

Amended September 20, 2010

The first meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, September 13, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

President Marx 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 President provided an update on the progress of planning for the College's new science center. President Marx said that the architectural firms of Stefan Behnisch Architects and Payette Architects have been contracted to develop a conceptual design for the new building, with Behnisch focusing on the exterior and overall design, and Payette working on the interior of the building, the designs for which will be guided by programming needs. The architects are exploring the option of a site that encompasses the current Merrill location and adjacent land to the north and east of the present structure, the President noted. He explained that goals for the project include a central campus location for the new center, sensitivity to existing campus architecture, retaining current open views, and opening up new views. President Marx noted that emphasis is being placed on planning to ensure that there is as little disruption as possible to the sciences during the transition from the old building to the new, and the option of building the new structure in phases is under discussion. President Marx said that the center's architects will visit the campus on September 23 and 24 to discuss the project with faculty in departments currently located in Merrill and McGuire and members of the Board of Trustees and administration. Professor Umphrey asked why the decision was made to build a new structure, rather than to renovate Merrill. President Marx replied that the cost of these two approaches was roughly comparable, but that there would be more disruption if the renovation approach had been chosen, and that a renovation would likely not provide the flexibility of space needed to meet programmatic needs. Professor Loinaz asked how the McGuire Life Sciences Building, which houses the Department of Biology, would be incorporated into the new science center. President Marx explained that, since the new building may be located far enough away from McGuire so as to hinder possibilities for fostering interdisciplinarity among the sciences, the Trustees have requested that the architects explore options that incorporate the biology department into the new building. Alternative uses for McGuire would be considered if biology is located in the new building, he said. Professor Loinaz asked about the costs associated with the new science center. President Marx said that it is currently estimated that the project will cost about \$150 million.

Continuing with his remarks, President Marx asked for the members' thoughts on the draft of a Five College strategic plan (available at <http://fivecolleges.edu/sites/planning/> that he had recently distributed by email to all faculty and staff. He said that the Five College directors would welcome the Committee's feedback on the document and asked if the members would offer their thoughts on the draft at the Committee's meeting on September 20. Professor Basu noted that the document, and the request for comments on it, had been mentioned at the recent Five College chairs meeting that she had attended. She wondered if chairs should be asked to share the document with their departmental colleagues and to request their feedback. It was noted that everyone on campus has received the document, and Dean Call commented that the timeframe (comments are due by October 31, 2010) is fairly short for responding, so there may not be time for a formalized effort to review the document. President Marx explained that each institution is being asked to decide how best to conduct the review of the document on its own campus. Comments may be submitted online or emailed directly to Neal Abraham, Executive

Amended September 20, 2010

Director of Five Colleges, Inc. Professor Umphrey wondered whether some faculty committees might be asked to consider the document. She noted that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has been engaged in a number of discussions relating to the consortium in recent years. Professor Ciepiela, who said that she found the document to be abstract and rhetorical overall, noted a new emphasis on having collaborations within the consortium, between two or three schools for example, rather than insisting that all of the Five College institutions always launch initiatives together. The President and the Dean commented that such collaborations are often very effective. The members agreed to read the strategic plan and to have a discussion about it at the September 20 Committee of Six meeting.

President Marx next informed the members that conversations are continuing about the creation of a body, which will likely be called the Employee Council, to represent all staff, including Trustee-appointed staff (with the exception of managers). He then turned briefly to the topic of the John Woodruff Simpson Lectureship and the John J. McCloy '16 Professorship of American Institutions and International Diplomacy.

President Marx noted that, this year, Richard Wilbur '42, who is being hosted by the Department of English, and Fulvio Melia, an astrophysicist, hold appointments as Simpson Lecturers. Andrew Bacevich, who is being hosted by the Department of History, holds an appointment as a McCloy Professor for the Fall semester. President Marx informed the members that Robert Kagan, who had agreed to be a McCloy Professor during the Spring semester, can no longer come to Amherst this year. He asked the Committee to review the credentials of a nominee to replace Professor Kagan, perhaps for the Spring 2011 semester, if not at another time. He also asked the members to review the credentials of other candidates for the Simpson Lectureship. The members agreed.

Continuing the discussion, Professor Loinaz asked about the process for selecting Simpson Lecturers and McCloy Professors. President Marx responded that he has been, and remains, open to nominations from individual faculty and/or departments for these positions. He said he has also received responses from scholars to an ad that he had placed for these positions and would continue to seek nominations broadly. The procedure for considering these appointments has been to share the CVs of candidates with the Committee of Six and to ask for the members' advice as to whether to offer individuals these positions. The Committee of Six has agreed that Simpson and McCloy should have made significant contributions to their fields. They should have the potential to contribute something new and exciting to Amherst's curriculum, and, through their teaching, it is hoped that they will expose and/or attract Amherst students to fields or approaches that the students might otherwise not have been inclined to explore. President Marx said that Simpson Lecturers and McCloy Professors could be, but need not be, affiliated with departments. The President said that, after discussion with the Faculty, it had been agreed that he could invite a small number of highly distinguished scholars to be appointed as Simpson Lecturers or McCloy Professors to teach at the College for a period of up to three years. It had been agreed that there would be a total of no more than three Simpson Lecturers and only one McCloy Professor at any given time. Simpson Lecturers can be from any field, while McCloy Professors had some restrictions in terms of field. Professor Ciepiela said that she had been unaware that there were limitations in terms of field for McCloy Professors, noting that such restrictions diminish the value of the position for replacing visitors across the curriculum. President Marx said that he would re-read the document that established the fund to

Amended September 20, 2010

see if there is flexibility within the terms of the agreement in regard to acceptable fields and would report back.

The President said that, while there can be only a very few Simpson Lecturers or McCloy Professors, he has bolstered the visitors budget in a number of ways. He has been supportive of having a small number of accomplished alumni and/or others teach courses on a single-course basis, if departments wish to make proposals to the Dean, following regular procedures for requesting visitors. Those appointed to these positions are known as Croxton Lecturers, and he has made funding from the Croxton Lecture Fund available to support them. In 2009-2010, David Bollier '78 (hosted by the Department of Anthropology and Sociology) taught a course as a Croxton Lecturer, and this year, Ralph Thaxton (hosted by the Department of Political Science) and Werner Gundersheimer '59 (hosted by the Department of History) have been appointed as Croxton Lecturers. In addition, drawing from his discretionary funds, specifically the President's Initiative Fund (PIF), the President said that he has been able to support some departmental requests for visitors. The Dean noted that, last year, five visitors were awarded through the PIF to a combination of departments and faculty groups that had made proposals. Professor Basu asked if departments may still apply for Croxton Lecturer positions, and, if so, how they would be informed that this is a possibility. President Marx said requests should be sent to the Dean. Dean Call noted that he would make an announcement at the next Faculty Meeting and that the Committee's minutes would also serve as a source of information about this continuing opportunity.

Dean Call began his announcements with words of welcome to new and returning members. He discussed with the Committee interim structures that he plans to put in place for the Department of Information Technology, following the departure from the College of Peter Schilling, who had served as Amherst's Director of Information Technology since 2005 and recently accepted the position of Associate Vice President for Academic Innovation at New York University's Global Network University. Dean Call expressed best wishes to Mr. Schilling and praised his service to the College over the past five years.

