than a series of lectures, as has been the practice. The Simpson Fund's donor designated that the fund be used for several purposes, among them securing scholars for the purpose of "delivering lectures or courses of instruction at Amherst College." At present Professor Goldsby is the Simpson Lecturer, but the fund can support additional Simpson Lectureships, President Marx said. In the past, prominent scholars (including Niels Bohr, Robert Frost, and Archibald MacLeish) who were not members of the Amherst Faculty have been named Simpson Lecturers and have taught at the College, as visitors, for a specified period of time. The Simpson Fund is now primarily used to support graduate fellowships. Professor Servos asked if the President would make nominations for these positions, and President Marx said that he would like the opportunity to do so, as well as to solicit nominations from the Faculty. All suggestions of individuals for these positions would be reviewed by the Committee of Six, he said. Since the reappointment of Robert Frost in 1949, the President has been responsible for the appointment of the Simpson Lecturer.

The Dean next shared with the members a draft letter of understanding between Amherst and the Anacapa Society. Dean Call explained that several Amherst faculty members were instrumental in forming this new organization in July 2007 and remain actively involved in it. The society is dedicated to supporting research in theoretical physics at primarily undergraduate institutions. Under the terms of the agreement, the College would host the Anacapa Society, providing the organization with facilities (mostly virtual) and assistance with proposals for grants. The members agreed that the proposed arrangement would not demand very much from Amherst, and that the fledgling organization would benefit from having the imprimatur of the College.

The members discussed a letter (appended) sent to the Committee by Professor Dumm, in which he expressed concern regarding the Respect for People All Staff Training on Harassment and Discrimination Workshop that he had attended on April 30. It was Professor Dumm's understanding that supervisors were required to attend the workshop, and that chairing a department was considered a supervisory position by the workshop organizers. He had also been told that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is requiring supervisors to attend such workshops. The members agreed with Professor Dumm about the difficulties of viewing the chairmanship of a department as a supervisory position in terms of the chair's relationship to other members of his or her department, while noting that the chair may supervise staff members. The Dean informed the Committee that the chairs had been asked to attend, not solely because they served as supervisors, but as a means of establishing a starting point for inviting faculty members to the

Amended May 21, 2008

workshop, since chairmanships rotate among the Faculty. The thought had been, if chairs were invited every year, a large proportion of the Faculty would ultimately attend the workshop. Professor Sinos wondered whether the information that the state requires could be conveyed by means other than attendance at a workshop, perhaps in writing, for example. Professor Frank said that she could see some benefit to having faculty members, many of whom do supervise staff and have to peer-to-peer supervisory roles, attend the workshop. President Marx offered to consult with legal counsel about this matter, and the Committee agreed that he should do so.

Dean Call next informed the members that he has begun to consider which departments might have departmental reviews in 2008-2009 and would like to solicit their thoughts. High in his list of departments are those who may experience transitions in the near to medium term; those located in Merrill Science Center, which would particularly benefit from planning because of the upcoming renovation of the facility; and those that have not been reviewed in some time. The Committee members made some recommendations (the Departments of History, Economics, Physics, and Political Science), which the Dean said he would take under advisement. Professor Sinos noted the strain that self-study and external review place on small departments, and their possible lack of enthusiasm for undertaking this process. She commented that the departmental planning documents that were requested to inform the considerations of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) and the process of reaccreditation required a good deal of work. She questioned the benefits to departments of embarking on yet another review at this time. The President and the Dean noted that, among other positive outcomes, the process of external review is particularly useful for informing and strengthening a department's FTE requests.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Jagannathan, while noting that the Dean had made fine appointments of new Associate Deans, commented that in the recent letter announcing those appointments, it was inaccurate to say that the Committee of Six had been offered recommendations for these positions and had agreed to the choices for them. He noted that the Dean had informed the Committee that the appointments of particular individuals were to be made. It was also noted that three faculty members—Deans Basu, Courtright, and Cheney would now be teaching half-time. The Dean responded that Dean Griffiths and Dean Basu have also accounted for one-and-a-half FTEs. He noted, from his own experience as Dean of New Students, that serving as a Dean in a half-time capacity enables colleagues to continue to participate in their departments, which is desirable. The members then returned briefly to committee assignments. The Dean noted that Professors Dizard and Clotfelter have urged that the Wildlife Sanctuary Committee remain as a committee, rather than having its responsibilities assumed by the Committee on Priorities and Resources. The Dean said that, with the Committee of Six's assent, he would like to honor this request. The members agreed that Dean Call should do so.