The Dean informed the members that he has been meeting regularly, both individually and collectively, with the heads of the six groups within IT, and said that he is confident that these colleagues will be able to meet Amherst's IT needs during the time that the College is without a Director of Information Technology. He explained that the last external review of the department occurred eight years ago and that plans for another review had already been under way before Mr. Schilling decided to accept a new position. Dean Call said that he would work with members of the Faculty Computer Committee, in consultation with IT directors at peer institutions, to assemble a team of colleagues to review the department during the fall. It is his hope that, after a national search, there will be a new IT director in place by the summer of 2011. Since the review will be completed this fall, the new director will be able to use the review team's recommendations for the department's goals as a guide.

Continuing with his discussion about IT, the Dean said that, after consulting with the President, members of the administration, and IT colleagues, he has decided to appoint two Acting Co-Directors of Information Technology, drawn from the current IT managers, who are already familiar with projects under way and initiatives that have been planned. Such an interim structure should ensure that current projects, such as online registration and other initiatives, continue to move forward on schedule. Professor Loinaz asked if there will be a sharp delineation of responsibilities between the Co-Directors and why a single director is not being

Amended September 20, 2010

put in place. The Dean responded that, although the responsibilities within IT are clearly delineated, the department operates under a model of shared responsibility and collaboration, and he feels that continuing this approach is important. Having two Co-Directors, who between them are familiar with most of the projects under way on campus, seems to be the best option.

Discussion turned to staffing within IT. Professor Umphrey asked about the current state of staffing levels in the department. The Dean said that there are currently some vacancies, and that the department is in the process of filling a number of them. Approval to search for a number of additional positions was recently authorized, he said. Professor Ciepiela noted that it seems that, at present, IT is inadequately staffed to respond to daily requests. Dean Call said that filling vacant positions will be helpful in this regard. He commented that, although this will be a challenging transition period, the budget and priorities for the year for the department have already been set, which will be helpful. Professor Loinaz asked what role Professor Jack Cheney, Associate Dean of the Faculty, and Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research and Planning, will play in the interim structure. The Dean explained that Professor Cheney, the Associate Dean in his office who has been serving as the liaison to IT, will work with the heads of the six groups within IT on projects relating to the Faculty and the academic side. Ms. Matheson will serve as a liaison for administrative projects. Professor Cheney and Ms. Matheson's primary role will be communicating with faculty, administrators, and staff about their IT needs and facilitating projects with IT. The Dean said that, by adding pieces of the directors' position to a number of colleagues' duties, he believes that IT projects will be kept on track this year.

Continuing with the discussion about IT, the Dean asked the members to consider how best to support the work of the Faculty Computer Committee, which may be asked to take on additional responsibilities because of the transition in leadership in IT. He asked whether appointing an additional faculty member to the committee should be considered. Professor Rockwell suggested that, if the chair of the Faculty Computer Committee, Professor Kimball, wishes, he could invite an additional faculty colleague, preferably with experience working on IT issues, to serve in a consultative role to the Committee. In this way, there would be no need to go through the process of revising the current charge of the Faculty Computer Committee, which would require a vote of the Faculty, since an additional faculty member would most likely only be needed on a temporary basis. The other members and the Dean agreed that this would be the best approach, and the Dean thanked the Committee for its advice. The Committee then turned to several committee nominations.

Continuing with his announcements, the Dean informed the Committee that Assistant Dean Janet Tobin will continue to serve as the Recorder of Committee of Six minutes and that Nancy Ratner, Associate Dean of Admission and Researcher for Academic Projects, will serve as the Recorder of the Faculty Meeting minutes. He then turned to the subject of the College calendar, noting that, over the summer, Hampshire College had decided to make changes to its calendar that must now be considered, along with other calendar changes by Five College institutions, before the College Council can finalize its proposal for Amherst's calendar to bring before the Faculty. The Dean explained that Hampshire has decided to align its calendar more closely with the three other members of the Consortium (Mount Holyoke, Smith, and the University of Massachusetts) that have agreed to changes in their academic calendars. The university and Mount Holyoke have decided to start their spring semesters on the Tuesday after

Amended September 20, 2010

Martin Luther King Day for five out of seven years and on the following Monday for the two years out of seven when Martin Luther King Day falls as early as possible.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Umphrey noted the upcoming (October 14) dinner, lecture, and discussion with Louis Menand, Anne T. and Robert M. Bass Professor of English at Harvard University. She explained that, last February, Professors L. McGeoch and Parham, Dean Call, and she had attended a stimulating Mellon 23 meeting on the subject of “the liberal arts college.” In preparation for discussions, the Amherst group had read Professor Menand’s latest book, *The Marketplace of Ideas: Reform and Resistance in the American University*. Mellon awarded each institution with representation at the meeting funds to follow-up on the discussions that began there, and the Amherst group decided to host a series of gatherings to discuss the future of the liberal arts college. It was agreed that these events, the first of which will be the Menand dinner/talk, should be open to all members of the Faculty and Board of Trustees, and to invited members of the administration. To inform the conversation, attendees have been provided with copies of Professor Menand’s book. Dean Call informed the members that the response to the invitation to the Menand event has been excellent, with more than ninety colleagues planning to attend so far. Noting that the group that attended the Mellon meetings feels strongly that it is the Faculty’s role to lead a dialogue on the larger questions facing liberal arts colleges in the next decade or two, he asked the members to consider future events that would continue to stimulate conversation among members of the Amherst community about the College’s future. Professor Umphrey and other members expressed enthusiasm for having informal and wide-ranging discussion of issues facing liberal arts colleges. Professor Basu suggested having a Teaching and Advising Program (TAP) lunch as a follow-up to the Menand event.

Continuing with “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Rockwell asked the President about the performance of the endowment. President Marx replied that the return on the endowment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010, was 8.4 percent. He noted that the Treasurer will give a report on the budget and endowment performance at the next Faculty Meeting. The President noted that, when making budget projections, the assumption for the endowment’s return for last year was zero. The actual performance will bring the College closer to the long-term endowment spending target of 5 percent. President Marx stressed that it remains difficult to make budget projections in an uncertain economic climate, and that the College must remain vigilant in thinking about the assumptions on which it bases its budget projections. Professor Loinaz, noting both his enthusiasm for quantitative data and the difficulty of engaging quantitative data productively at Faculty Meetings, suggested that it would be helpful to have such data in advance of the Faculty Meetings during which the information would be discussed, ideally with the Faculty Meeting agenda. President Marx agreed that doing so would be informative, and he said that he would discuss with the Treasurer the possibilities for providing data in advance, given the schedules under which information is gathered and analyzed and presentations created. The Dean noted that one possibility, when time does not permit making information available in advance of a Faculty Meeting, would be to have the presentation at the Faculty Meeting and to have further conversation at a subsequent Faculty Meeting, by which time the Faculty would have had time to digest the information.

Dean Call next 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. The Dean said that personnel matters are

Amended September 20, 2010

kept confidential; members of last year's members commented that very few conversations (typically those concerning personnel matters and committee nominations that were under consideration) had been kept out of the public minutes of the Committee. Professor Rockwell noted that last year's Committee aimed for as much transparency in the minutes as possible and used reasonableness as a guide when determining if a discussion, on rare occasions, should be kept confidential. Professor Umphrey commented that there seems to have been a rebuttable presumption of publication. Committee of Six members who had served last year agreed. Professor Ciepiela expressed support for aspiring to reasonable transparency in the minutes. Professor Basu asked if there have been opportunities for Committee members to offer an unformulated idea without having comments appear in the public minutes. Professor Ciepiela replied that last year's Committee did not endorse or follow such a practice, as, she believes, this year's Committee should not. The members of last year's Committee noted that there are two opportunities for members, the President, and the Dean to edit their comments during the minute approval process.

President Marx agreed on the import of transparency and commented that each Committee of Six with which he has worked has come to its own understanding, informed by the Faculty as a whole, of whether or when the members would be comfortable discussing issues in confidence. Instances could include when he is seeking guidance from the Committee on sensitive matters that cannot be made public, or if any member wants to discuss any idea that is not yet fully formed. The President asked for the members' views on how to ensure both transparency and honest exchanges of often preliminary ideas or views.

Professor Loinaz asked if there is language in the *Faculty Handbook* about the place of confidentiality within the Committee's minutes. The President said that the *Faculty Handbook* does not address this issue. Dean Call said that he is in favor of transparency, but that he worries that the minutes have become lengthy in an effort to record every detail of the meetings. He expressed concern that, if the minutes are too long, fewer colleagues would read them. Professor Umphrey agreed. She noted that the delay in distributing the minutes to the Faculty became problematic last year and wondered if the length of the minutes contributed to this problem. The Dean noted that longer minutes require more time to read. Professor Ciepiela commented that, at the end of last year, the Committee had agreed that, when there was little disagreement during particular discussions, summary could be employed. However, when divergent views are put forward, more attribution and fuller details would be required in the minutes. The Committee agreed that this would be a good approach to take in the future. The Dean reviewed with the members a proposal to improve the efficiency and timeliness of the minute review and approval process. The members, the President, and the Dean agreed to adhere to a schedule that includes firm deadlines and to make every effort to meet these deadlines regularly. The Dean noted that, traditionally, the Dean and the President have read the first draft of the minutes before they are shared with the Committee. He said that last year's Committee had requested that the Committee, the Dean, and the President receive the minutes at the same time. Dean Call wondered if this year's Committee wished to return to the earlier practice or wanted to continue with the more recent one. Professor Basu asked what the reason was for the change in practice. Noting the busy schedules of the President and the Dean, in particular their travel schedules, Professor Rockwell said that, at times, having to wait for the President and the Dean to complete an initial reading of the minutes resulted in lag time between Committee of Six discussions and the distribution of the minutes to Committee members and to the Faculty. Professor Loinaz said

Amended September 20, 2010

that the change of last year seemed to respond well to faculty concerns, and he suggested that the Committee continue to receive the minutes at the same time that they are shared with the President and the Dean. Professor Ciepiela noted that, during the process of writing the minutes, Assistant Dean Tobin, had, on occasion, contacted her to clarify a statement. The members agreed that the practice of last year should continue, and that the Committee, the President, and the Dean would receive the minutes at the same time, and that Assistant Dean Tobin, during the process of writing the minutes, may contact the Committee, the Dean, and the President to gain clarification on their comments. At the conclusion of the conversation, the members agreed that direct attribution would be their preferred mode.

The Committee then discussed the circumstances under which it would communicate via email. It was agreed that email 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. The Dean informed the members that there is a secure shared drive that the Committee can use for electronic communication.

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 at 3:30 P.M. on Mondays until tenure season, but that the Committee would meet at 3:00 and at a number of additional times, as needed, during the period of tenure discussions. The meeting ended with the discussion of a personnel matter.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended September 27, 2010

The second meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by Dean Call in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, September 20, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. President Marx, who was traveling for the College, was absent.

Continuing their conversation of the previous week, the members discussed the procedures and timetable for approving the Committee's minutes, with the goal of refining the process to allow sufficient time for the Committee to review and edit the minutes, while ensuring that the document reaches the Faculty in a timely manner. After making some adjustments to the first iteration of the process, the members agreed to adopt a system that would typically result in the public minutes being made available eight days after the Committee meets. If a Faculty Meeting has been scheduled, an expedited process will be used to produce, review, and approve the minutes. If for any reason the Committee cannot reach a consensus to approve the minutes under these circumstances, it was agreed that two sets of abbreviated minutes would be read at the Faculty Meeting. The members then voted unanimously to approve the minutes of September 13.

At 4:00 P.M., Dean Call introduced Attorney James Wallace, who participated in the meeting by speaker phone. Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel, also participated by speaker phone. 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. At the conclusion of the discussion with Mr. Wallace, the Dean, the Committee, and Mr. Murphy expressed their thanks. The Committee then turned to several committee nominations.

Continuing with his announcements, Dean Call discussed with the Committee the long-standing 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 Dean then noted possible Faculty Meeting dates for the Fall semester. They are October 5, October 19, November 2, and December 7.

In response to the question, posed the previous week, of whether there might be any flexibility within the terms of the agreement that established the John J. McCloy'16 Professorship of American Institutions and International Diplomacy in regard to the fields of its occupants, Dean Call reported back on his reading of the agreement. The Dean said that the memo of understanding states that McCloy Professors must be located in the Department of History. He reported that, over the years, the professorship has been used to bring to Amherst distinguished scholars in Mr. McCloy's fields of interest: American history, American studies, economics, history, law, political science, and sociology. While the professorship was established to bring scholars to the College to "offer structured courses to the undergraduates of the College," for many years McCloy Professors were asked to come to the College to present lectures and not classes. Visiting professorships are more consistent with the intention of the agreement, Dean Call noted. He said that the College has and will continue to remain faithful to the agreement that established the professorship, while interpreting it broadly. Dean Call noted that similar constraints in terms of field are not applicable to the John Woodruff Simpson Lectureship, and that this position may be used to bring distinguished visitors to the College across a wide range of disciplines. The members then discussed the credentials of three individuals who might be considered for a McCloy Professorship or Simpson Lectureship.

Professor Rockwell commented on the importance of ensuring that anyone who is appointed to these distinguished positions have terminal degrees and other academic credentials

Amended September 27, 2010

that are, at a minimum, comparable to those required of Amherst faculty members, since he or she would be teaching. Professor Saxton disagreed, noting that, under some circumstances, she could envision a journalist, who might not have a terminal degree, being a suitable candidate for these positions. Dean Call noted that all three candidates under discussion have Ph.D.s and have held academic teaching appointments.

Continuing the conversation about visiting faculty more broadly, Professor Basu asked about plans for informing the Faculty about the opportunity to nominate Simpson Lecturers and McCloy Professors, as well as Croxton Lecturers. Dean Call said that he would make an announcement at the next Faculty Meeting about making nominations for all of these positions. He also plans to notify departments that they may nominate a Croxton Lecturer as part of the letter regarding requests for visitors for next year, which he will soon send to chairs. Professor Basu asked if these positions would be advertised more broadly. The Dean responded that an ad had been placed in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* last year for the McCloy and Simpson positions, but that this venue had drawn only a small number of viable candidates, though it did serve to inform members of the higher education community about these positions. Professor Umphrey argued that the positions should be advertised beyond the College's Web site, as is the regular practice for other academic positions, including that of Copeland Fellow, for example. Professor Basu commented that the selection of Copeland Fellows through both advertising and nomination provides a useful model. The Dean confirmed that some Copeland Fellows are solicited through advertising, while others are nominated by Amherst faculty and/or chosen by the Copeland Program's faculty theme group for the year. Dean Call commented that Croxton Lecturers teach on a per-course basis and are not likely to teach more than a couple of courses. Formal searches and broad advertising are not done for positions of this type typically, he said. A number of alumni have expressed interest in the Croxton Lectureship, and faculty colleagues' networking is another way that candidates for these positions have emerged.

Dean Call next discussed with the members the issue of restructuring visiting/temporary teaching positions at the College as permanent renewable teaching positions that are not tenure-track or tenured lines. The Dean noted that, in his experience, it is not uncommon for departments, particularly when they are pleased with the performance of a visitor who has been teaching courses at Amherst for some time and who may be filling a curricular need, to request to have an ongoing rotating position converted to a permanent renewable position. He said that it would be helpful to have a sense of the Committee's views on this issue in a broad sense, as the question of whether creating more of these types of positions at the College can become lost, as each request for a new structure is treated on an individual basis.