The Committee next reviewed the nominee for the Hitchcock Fellowship, and the Committee voted six in favor and zero opposed to approve the nominee.

Discussion turned to the Faculty's conversation at the Faculty Meeting of May 6 about the reports of the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) and the Special Assistant to the President for Diversity. Professor O'Hara commented that, while the discussion

Amended May 21, 2008

at the Faculty Meeting was a good beginning, it focused largely on the needs of less well-prepared students, in relation to the curriculum and to academic support, particularly in regard to the sciences. While this was and continues to be an important conversation, there was not enough time to move the discussion beyond this topic, she said. Professor O'Hara noted that the two reports serve as a prompt for a broader conversation about how being a diverse community of students, faculty, and staff at Amherst College is in everyone's best interest.

Professor O'Hara proposed that, at the Commencement Faculty Meeting on May 22, perhaps under the rubric of "Unfinished Business," she report to the Faculty that a task force on academic support has been formed and will explore many of the comprehensive questions raised at the last faculty meeting. She would also like to acknowledge that the important questions of how diversity affects other dimensions of the scholarly activity at the College—in the Arts, the Humanities, the Social Sciences, and how it affects other dimensions of life at the College—for example community-based learning, athletics, and relationships and respect among students, staff, and faculty—have yet to be addressed. Professor Frank agreed that such a conversation about the impact of diversity and what the College community gains from being diverse should take place.

Professors Servos and Jagannathan, while expressing great support for the College's commitment to diversity, questioned whether a Faculty Meeting would be the forum most conducive to a frank, nuanced, and informative discussion about this complex subject. Professor Servos asked what the productive consequence of such a discussion would be if there are no specific questions or solutions put before the Faculty. Professor Jagannathan said that, while he is appreciative of the two reports, they are not specific enough to engender such a conversation and further clarity is needed about what exactly the Faculty would be discussing. Professor Frank said that she envisions a discussion of the benefits of having students at the College who persist despite great challenges. Professor Servos noted that it is very difficult, at the time of application to the College, to determine which prospective students have this quality of persistence. He feels that all faculty would agree that persistence and imagination are among the most valuable qualities that a student can possess and are very important to success. Finding ways to help students develop these qualities is a very difficult proposition, he noted.

Continuing the conversation, but in a slightly different vein, Professor George noted that, while so-called over-prepared students (who were discussed as a category in the report of the FCAFA) often do become academically engaged and go on to a chosen career, less well-prepared students frequently experience failure and heartache. He feels that the way the SAT data are portrayed in the FCAFA report does not convey accurately the range of preparation for college work, particularly in math and science, among our students. Professor George said he would like to review information about less well-prepared students, to correct an impression created by reports and statements recently and in the past that most or all Amherst students are academically near the top of their respective racial groups. His concern, he said, is that we tell the truth about the range of preparation of Amherst students, not that we change our admission policies. He said that he plans to discuss this issue with Tom Parker, Dean of Admission and

Amended May 21, 2008

Financial Aid, to get Dean Parker's feedback and to share his views with the new Committee of Six, by letter, in the fall.

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 them to the Faculty. The Committee was deeply impressed with the quality of thesis students' research and scholarship, and Professor O'Hara suggested that the College should consider posting the theses or portions thereof on the Website. The Dean agreed that it would be wonderful to share this high caliber student work more broadly, and he said that he would explore how issues surrounding copyright might be solved. Professor George said that theses from his department are posted as PDFs and are password-protected so that access is limited to the Amherst community.

The Committee next approved the Faculty Meeting agenda for May 22, agreeing that the diversity discussion should be included under "Unfinished Business."

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

AMHERST COLLEGE
Department of Law, jurisprudence & Social Thought

PROFESSOR MARTHA MERRILL UMPHREY

9 May 2008

Committee of Six
Converse Hall

Dear Colleagues -

Attached you will find two proposals emerging out of the Committee on Educational Policy's deliberations this spring: a proposal to shorten add/drop period by two days, and a proposal to revise the current system of awarding Latin Honors. We would be grateful if you could, prior to the impending Commencement meeting of the faculty, take up the add/drop period proposal because it has ramifications for the college calendar upon which the faculty votes at that meeting. We would ask that the proposal concerning Latin Honors be place on the Committee of Six's agenda early next fall.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Martha Umphrey
Chair, CEP

Proposal to Shorten Add/Drop Period

The CEP recommends the following alteration to the College's drop-add procedures:

The period during which a student may add or drop a course without penalty shall run from the first day of the semester through Wednesday of the second week of classes.