As background for the discussion, Dean Call noted that he has worked over the years to prevent visiting positions from becoming long term and exploitative. Visiting Assistant Professors now typically have appointments for three years, and never for more than four. He then described the position of Lecturer at the College, noting that he has tried to regularize this position (as part of the larger effort to move away from having long-term visiting appointments), which is largely part of the teaching structure in foreign languages and arts departments, though there are a few Lecturer positions outside of those departments. The Dean explained that Lecturers and Resident Artists are hired on three-year contracts. After two three-year terms, a Lecturer or Resident Artist may be eligible for promotion to Senior status, receiving a five-year contract, with a greater expectation of renewal. In relation to the question at hand, he noted that, if a colleague has taught at the College for some time as a visitor and is later hired into a new renewable position, he or she often has one three-year contract, a review, and then is promoted to Senior Lecturer or Senior Resident Artist.

Amended September 27, 2010

The Dean explained that, when considering a request from a department to convert what has been a visiting position to a Lecturer or Senior Resident Artist position, it is important to consider how best to structure the position—whether to have an ongoing appointment or one that rotates—to best meet the institution’s needs and not to focus on the benefits that the person currently occupying the position might bring. Professor Rockwell asked if national searches are conducted when a position is re-structured, ensuring that affirmative action guidelines are followed. The Dean said that, when a position is re-classified as an ongoing appointment, an ad is placed in the relevant publications for the field, and the procedures for a national search are followed rigorously. Practically, what often tends to happen is that the person who had occupied the rotating position is seen as the best candidate for the permanent one, and he or she is hired. Professor Basu asked if there is a danger that decisions about terminations of contracts might be made on an ad hoc basis. The Dean said that, since visiting colleagues no longer teach on an extended basis, his intention has been and remains to ask departments to make recommendations about restructuring positions occupied by long-term colleagues and thus to eliminate these informal arrangements over time.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Saxton said that she imagines that departmental needs should govern decisions about the best structure for these positions. Professor Ciepiela commented that she finds it difficult to discuss this issue in the absence of a specific example. The Dean reiterated that in considering this issue, the objective is not to consider individuals, but to focus on structures. Professor Umphrey commented that adding these sorts of positions to the College is not done through the regular Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) process. She wondered about the level of vetting that proposals to reclassify positions receive as a result. The Dean said that, if a department requests to restructure a rotating position into an ongoing one, there is a conversation with the CEP, as doing so is providing a new resource to the department. Following the conversation, the CEP makes a recommendation to the Dean, who makes the decision. Professor Umphrey expressed some concern about the possibility of creating a second-tier faculty if these positions proliferate. Professor Saxton noted the precedent for permanent non-tenure-track or tenured positions in the arts and language departments, for which this seems to have been an effective structure. Professor Umphrey commented that small departments often need to fill curricular gaps that arise from sabbatic leaves, and that having the continual presence of a Senior Lecturer, or a series of visitors, can be necessary to mount a major. Professor Ciepiela agreed that these positions are filling a critical need within some departments. Professor Loinaz asked if there are ongoing non-tenure-track or tenured positions in the science departments. The Dean said that there are not. Though there are lab instructor and coordinator positions that are permanent, these positions involve some teaching (of lab sections and discussion sections, typically), but they are classified as staff positions rather than faculty lines.

Professor Basu returned to the concern about creating a differential in status among teachers at the College, if these positions proliferate. The Dean noted that this issue is further complicated by the field-specific nature of these positions. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers and Resident Artists and Senior Resident Artists are similar in terms of their contracts. However Lecturers outside the language departments typically have a two/two teaching load and conduct scholarly research. Language lecturers tend to focus largely on pedagogy and teach three courses (often two sections of the same course) per semester. Professor Saxton noted that the Faculty made a specific decision not to create a group of lower-level faculty to teach writing. It was felt that having a structure of what would essentially be technicians would not be desirable. Professor Rockwell expressed concern about regularizing a growing number of these positions across departments and posed the question of whether doing so might ultimately undermine the College’s commitment to tenure and tenure-track positions, possibly supplanting them. The

Amended September 27, 2010

Dean said that he shares this concern, while recognizing the benefits of creating these ongoing positions when it is in the best interests of departments and the College as a whole. The Committee then turned briefly to a personnel matter.

In the context of discussing a request from a department to restructure a position, Professor Loinaz asked what the distinctions are between a Senior Lecturer or Senior Resident Artist, outside the language departments, and a tenured faculty member. The Dean responded that the standard of review is higher for tenure-track and tenured faculty and that the leave policy is different. He noted that, while Lecturers are often scholars in their fields, their primary role at the College is a teaching one, and their performance is evaluated on the basis of teaching alone. In addition, there are some differences in terms of requirements for service to the College. Senior Lecturers are eligible for a single one-semester leave during the course of their careers at Amherst.

The Committee next discussed a proposal for the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Summer Stipend Program and approved the nomination of the professor who had submitted it.

The Committee returned briefly to a discussion of the draft of the Five College strategic plan. Professor Rockwell expressed the view that the process of gathering feedback on the document is being rushed, and that, since the window for responding to the draft is so brief, Amherst should not be viewed as having endorsed it. Dean Call said that he does not have the sense that a formal endorsement is being sought, as the document is not a contract. The Dean explained that the Five College Directors feel that it would be helpful for Neal Abraham, the new Executive Director of Five Colleges, to have a plan in place as soon as possible. Professor Umphrey reiterated her suggestion that the relevant major committees (the Committee on Priorities and Resources, the CEP, and the Committee of Six, at the least) of the Faculty be asked to comment on the document. Dean Call asked if the members felt that Amherst should try to have a broad discussion of the document. The members decided to discuss this question at their next meeting. Professor Umphrey asked how the initiatives outlined in the document would be funded, if adopted. The Committee expressed concern that Amherst, as the institution in the best financial position, might have to take on a disproportionate share of the financial burden for implementing any plans that are adopted. Dean Call responded that the institutions would share costs, and that grant funding would be sought, for any plans that are launched. He anticipates that in the future, as initiatives are brought forward, each institution will decide for itself whether it will participate. The Dean said that there is a general sense among the institutions that collaboration is often, but not always, beneficial. Recalling the Committee's discussion of the previous week, he noted that not every collaborative project need be undertaken by all five institutions.

The meeting ended with a brief discussion of a personnel matter.