Rationale: The dynamism of the add/drop period poses sometimes daunting pedagogical difficulties in the classroom. Many faculty have worried about negative effects when students shuffle through the classroom for a full two weeks at the beginning of the semester, and find it frustrating and counterproductive to postpone certain kinds of assignments and to return, for newcomers, to materials already covered in the classroom. A fair number of students, anxious enough about the add/drop process, tend to wait until the last day or two to finalize their course selections and find themselves frantically trying to find their advisors at the last minute on that final Friday.

This proposal, while it will not resolve any of these concerns fully, will have at least two salutary effects:

- reduce the period during which enrollment uncertainty hampers effective pedagogy in the classroom
- encourage students to come to a decision at a point in the week when faculty tend to be available.

This proposal poses an administrative difficulty only for those once-a-week seminars that meet on Wednesdays whose class meetings run past 4:30 pm. In that case, a student who might wish to join the class but who only attends the second session will not be able to add the course before the Registrar's office closes on Wednesday. We have discussed this problem with Gerry Mager, who assures us that an exception to the Wednesday deadline can be made without penalty for such students.

We have undertaken to propose this change after consulting with the CEP's student representatives, who canvassed their constituency, with the College Registrar and, with Greg Call's help, with administrators at the other three colleges and the university. The proposal appears to create no administrative problems, and indeed was met with a uniformly positive response. Hence we forward this proposal believing that shortening the add/drop period by two days will alleviate some of its most nettling pedagogical and advising issues faculty face while offering students sufficient time to make thoughtful final decisions about their schedules in consultation with their advisors and their professors.

Proposal to Revise the Current System of Awarding Latin Honors

The CEP recommends that, early in Fall 2008, the Committee of Six and the faculty take up, debate, and vote on the following amendment to our system of awarding Latin Honors (Faculty Handbook, p. 71; changes underlined):

2. Candidates eligible for the degree magna cum laude must have a minimum overall grade point average in the top 30% of their class and have received a recommendation of magna based on a thesis or comparable work from a department or program in which they have majored....

Distinction

Candidates eligible for a degree with Distinction must have an overall grade point average in the top 30% of their class.

Process and Rationale for Proposed Change:

In 2004 the College implemented a new policy on the awarding of honor, and at that time mandated that the CEP review the new system after three years. To fulfill this mandate, the CEP did the following:

1. In Fall 2007 we considered whether to review the entire Latin Honors system de novo or to focus on what seemed to us to be the most pressing issues and solicit feedback from students and faculty on those issues. We opted for the more focused approach because reopening the larger field of questions concerning how the College might award Latin (and English) Honors (to consider, for example, a breadth requirement for Latin honors), after two substantial periods of conversation on that very subject in the last decade, seemed to invite unwarranted and unfortunate instability. We agreed, however, that if we heard large and pressing concerns from either students or faculty we could revisit that decision.

2. On that basis, we solicited and received thoughtful responses from departments to the following three questions:

What is your perception of the grade point average cutoff? Given that any cutoff is arbitrary, is the current scheme causing such serious problems for you or your students that we ought to consider changing it? Is a single cutoff appropriate?

What has happened to the process of doing a thesis in your department? Do you have any concerns about how these changes have affected that process?

Do you have other concerns that warrant a revisiting of the College's current policy on awarding honors?

3. We asked our student representatives to canvass students on similar questions and incorporated their feedback into our deliberations.
4. The Chair also had a lengthy conversation with the Registrar.
5. We assessed the feedback we received from students, from nineteen departments, and from the Registrar. Opinions about the current Latin Honors system quite expectedly varied both among and within departments and among students, but two issues came to the fore in a significant number of comments:

some departments (approximately four) would like to make possible the granting of exceptions or exemptions from the GPA cutoff under extraordinary circumstances.

a larger number of departments (seven or eight) would like to re-examine the 25% cutoff for students writing magna cum laude theses, enlarging the pool of students eligible for magna somewhat.

A number of overlapping rationales were forwarded in support of both suggestions. Focusing primarily on the situation in which a student writes an exceptional thesis but still graduates cum laude, some colleagues and students worried about unfairness when a student has one bad semester for reasons out of his or her control; or when a student takes risks in course selection and has a somewhat more uneven record than one who plays it safe; or comes to Amherst somewhat underprepared and requires some transition time to accustom him or herself to the demands of our curriculum. Faculty and students worry about the unfairness of an arbitrary cutoff that lumps summers and magnas together, disadvantaging and demoralizing those excellent students who just barely miss the 25% cutoff.

The CEP discussed both suggestions thoroughly. We were unanimously of the opinion that allowing for departmental petitions in exceptional cases would, as it did in the past, introduce an unfair arbitrariness into the awarding of Latin honors: some departments might be more willing to petition than others; some students might be more willing than others to request an exception or discuss any reasons for it in the first place. Opinion was divided, however, on the issue of expanding the grade point cutoff for magna cum laude. Some members argued strongly in favor of raising the cutoff to 30%; others thought that such a move would not solve the problem of "near-misses" since such a situation arises wherever an arbitrary line is drawn, and hence any change would not mitigate the disappointment of those just missing the new cutoff. Moreover, some argued, that the number of tightly bunched GPAs would only increase the closer one approached the class's median GPA.

Given the division of opinion among CEP members, the Committee decided that the faculty ought to weigh in the question of amending our current system of awarding Latin Honors. Since the language proposed above enlarges the grade point range for awarding *magna cum laude*, we have also adjusted the cutoff for English honors but leave the advisability of that change up for debate as well.

We request that the Committee of Six and, if the C6 agrees, the faculty deliberate on the proposed changes to language on the faculty handbook detailed above. We offer this language not because all of us would ourselves embrace it, but because we believe a concrete proposal will propel a focused and thorough discussion among colleagues on the faculty floor. We also request that those deliberations include a discussion of the following questions:

1. Should the GPA required for a summa designation differ from the GPA required for a *magna* designation?
2. If so, should this be accomplished by tightening the GPA required for the *summa*?
3. Alternatively, should this be accomplished by broadening the GPA for a *magna*?

We hope that this proposal might be placed on the Committee of Six's agenda sometime early in Fall 2008, and forwarded to the faculty soon thereafter if the Committee of Six finds it advisable to do so.

Amherst College Calendars 2009-2012

Event	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Classes Begin	Tues., Sept. 8	Tues., Sept. 7	Tues., Sept. 6
End of Interchange Registration	Wed., Sept. 16	Wed., Sept. 15	Wed., Sept. 14
Mid-Semester Break	Sat., Oct. 10-Mon., Oct. 12	Sat., Oct. 9-Tues., Oct. 12	Sat., Oct. 8-Tues., Oct. 11
Pre-Registration for Spring	Thur., Nov. 12-Wed., Nov. 18	Thur., Nov. 11-Wed., Nov. 17	Thur., Nov. 10-Wed., Nov. 16
Thanksgiving Vacation	Sat., Nov. 21-Sun., Nov. 29	Sat., Nov. 20.-Sun., Nov. 28	Sat., Nov. 19.-Sun., Nov. 27
Last Day of Classes	Tues., Dec. 15	Wed., Dec. 15	Wed., Dec. 14
Reading/Study Period	Wed., Dec. 16-Thurs., Dec. 17	Thur., Dec. 16-Fri., Dec. 17	Thur., Dec. 15-Sat., Dec. 17
Examination Period	Fri., Dec. 18-Tues., Dec. 22	Sat., Dec. 18-Wed., Dec. 22	Sun., Dec. 18-Thurs., Dec. 22
Grades Due	Mon., Jan. 4	Mon., Jan. 3	Tues., Jan. 3
January Term	Mon., Jan. 4-Fri., Jan. 22	Mon., Jan. 3-Fri., Jan. 21	Mon., Jan. 9-Fri., Jan. 27
Classes Begin	Mon., Jan. 25	Mon., Jan. 24	Mon., Jan. 30
End of Interchange Registration	Wed., Feb. 3	Wed., Feb. 2	Wed., Feb. 8
Spring Recess	Sat., Mar. 13-Sun., Mar. 21	Sat., Mar. 12-Sun., Mar. 20	Sat., Mar. 17-Sun., Mar. 25
Pre-Registration for Fall	Mon., Apr. 5-Fri., Apr. 9	Mon., Apr. 4-Fri., Apr. 8	Mon., Apr. 9-Fri., Apr. 13
Last Day of Classes	Fri., May 7	Fri., May 6	Fri., May 11
Reading/Study Period	Sat., May 8-Sun., May 9	Sat., May 7-Sun., May 8	Sat., May 12-Sun., May 13
Examination Period	Mon., May 10-Fri., May 14	Mon., May 9-Fri., May 13	Mon., May 14-Fri., May 18
Grades Due --Senior	Mon., May 17-9:00a.m.	Mon., May 16-9:00a.m.	Mon., May 21-9:00a.m.
Other	Wed., May 19	Wed., May 18	Wed., May 23
Commencement	Sun., May 23	Sun., May 22	Sun., May 27
	*Mon. Classes on Tues., Sept. 8	*Mon. Classes on Wed., Sept. 8	*Mon. Classes on Wed., Sept. 7