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 4, 2010

The third meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, September 20, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The members reviewed the second draft of the minutes of the Committee's meeting of September 20. Conversation turned briefly to a point that had been raised by Professor Rockwell during a discussion of the John J. McCloy '16 Professorship of American Institutions and International Diplomacy and the John Woodruff Simpson Lectureship. Professor Rockwell had expressed the view that anyone appointed to these distinguished positions should have terminal degrees and other academic credentials that are, at a minimum, comparable to those required of Amherst faculty members, since he or she would be teaching. Professor Saxton reiterated her perspective that, under some circumstances, she could envision a distinguished individual who might not have a terminal degree being a suitable candidate for these positions. The Committee discussed whether a judge would be an acceptable candidate as an example. Professor Rockwell said that he would have no objection to the appointment of a judge, as he or she would have a terminal degree that would be comparable to a Ph.D. President Marx noted that last year's Committee had agreed that a distinguished journalist, who does not have a graduate degree, should be invited to teach a course as a Croxton Lecturer. The Committee agreed that the invitation was worthwhile, and that nominees for these distinguished visiting positions would continue to be discussed on an individual basis by the Committee, the President, and the Dean. The members then voted unanimously to approve the minutes of September 20.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Marx informed the members that the Senior Staff has authorized a search for a replacement position, that of Health Professions Advisor, which is within the Career Center. The President noted that the Career Center has also requested an additional (new) position, and that the Senior Staff, the Dean, and he are considering the structure of the Health Professions position in relation to other needs within the Career Center, to determine how to allocate resources most effectively and efficiently. President Marx explained that pre-medical work makes up approximately 90 percent of the Health Professions Advisor position, leaving about 10 percent for other duties. The person occupying this position will be expected to serve as Dean-on-Duty, for example. Professor Loinaz asked about the time commitment required for this responsibility. Dean Call said that each of the Associate Deans in the Dean of Students office serves as Dean-on-Duty for two one-week shifts per semester, and that this duty involves being available outside normal operating hours to answer questions and to address urgent problems that arise concerning students. He noted that Resident Advisors and Area Coordinators are often the first line of contact under such circumstances, however.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Loinaz asked if candidates who might be suitable for the Health Professions Advisor position would typically also possess the skills needed to fulfill the role of Dean-on-Duty. The Dean said that he believes that qualified candidates most likely would. Noting that the work of the Health Professions Advisor is very heavy at some points of the year, because of the timetable of medical school applications, and lighter at others, Professor Loinaz asked if the scheduling for the assignment of the Dean-on-Duty responsibilities for the Health Professions Advisor would be taken into account. Dean Call said that he believes that Dean Hart would do so. Professor Loinaz noted that, during the summer, the duties of the

Amended October 4, 2010

Health Professions Advisor, which are at the moment being performed by him with support from Professor S. George, Associate Dean of Students Carolyn Bassett (who had been the Health Professions Advisor before moving into her new position within the Dean of Students office), and Associate Dean of Students Allyson Moore, are overwhelming. The advising and application process is becoming increasingly complex, and the Health Professions Advisor was recently asked to take on additional related duties for the new post-baccalaureate program, he commented. In his view, particularly since any new Health Professions Advisor would need time to learn the intricacies of Amherst's pre-medical advising and application process, the Health Professions Advisor will have little time left over for other duties.

Professor Loinaz noted that, as the faculty member who chairs the Health Professions Committee, he will be responsible for assuming additional responsibilities if the Health Professions Advisor does not have sufficient time to fulfill the duties of that position. The President and the Dean said that they recognize the importance of the Health Professions Advisor position and of the responsibility and burden of chairing the Health Professions Committee. They said that they anticipate having an ad developed for the Health Professions Advisor position within a week. Professor Loinaz thanked President Marx and Dean Call for moving forward expeditiously with filling the position. The President and the Dean expressed great appreciation to Professors Loinaz and S. George and Deans A. Moore, and Bassett for assisting Amherst's pre-medical students with the medical school application process.

Continuing with his announcements, President Marx said that, in reviewing the minutes of the Committee's September 20 meeting, which he had not attended, he had noted the members had continued the discussion of the three candidates who had recently been nominated for either a McCloy Professorship or Simpson Lectureship. He thanked the members for their advice.

Returning to the question of how best to disseminate information about these positions within and outside the College, President Marx said that he plans to ask the Faculty for nominations at the next Faculty Meeting, in addition to posting information on the Dean of the Faculty's Web site. Professor Basu suggested that, in addition, department chairs could speak with their colleagues about making nominations of Simpson Lecturers and McCloy Professors, as well as Croxton Lecturers. Dean Call said that he will notify departments next week, as part of his regular letter to chairs regarding requests for visitors, that they may nominate a Croxton Lecturer. President Marx asked for suggestions of venues to advertise the positions. He reiterated the Dean's view that the ad for the McCloy and Simpson positions that had been placed in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* last year, had drawn only a small number of viable candidates. Professor Umphrey noted that because the positions may be in a number of different fields, disciplinary publications would not be the most effective advertising vehicles. However, she continued to favor advertising these positions in ways that are comparable to those used for other academic positions. She asked what the regular procedures for advertising are. Dean Call responded that, at the end of the summer, his office, working with departments, places an omnibus ad in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* in an annual special careers issue. Over the years, this ad has become increasingly expensive, so the decision was made to include only the titles of the positions (which are primarily tenure-track positions or appointments with tenure; Lecturer; or Resident Artist positions; as visiting positions are typically not yet allocated at the time the ad is placed) and to refer readers to the Dean's Web site for complete information. In addition, each department places ads in disciplinary-specific publications, either in print or

Amended October 4, 2010

online. Departments also place ads for visiting professors (assistant, associate, or full), but do not typically advertise for positions that involve teaching on a per-course basis. Noting that the opportunity to include the distinguished visiting positions in the omnibus ad for this year's searches had passed, the Committee, the Dean, and the President agreed that a separate ad for the McCloy Professorship and Simpson Lectureship should be placed in the *Chronicle*, and that, in future, these positions should be included as part of the omnibus ad.

Under Announcements from the Dean, Dean Call distributed the finalized procedures for the Committee's minute review process, as refined by the Committee over the past several meetings. The members agreed that the new system is working well and indicated that they are pleased with the timeliness with which the minutes are being posted for the Faculty. The members next discussed the schedule for some additional meetings. The Committee turned briefly to a procedural matter for the distribution of tenure materials. The Dean thanked the Committee for agreeing to participate on a panel as part of the Volunteer Leadership Summit that will begin this Thursday, September 30. The Advancement office has organized this event for alumni and parents who volunteer for Amherst's fundraising and engagement programs. The Dean noted that the program has been designed to provide an insider's view of Amherst. The Committee of Six was asked to offer information about faculty governance structures and the ways that Faculty serve the College through teaching, scholarship, and service. The Dean then discussed a committee nomination with the Faculty members.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," prompted by recently announced plans to conduct an external review of the Department of Information Technology, and noting the department's important intersections with the curriculum, Professor Umphrey asked about the regularity of external reviews of administrative departments, the process used to conduct them, and the role of the Committee of Six, if any. Dean Call responded that he has been in conversation with Professor Kimball, Chair of the Faculty Computer Committee, and Scott Payne, Director of Academic Technology Services, who also serves on the committee, about developing a charge for the visiting team and how best to solicit feedback about the department from faculty and administrators and to involve colleagues in the review. In addition, he has been working with the Faculty Computer Committee, the managers of the six IT departments, and administrative colleagues to assemble a visiting team. Professor Umphrey, noting that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) reads the reports of visiting committees that review academic departments, asked who will read the report of the visiting team for IT. The Dean said that this has not yet been determined, but, depending on the issues that are raised, he said that he would imagine that the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) and the Faculty Computer Committee would possibly do so. Professor Loinaz asked if administrative departments have a regular cycle of reviews, as academic departments do. President Marx said that reviews of administrative departments are often done when opportunities arise to re-think how these departments perform and function, for example a transition in leadership. The President noted that, in recent years, there have been external reviews of the Counseling Center, the Quantitative Center, the Writing Center, and the Career Center. Whether the reviews are of academic departments or administrative ones, the goal is to engage with experts in the particular field, who are asked to offer their best ideas for the College to consider.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Umphrey asked what the protocol is for bringing an issue to the Committee for discussion. President Marx said that

Amended October 4, 2010

the Dean and he would encourage the Committee to propose topics for discussion, either during meetings or in between meetings, as they wish. Dean Call agreed and explained that he assembles a list of agenda items each week and would welcome suggestions for additional items at any time.