AMHERST COLLEGE
Department of Black Studies

JEFFREY B. FERGUSON
Associate Professor of Black Studies
and American Studies

May 8, 2008

Gregory Call
Dean of the Faculty
Amherst College

Dear Greg:

I am writing in my capacity as Chair of the College Council.. Last Thursday we voted to change the College calendar for the year 2009-2010 by subtracting one day from the mid-semester break. Nevertheless, we would also like to convey the strong desire to maintain the traditional length of the break in the future. When the timing of the ongoing calendar discussion allows, we would like to reconsider the possibility of starting the semester a bit earlier than Labor Day in order to provide room for maneuver in a more permanent form. Thanks for visiting with us.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey B. Ferguson
Chair of the College Council

AMHERST COLLEGE
Department of Political Science

May 1, 2008

Committee of Six
Amherst College
c/o Dean of Faculty's Office

Dear Colleagues:

I write to express my deep concern regarding information that was disseminated at the Respect for People All Staff Training on Harassment and Discrimination Workshop yesterday morning. My understanding is that attendance at this workshop is mandatory for all supervisory personnel at the College because the Commonwealth is now demanding that such programs be compulsory. The rationale seems to be that a more fully informed employee workforce will be more sensitive to the various and insidious ways that discrimination and harassment operates, and will become more fully informed of the force of the law as a remedy for such discrimination.

As a professor at the College, the language of mandated workshops and compulsory attendance rings strange to my ear, but I also think it is important that all of us be attuned to how discrimination and harassment wreak their insidious effects in our institution. So I am not, in principle, opposed to such efforts, whether they are mandatory or not.

What does worry me is that professors who are chairs of departments are now being ordered to "stop the inappropriate behavior" of our colleagues. I quote now from the document that was distributed at the workshop (since it was in the form of a Powerpoint diagram, the quotation is itself a bit awkward in form, but I hope you get the sense of it).

A supervisor should respond in three ways to any situations involving harassment.

Supervisor is informed of an incident, or observes inappropriate behavior at work.

Speak to the person who acted inappropriately Insure the behavior stops

Inform the appropriate college office or individual to discuss appropriate responses, to initiate an investigation or to document your response to the incident (Human Resources, Office of Diversity & Inclusion, Dean of Faculty or Students)

Report back to the person who filed the complaint to inform him or her that the situation is being addressed

Providing specifics about the response is not necessary in most cases

Those of us who attended yesterday's meeting were informed, in somewhat scary detail, how failure on

the part of supervisory personnel to take such steps could result, not only in the college being sued, but the individual supervisor being sued as well for failure to properly act.

This final piece of information is the reason for my letter. It seems to me that supervisory personnel at the College who are hired as regular employees understand that an explicit responsibility of their jobs involves the implementation of these policies. But it was news to me to learn that I, as a department chair, have the same supervisory responsibility in regard to a group of people I have long known, not as people working under me, but as colleagues. I think that the two groups of people are qualitatively different from each other for one other reason as well. The position of department chair, at least in the political science department, is the moral equivalent of being a paperclip counter. I convene meetings, I remind colleagues of deadlines, I sign entry into major forms, I have at most a vague understanding of our budget - which is handled by the department coordinator, fortunately. If I ever got it into my head that I was more than one among equals, my colleagues would very quickly remind me otherwise. Moreover, whereas regular employees are hired with the details of the job descriptions explicitly including the aspects of supervision for which they are to be evaluated, the position of department chair is voluntary, not a result of anyone seeking the job, but a responsibility that we undertake understanding that it rotates, even if now for the most part on two year cycles, involves no training (until now!) and provides no benefits in the form of extra salary and/or course relief.