The members considered when the next Faculty Meeting should be held, exploring the possibilities of October 5 and October 19. President Marx noted that, if the meeting were held on October 19, it would provide an opportunity to report on the meetings of the Board of Trustees, which would have been held the previous weekend and during which the Board will discuss the new science building project, among other topics of interest. Dean Call said that having the meeting on the later of the two dates would enable the President and him to share data that will inform the Treasurer's report with the Committee, in preparation for distributing it to the Faculty in advance of the Faculty Meeting in which it would be presented. That information is not yet available, so it would not be possible to take this approach if it is decided to have the meeting on October 5. The President also noted that Tom Parker, Dean of Admission and Financial Aid, cannot attend a Faculty Meeting on October 5 and thus would not be able to offer a report to the Faculty in person, as he generally does at the first full Faculty Meeting. Professor Rockwell noted that responses to the draft of the Five College strategic plan are due by the end of October, and he wondered if there would be enough time for the Faculty to discuss the plan, if a decision is made to have some faculty committees respond to the document before the full Faculty considers it. President Marx said that he is certain that it will not be problematic for Amherst to offer comments on the document after October 31. Professors Ciepiela and Loinaz wondered if the other items on the agenda for the first meeting—the introduction of new colleagues and the reports of senior administrators—could be accomplished at the same meeting in which the other issues (the Five College strategic planning document, a detailed report from the Treasurer, and the President's report on the Board Meeting) under discussion might also be addressed. President Marx suggested that administrators could be asked to submit their reports in writing in advance of the Faculty Meeting, and that there could be an opportunity for discussion and questions at the meeting. The members agreed that this would be an excellent plan for freeing up more time at the meeting. The Committee agreed that the next Faculty Meeting would be held on October 19.

Professor Umphrey raised the more general, but related, topic of whether to have Faculty Meetings with greater regularity. She said that she favors doing so, as she knows other colleagues do, while noting that some faculty members hold the view that Faculty Meetings should only be held when there are some matters that require a faculty vote on the agenda. Professor Umphrey argued that it is possible to have substantive discussions even when the agenda does not include an issue that requires a vote, and that there is value in having regular opportunities for the Faculty to come together for dialogue and informational purposes. She suggested that three meetings a semester could be the goal, while commenting that meetings should not be held simply for the purpose of having them. Professor Umphrey said that she would find it interesting, for example, to have the major committees of the Faculty discuss what they have on their agendas for the year. Dean Call agreed that regular meetings would be valuable, noting that a pattern of meeting either very often, or not often enough, has emerged in recent years. Knowing that there would be a certain number of meetings during a given semester would enable a rhythm to develop and could lead to planning agendas for the meetings further in

Amended October 4, 2010

advance, which would be desirable, the Dean said. Noting that the tendency has been to meet when there is a pressing issue to consider, President Marx supported having more regular meetings. He agreed that anticipating matters that could be discussed before they become pressing issues would be desirable. The Committee, the Dean, and the President agreed to try to have Faculty meetings in October, November, and early-December, if possible. Dean Call suggested that a presentation on the College's new online advising tools would be particularly relevant immediately before pre-registration. The Committee agreed that a Faculty Meeting could be held on November 2 for this purpose, as well as for others that may arise. Dean Call noted that follow-up questions on the Treasurer's presentation, now set for October 19, could also be on the agenda of a November 2 meeting.

President Marx informed the members that Trustee Howard Gardner and former Trustee Diana Chapman Walsh have requested to meet with the members the Committee of Six on October 14, when the Trustees will be in town for Board meetings. President Marx said that it is his understanding that the meeting would be a follow-up to the conversation that last year's Committee had with the full Board during Board Meetings in March. During this conversation, for which he had not been present, the President said that the Board noted that the Faculty expressed concerns about how faculty governance had been functioning and the role of the administration in regard to difficulties that had arisen in this area. The Board, recognizing that the future of the College rests on having effective governance structures, felt that, if there were serious concerns about faculty governance, it would be helpful to bring together faculty colleagues and Board members who are academics themselves for the purposes of conversation. In response to the invitation, the Committee engaged in a discussion that encompassed the role of the Board in matters of faculty governance; the absence of a clear agenda for the conversation; the structural awkwardness that new members of the Committee said that they would feel about meeting with the Trustees when they were not part of last year's confidential discussions and before they had experienced serving on the Committee for a significant length of time; the awkwardness that members of last year's Committee would feel because they would be unable to share the substance of last year's confidential discussion with new members of the Committee; the possibility of re-igniting tensions about faculty governance that appear to have subsided; and the irregularity of having a meeting between the Committee of Six and Trustees outside the regular annual conversation between the Board and the Committee that typically takes place during Instruction Weekend in March or April.

President Marx commented that it is his understanding that the Trustees have proposed a meeting in the spirit of open conversation and to be responsive to concerns that were shared with them by the Faculty. The members indicated their appreciation for the Board's responsiveness but, on reflection, agreed that there does not appear to be any urgent need to meet with the Trustees now, and that it would be preferable for the Committee to meet with the full Board at the regularly scheduled time in the spring. Under such a schedule, new members, in particular, would have the benefit of having served on the Committee for almost the full year and would be better equipped to reflect on faculty governance processes with their colleagues and engage Board members in conversation. Professor Ciepiela noted that last year was an exceptionally difficult year that tested governance structures, citing the example of the Faculty's consideration of adding staff members to the CPR. She continued, while there were contentious moments in the process, the very difficult issues at hand were resolved by the Faculty through its regular

Amended October 4, 2010

governance structures. President Marx said that he agreed fully. The Committee agreed that the President should convey to the Board that the Committee welcomes a conversation with the Trustees and looks forward to meeting with them this spring.

Turning to the process for responding to the Five College planning document, the members noted that the document is largely aspirational and does not require any commitments or endorsements from the College at this time. President Marx and the Dean agreed. Professor Rockwell suggested that certain faculty committees were perhaps best positioned to identify potential issues that might arise from the report. The other members agreed and asked the Dean to invite response statements on the plan from the CEP and the CPR by October 15. Professor Loinaz asked if taking on this task would interfere with the regular business of the committees, which may have already set their agendas for the semester. The Dean, who attends the meetings of both committees, said that the committees would discuss their agendas, but hopefully they would be able to make time to consider this document. Professor Rockwell commented that, once the Committee has received the informed opinions of these committees, it may become clearer whether it will be necessary to devote a full Faculty Meeting to the discussion of the document. The members agreed to discuss the responses of the CEP and the CPR at their meeting on October 18.

The Dean thanked the members for the informative discussion, which occurred during last week's meeting of the Committee, about restructuring visiting/temporary teaching positions at the College as permanent renewable teaching positions that are not tenure-track or tenured lines. The members then turned to a personnel matter.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 14, 2010

The fourth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, October 4, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The members reviewed the second draft of the minutes of the Committee's meeting of September 27 and voted unanimously to approve the minutes. The members then turned briefly to a personnel matter.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Marx informed the members that, as requested by the Committee, he had conveyed to the Trustees the members' preference to meet with the Board this spring, rather than talking with Trustee Howard Gardner and former Trustee Diana Chapman Walsh in October, as proposed. The President said that it is his understanding that the Board would welcome a broad discussion of governance at the College, in the aftermath of the dramatic changes in the economy of last year, and in anticipation that governance structures may be tested in similar ways in the future. The Committee agreed that the members should prepare for such a conversation, which would occur with the Board this spring, by having minuted discussions on this topic during some of its regular meetings in February. The Committee also decided that it would be beneficial to convey directly to the Board its rationale for declining Mr. Gardner's and Ms. Chapman Walsh's invitation to meet in October and its interest in having a conversation this spring that would encompass the topics that the President had described. The members agreed to draft a letter to Mr. Gardner, Ms. Chapman Walsh, and Board Chairman Jide Zeitlin '85. The Committee then turned briefly to personnel matters.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the members that he had shared with the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) and the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) the Committee of Six's request that each of these committees review the Five College strategic planning document and provide a response statement on the plan to the Committee by October 15. Dean Call informed the members that, while the CEP's schedule will permit the committee to respond by the deadline, the CPR's agenda and meeting schedule (the committee meets on Tuesdays and will not meet on October 12 because of fall break) will make it impossible for the CPR to offer a response by the Committee of Six's deadline. The CPR has agreed to discuss the Five College strategic plan on October 19, Dean Call said, and to respond as soon as the committee can thereafter. As a result, the Committee of Six will need to adjust its schedule for discussing the responses of the CEP and the CPR, shifting to its October 25 meeting instead of having its conversation on October 18, as originally planned. This schedule should still permit the Faculty to be informed, through the Committee of Six minutes, of the members' discussion of the response statements, before the anticipated November 2 Faculty Meeting.

Noting that the Copeland Colloquium Program had been expanded and is now organized around a theme put forward by the Faculty, Dean Call informed the members that last year's Committee of Six had decided that it would be best to have more data before seeking to evaluate this new interdisciplinary theme-based structure. The new format, the Dean said, had been initiated for the colloquium on a pilot basis three years ago. The Committee had also agreed that the Faculty Research Awards (FRAP) Committee and the Lecture Committee together, or a self-selected subcommittee of the members of these committees, should conduct the evaluation of the theme-based approach. The Dean explained that, if the theme-based approach is to continue in 2011-2012, theme proposals must be solicited this fall for next year's Copeland Colloquium.

Amended October 14, 2010

Because of this timetable, he asked the members if the Copeland Colloquium should be allowed to run one more year in its present form, while the evaluation is under way (it is expected that it will be completed in spring 2011).

Continuing the conversation, Dean Call noted that this is the fourth year that Copeland Fellows have come to campus for a year, rather than for a semester, with the intent of scholarly collaboration and engagement with the Amherst community. The Dean said that, during the first year (2007-2008), the theme was "Art and Identity in the Global Community." The next year the theme was "Violent States." Last year's theme was "It's Not Easy Being Green: The Science, Politics, and Ethics of Environmentalism." This year's theme is "International Development: Successes, Failures, and Future Directions." Noting the relatively small number of Copeland theme proposals developed and put forward by the Faculty, Professor Basu commented that, if theme proposals are solicited from the Faculty for next year's colloquium, it would be useful to encourage faculty members to bring proposals forward. She suggested, for example, a meeting between faculty members who have been involved in the theme-based colloquia and colleagues who might be interested in developing proposals. It would be beneficial to encourage proposals focusing on disciplines and topics that have not been represented among the selected themes so far, she commented. The Dean agreed that ways to encourage a greater number and fuller range of proposals should be explored. The Committee recommended that the Copeland Colloquium should continue next year under the new approach. The Dean thanked the members and commented that, in addition to sending a letter to the Faculty inviting colleagues to submit theme proposals for 2011-2012, he plans to make an announcement at the next Faculty Meeting to encourage the submission of theme proposals. The minutes of the Committee's discussion would also serve to inform colleagues, he said.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Umphrey said that she would find it helpful to gain clarity about the process for nominating Croxton Lecturers, asking specifically about the role of departments in regard to these and the other visiting appointments that the Committee had discussed over the past several meetings. President Marx explained that, due to the need to reduce the budget for visiting faculty last year, he has tried to bolster that budget in a number of ways. One approach has been to make funding from the Croxton Lecture Fund (which had previously been used only to support single lectures at the College) available to support a small number of visiting positions for accomplished alumni and/or others to teach courses on a single-course basis, if departments wish to make proposals to the Dean, following regular procedures for requesting visitors. If nominations for Croxton Lecturers are brought forward by individual faculty or through self-nomination, departments are provided with information about the individual and choose whether they wish to host the visitor. All Croxton Lecturers must be hosted by a department, the President said. President Marx noted that the President's Initiative Fund (PIF) has also served as an additional source of funding for bringing visiting faculty to the College. Departments and groups of faculty could apply for visitors through the PIF. These visitors need not be hosted by departments, as agreed by the Faculty. In addition, the President noted that, after discussion with the Faculty, it had been agreed that he could invite a small number of highly distinguished scholars to be appointed as Simpson Lecturers or McCloy Professors to teach at the College for a period of up to three years and that there would be a total of no more than three Simpson Lecturers and only one McCloy Professor at any given time. All of these requests would come to the Committee of Six, including the Dean, in accordance with the processes upon which the Faculty had agreed. President Marx

Amended October 14, 2010

responded that he has been, and remains, open to nominations from individual faculty and/or departments for these visiting positions. The College had not accepted any new funds to underwrite any of these visiting positions, but is instead using existing endowments.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Basu asked what the teaching load is for Croxton Lecturers. The Dean said that Croxton funds could be used to support a range of visiting positions, from a single-course hire to a full-time visitor, but that, if an individual Croxton Lecturer is asked to teach more than two courses, it would be necessary to advertise and conduct a national search for the visitor. Professor Basu asked how many Croxton Lecturers may be supported each year. President Marx said that he would review the budget for the Croxton Fund and would report back to the members. Professor Basu asked if a department could request a Croxton Lecturer to teach a single course in an area in which there might be little expertise among Five-College faculty, making it impossible to hire a "Five-College Borrow." President Marx said that such a request would probably always have been a possibility, even without Croxton funding. The Dean agreed. Professor Umphrey thanked the President for the clarification that he had provided.

Noting the departure from the College of Steven Sauter, Museum Educator at the Amherst College Museum of Natural History, Director of the College's Bassett Planetarium, and Amherst College Weather Station Manager, Professor Loinaz asked about plans to fulfill Mr. Sauter's many responsibilities in the near and long term. Dean Call said that he has been in conversation with Professors Crowley, Greenstein, and Harms to develop plans to meet needs in the areas overseen by Mr. Sauter immediately, for the near future, and for the longer term. He stressed that for the short term, the focus will be on keeping facilities and programs running, until a replacement is hired for Mr. Sauter's position. For the medium and longer term, Dean Call said that he has asked faculty and administrative colleagues to explore with curators at the Mead Art Museum ways in which approaches to collections management, education, and outreach programs may overlap, and possibilities for collaborative approaches to meet the needs of the College's museums.

President Marx, noting Mr. Sauter's varied contributions to the College, commented that it may be difficult to find another colleague with such a unique combination of interests and skills to assume Mr. Sauter's role. The President said that he is awaiting a proposal for how best to move forward with structuring a replacement position. Commenting that the College has made a substantial commitment to the Natural History Museum and that Amherst will continue to do so, the President noted that more than 88,000 people have visited the Museum since it opened in its new location four years ago and that it is a valuable education resource for Amherst College and the wider community. Professor Loinaz asked if the future of the observatory, which is used largely at alumni and parent events and by local amateur astronomers, is being considered at this transitional juncture, both in terms of the departure of Mr. Sauter, and as a new science center is being conceived. Professor Loinaz commented that the telescope has historic value and was one of the most sophisticated instruments of its time, while noting that it is no longer a research-grade instrument. Professor Loinaz informed the members that he and other colleagues had met with the Dean some time ago about the possibility of establishing a science outreach center in the observatory building. President Marx said that, while no decisions have been made, the architects of the new science building could be asked to explore whether the telescope could become a part of the new science center. He said that, in his view, questions

Amended October 14, 2010

surrounding resources and the distance from the observatory to center of the campus would make establishing a science outreach center there a significant challenge.