I am led to think that the position of department chair needs to be dramatically rethought by the College. My first reaction to the news I received at yesterday's meeting was to consider resigning as chair. After all, why should I expose myself to the possibility of lawsuit when, first, I have until yesterday received no training in handling discrimination and harassment, and second, have a dramatically increased burden of responsibility, now that I am aware of the seriousness of my duties. But I realize that the College is in a serious moment of transition, and we all need to do what we can to help. Nevertheless, yesterday's meeting made it clear to me that the idea that the system of department chairmanship can continue as it has in the past is becoming untenable.

I urge you to take this matter up at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Thomas Dumm
Chair, Political Science Department

Committee of Six Minutes of May 19, 2008

The thirtieth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2007-2008 was called to order by President Marx in his office at NOON on Monday, May 19, 2008. 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 a discussion of the nomination of Richard Wilbur '42 for the John Woodruff Simpson Lectureship, which was once held by Robert Frost. The members expressed enthusiasm for having President Marx invite Mr. Wilbur to be a Simpson Lecturer for a specified period. It was noted that, at present, Professor Goldsby is the Simpson Lecturer, but that the Simpson Fund can support additional Simpson Lectureships.

The members turned briefly to a personnel matter.

The Committee discussed the new format for the first Faculty Meeting of the 2008-2009 academic year. It was agreed that a meeting would be held immediately after Convocation only if there is a need to approve late courses for fall 2009. The Faculty would be asked to remain in their seats at the conclusion of the Convocation ceremony, and students would leave Johnson Chapel. The meeting would be very brief, and, if needed, a meeting with a full agenda could be held two weeks later. The Committee turned once again to personnel matters.

The Committee next reviewed course proposals and voted to forward them to the Faculty. Turning to its review of the nominee for the Woods-Travis Prize, the Committee voted six in favor and zero opposed to approve the nominee.

The Dean next reported that he has asked Academic Department Coordinators in departments with tenure cases that will be reviewed in fall 2008 to provide typed transcriptions of in-class teaching evaluations and has agreed to provide support to facilitate this work. The members agreed that this was an excellent first step toward having students type their own evaluations online. Professor Servos noted that he has conducted an informal survey among his students on the topic of online teaching evaluations and has learned that they were universally positive about the idea and did not have a problem with the prospect of making the completion of evaluations online a condition of receiving a final grade. Professor George noted that students should have the option of indicating that they decline to do the evaluation. It was agreed that the new Registrar and the Department of Information Technology should collaborate to develop a proposal for online teaching evaluations that would allow for multiple formats, to meet departmental needs. The Faculty will be consulted in the development and approval of the new system. Dean Call then announced that Kathleen M. Goff, who is currently the Registrar at the Sage Colleges, had recently been hired as Amherst's new Registrar.

The members continued their discussion of issues surrounding class bunching, which remains a concern. Rather than completely overhauling the class time slot system, the Committee agreed that an incremental approach, with the goal of increasing efficiencies, would be best. Professor Sinos expressed the view that students' choices are narrowed because courses are not repeated frequently enough at Amherst. She wondered if the College regularly has more new courses than its peers. Professor Servos noted that, while there are many new courses, their substance tends not to be linked to contemporary events or ephemeral ideas as they are at some institutions, but focus on the fairly traditional content of the disciplines. Professor Frank said that offering new courses frequently is a healthy practice for the Faculty, enabling colleagues to

Committee of Six Minutes of May 19, 2008

continue to explore and teach new ideas and not to get stuck in an intellectual rut. Professor Sinos agreed that faculty members benefit from developing new courses, but she wondered if having a constantly changing curriculum is serving the needs of students.

Continuing the conversation, Professors Frank and Servos said that the problem of course-bunching is best addressed through acts of community spirit by departments. Faculty within a department should collaborate to make sure that they are offering courses within a span of time slots, they noted. Dean Call said that departments vary in the degree to which they utilize available time slots for their courses; a letter that he wrote to chairs asking them to encourage colleagues to distribute courses more broadly was only minimally, and temporarily, effective. It seems that many faculty members want to teach once a week or twice a week during a limited number of time slots. Professor Frank suggested that creating two additional twice-a-week slots during the day and one evening time slot would go a long way toward solving the problem. It was agreed that having classes between 6:40 and 8:00 P.M. would be ideal because this slot would not interfere as much with co-curricular activities that occur in the evening. The Dean suggested having classes on Tuesday and Thursday from 9:00 A.M. to 10:20 A.M.; 10:30 A.M. to 11:50 A.M.; 1:00 P.M. to 2:20 P.M.; and 2:30 P.M. to 3:50 P.M. It was noted that First-Year Seminars, which currently meet in the 11:30 to 12:50 P.M. time slot, would need to shift to one of these new time slots, but otherwise such a system would work and add a Tuesday/Thursday slot in the afternoon. Fourth hours of courses that are required for some math and science courses could be accommodated under such a schedule it was felt.

Professor Servos, who said that he favors adding the evening slot as well as the additional daytime slot, said that, while he now enjoys teaching at 8:30 A.M., he would have found it difficult to do so when his children were younger because of issues surrounding childcare. Untenured faculty members, who may also be concerned about enrollments, may choose not to teach in the early morning, he said. President Marx commented that the current bunching problem is making the curriculum less open than it should be, and that more hours of the day should be used for instruction. The President reiterated his view that shifting the time slot of classes with very large enrollments to the morning might free students to take other classes throughout the day and thereby alleviate bunching.

At the conclusion of the discussion, it was agreed that the best approach to alleviating this problem would be to try, beginning in 2009-2010, offering evening classes and adding one or more additional 80-minute course-meeting slots during the day. Professor Jagannathan asked if a systematic change could be tried informally or if a vote of the Faculty would be required. He noted that the Faculty had voted previously to create additional slots. It was agreed that the changes discussed should be made on an experimental basis in 2009-2010 and then evaluated.

Professor O'Hara brought up a concern about the scheduling difficulties for students who wish to take science and foreign language courses during the same semester. It is her impression that such students may have to give up taking a language if they wish to take the required courses for the pre-medical curriculum, because required courses for the sciences and foreign languages, which are both sequential, are scheduled at the same times. She wondered if language and science departments might be able to coordinate their schedules to give students the flexibility to study both science and a foreign language. Professor George said that the situation would be

Committee of Six Minutes of May 19, 2008

helped if information was shared several years in advance about which courses would be offered. He noted that the science departments are aware of which introductory-level courses they will offer, as well as the meeting times of those courses, years ahead of time, but said that he was not sure if the same was true for language departments. One solution that was discussed was reserving an early-morning or lunchtime time slot for foreign languages exclusively. It was agreed that communication among the departments involved should be encouraged, and that, in keeping with the College's commitment to global comprehension, solutions to this apparent scheduling conflict should be explored. The Dean offered to communicate with the chairs of science and foreign language departments to this end.

The members next considered the issue of grade inflation at the College. It was noted that Professor Sarat has been leading efforts among the Faculty to explore this topic, and that he and a group of colleagues have been conducting a grading experiment. Known as the "Real Grading Group," these faculty members have kept two sets of grades for their courses this semester, one that reflects the "true" grades that they feel students have earned, and the other the actual grades that they awarded to their students. Professor Sinos, a member of the group, reported that there was not much variation between her two lists, while noting that she does bump students up, rather than down, if they are on the cusp of a particular grade. Professor Frank noted that she has different grading criteria for creative writing at the beginning level than she does for other courses. She would find it useful to have College-wide grading guidelines and averages, she said. Professor Servos recounted his experiences with calibrating a grading system when he serves on grant funding panels. He suggested that departments should set standards for grading students in their courses. Most Amherst students, he feels, are excellent students, and their writing has improved over the past thirty years. Most often, they deserve excellent grades, he said. Other members, while citing the myth of the golden age, disagreed with the claim that student writing has been improving in recent decades. Professor Frank commented that writing does not appear to be better, but that it is also not worse, in her view.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Servos commented that Amherst students are often competing for slots in the best graduate programs, and that one reason for grade inflation may be the sense among faculty that a stellar transcript has become essential for success. President Marx said that he does not believe that students from Princeton, which has implemented a college-wide grading curve, have been adversely affected in terms of graduate admissions. Professor Jagannathan noted that, if he ratcheted up grading standards, students who struggle in his classes, disproportionately students from underrepresented groups, would fail. Though past attempts in bifurcating courses so that under-prepared students could take a course more gently paced have not solved this problem, having different courses for less well-prepared students might moderate this problem, he said. Several members noted that students who take Chemistry 15, the honors version of Chemistry 11, tend to get a higher grade when they subsequently take Chemistry 12. The members wondered if students might suffer a slight grade penalty for taking the harder course, Chemistry 15, rather than Chemistry 11, in the fall. It seems clear that grading conventions vary by department and by the course within departments. Professor Servos wondered if grade inflation could be traced in part to grades in a handful of courses. Dean Call said that the average grade is high enough that a handful of courses could not