The members reviewed a draft agenda for the October 19 Faculty Meeting. Dean Call said that, as the Committee had discussed, some members of the Senior Staff (Allen Hart, Dean of Students; Megan Morey, Chief Advancement Officer; Tom Parker, Dean of Admission and Financial Aid; and Peter Shea, Treasurer) will provide brief written reports in advance of the meeting (they will be posted with the Faculty Meeting agenda), and an opportunity for discussion and questions about the reports will be provided at the meeting. As part of the meeting, Treasurer Peter Shea will offer a presentation on the budget, and Jack Cheney, on behalf of the Planning Oversight Committee, will present an update on plans for the new science center. Professor Loinaz asked which colleagues make up the Senior Staff. President Marx said that the Senior Staff, all of whom report directly to him, are Dean Call, Allen Hart, Dean of Students; Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel; Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research and Planning; Megan Morey, Chief Advancement Officer; Tom Parker, Dean of Admission and Financial Aid; Susan Pikor, Executive Assistant to the President and Secretary to the Board of Trustees; Robyn Piggott, Special Assistant to the President; and Peter Shea, Treasurer. The members voted six to zero in favor of forwarding the Faculty Meeting agenda to the Faculty, after several suggested revisions have been made.

The Committee continued its conversation about restructuring visiting/temporary teaching positions at the College as permanent renewable teaching positions that are not tenure-track or tenured lines. Dean Call provided information about these positions by department, and discussed the process by which these positions had been created. The Dean also explained the structure of the contracts and process for review and renewal for these positions. He noted that teaching loads for these position vary, as several categories exist within these types of positions; some positions, for example, have an expectation of research and creative work, while others—those that are focused on pedagogy (largely language lecturers)—do not. The former type of position would have a lower teaching load than the latter, since there is an expectation of productivity in terms of research or creative work for those positions. Professor Saxton asked if any of these positions have administrative responsibilities. The Dean said that some do, and that it is up to departments to structure these positions. All of these positions have renewable contracts, the Dean said. Professor Umphrey asked the Dean if the structure of these positions seems to work well. The Dean said that he sees pros and cons to structuring positions as ongoing or rotating. If a position is structured as an ongoing one, then the structure of renewable contracts should be used, he said. Professor Basu suggested that, since this category of position seems to be growing and to be filling a need at the College, perhaps there should be an emphasis on making the process of review more rigorous. At present, it was noted, the Dean reads the reappointment file of those in these positions and shares his or her impressions with the Committee of Six. There are no outside reviewers, though candidates in some positions other than that of language lecturer are asked to report on their scholarly or creative work, Dean Call said.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Umphrey asked if the difficulty of evaluating creative work was a motivation for creating Resident Artist positions, rather than allocating additional tenure lines to arts departments. While acknowledging that evaluating creative work can pose challenges, the Dean said that there are constraints on the number of FTEs that can be allocated, since resources are limited. Since efforts have been made to move away from long-

Amended October 14, 2010

term visiting appointments, including a number of these positions within arts departments, the Resident Artist structure has provided a means of regularizing these positions and meeting departmental needs without allocating as many new FTEs.

Professor Basu reiterated that, if these positions are ongoing rather than rotating, she sees value in having greater scrutiny at moments of contract renewal, through the use of reviewers from outside the department or outside the College, for example. Professor Umphrey urged caution, commenting that, if the review for these positions approximates that done at the time of tenure, then these positions should become tenure lines. Professor Basu commented that introducing a more thorough review process, perhaps conducted by ad hoc committees that are outside the department and represent a stage of review without the Dean, would be a way of making moments of review more thorough and meaningful and would serve as a means to assess whether contracts should be continued or should not be renewed. The Committee then turned to a personnel matter.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 14, 2010

The fifth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 11:00 A.M. on Thursday, October 7, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton; Jide Zeitlin '85, Chairman of the Board of Trustees; Dean Call; President Marx; and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with the members congratulating President Marx on his appointment as President of the New York Public Library, a position that he had announced that he will assume at the end of this academic year. The President thanked the members and expressed regret that the announcement that he would be leaving the College had appeared in the media before he could inform the Amherst community, as he had planned. President Marx commented that he has been privileged and proud to be a member of the Amherst administration, Faculty, Board, and staff and to have had the opportunity to work closely with the Committee of Six.

Discussion turned to the process that will be used to search for the next President. Mr. Zeitlin, who said that a search consultant would be hired soon, explained that he will chair the search committee and that he plans to form the group by the time the Trustees complete their upcoming meetings (October 14-16). The Board Chairman described the make-up of the committee as follows: five Trustees, including himself; three faculty members (elected by the Faculty); one administrator (appointed by the President, in consultation with the Senior Staff); one staff member (selected by the Advisory Committee on Personnel Policies); two students; and two alumni/ae (selected through the Alumni Association). Mr. Zeitlin said that, while he is moving quickly to form the committee, once this structure is in place, the search process will proceed with thoroughness and care and will not be dictated by a calendar. The Chairman anticipates that the search committee will engage in conversation with the Amherst community for the remainder of this semester and will likely begin the stage of speaking with candidates during the Spring semester. The goal of the process will be to hire the strongest President possible, Mr. Zeitlin said, with the hope of appointing and/or having a new individual in place this summer. Depending on the course of events, it may become necessary to appoint an Interim President, Mr. Zeitlin noted.

Professor Umphrey asked how the Committee of Six could assist with the search process. Mr. Zeitlin thanked Professor Umphrey for inquiring and responded that there will be natural points of consultation with the Committee of Six as the search process unfolds. He said that the search committee may begin its consultative process by speaking with the Committee of Six.

The Dean discussed with the members possible ways of structuring the ballot for the election of the faculty representatives to the search committee. Dean Call noted that a Committee of Six-style election had been used to elect the faculty representatives to the most recent Presidential Search Committee, and the members agreed that a similar process should be used for this election. The members discussed whether to include on the ballot colleagues on leave this year and next, whether to include faculty who are administrators, and whether to include current members of the Committee of Six, the College Council, and the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). The members agreed that colleagues who are on leave this year should be asked whether they would prefer to be included on the ballot and should not be included unless they indicate a desire to be; faculty who are serving in administrative roles should not be included; faculty in their first year at the College should not be included; and members of the afore-mentioned committees should be included. By the time of the Committee of Six meeting, the Dean had sent an email to all tenure- and tenure-track faculty requesting that

Amended October 14, 2010

any colleague who did not wish to be on the ballot contact him and ask to be removed. The Committee thanked Mr. Zeitlin.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 14, 2010

The sixth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 2:00 P.M. on Friday, October 8, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The Committee turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 26, 2010

The seventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 9:00 A.M. on Thursday, October 14, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The members reviewed the final drafts of the minutes of October 4, October 8, and October 9 and voted unanimously to approve them. In the course of the Committee's recent review of new course proposals via email, some members had wondered about courses with single-digit enrollment caps that are being offered under the rubric of colloquia. The Dean explained that the College had received a \$200,000 grant from the Mellon Foundation for a three-year project designed to focus on student-faculty research collaboration in the social sciences and humanities. At present students often propose research projects that are unrelated to faculty members' own research areas, he said. This project will explore whether, by bringing student and faculty research projects into closer alignment, collaboration can be enhanced and become more meaningful for all involved.

Continuing, the Dean explained that, over the course of