Committee of Six Minutes of May 19, 2008

fully account for grade inflation at the College. President Marx suggested adding the distribution of grades within courses to the Amherst transcript for informational purposes. The Committee discussed whether faculty might share with one another grade distributions by course, department, and/or division. The Committee agreed that, if grading patterns are to be shared, it should be a faculty-led initiative. It was agreed that a working group should be established to explore the issue of grade inflation and report back to the Committee of Six.

The Committee continued its conversation about the possibility of having a broad discussion by the Faculty of how being a diverse community of students, faculty, and staff at Amherst College benefits everyone. While expressing great support for the College's commitment to diversity, some members questioned whether a Faculty Meeting would be the forum most conducive to a discussion about this complex subject. Other members felt strongly that such a discussion should take place at a Faculty Meeting.

What was missing at the Faculty Meeting of May 6, Professor O'Hara noted, was a discussion of the advantages of diversity. Professor Servos expressed skepticism that such a discussion would move beyond the realm of self-congratulation and into the realm of substance. Professor Frank disagreed, arguing that the point of such a conversation would be to move beyond the pieties of diversity, beyond "celebrating" it, into a more hard-headed and honest evaluation of what the Amherst community actually gains from it. She said that, while some faculty members seem to feel that such discussions take place all the time at the College, she has never heard such a conversation. Professor Frank said that she also agrees with the report of the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCFA) that students of color need to hear that they are valued by the College. Professor O'Hara noted that the Faculty is not used to having a conversation about diversity that includes a focus on successes and advantages, rather than challenges. Dean Call said that he feels that there were some misunderstandings at the last Faculty Meeting, and that some colleagues inferred that their commitment to diversity was being questioned, which was not anyone's intention in his view. It is his understanding that some faculty feel that it is important to articulate at a Faculty Meeting the underlying belief that diversity efforts should be undertaken for reasons other than social justice alone. Professor Jagannathan said that he understood the frustration expressed by some faculty members at the Faculty Meeting that the focus often seems to be on celebrating the universal value of diversity, when the more pertinent discussion, in his view, would focus on finding better ways to help the students whom Amherst admits to meet the academic challenges that they face and to succeed at the College and beyond.

In response, Professor O'Hara noted that a number of colleagues have been heartened by the formation of the Deans' Task Force on Academic Support, a step that is representative of the College's commitment to addressing, in coordinated, administratively organized ways, the issues of less well-prepared students over the long-term, developing multiple initiatives and considering how best to assess these efforts. Professor O'Hara noted that the task force plans to host a series of events to involve as many faculty members as possible in its work and to raise awareness about the issues on which the task force will focus. It was agreed that she would launch such a discussion about diversity by introducing the goal and structure of the task force at the Commencement Faculty Meeting.

Committee of Six Minutes of May 19, 2008

A brief conversation about the renovation of the Frost Library followed. President Marx asked for the members' vision for the library. Ideas included creating beautiful, uplifting spaces; designing classrooms for research seminars and creating spaces for thesis writers to conduct research; bringing IT, the Writing Center, and/or the Quantitative Center into the library; and, perhaps, moving the science library into Frost. The President asked whether individual library carrels for faculty members, which occupy choice space in the library at present and are often not being fully utilized, should be included in any new design. Professor Sinos noted that the library carrels provide needed places for some faculty members to isolate themselves to conduct research and to study. President Marx noted that it would be possible to create secure, flexible, and collective spaces in the library for Faculty or to create carrels in currently unused basement space, either in the library or elsewhere on campus.

The meeting ended at 3:30 with the Dean and the President expressing their great appreciation to the Committee for its excellent work throughout the year.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty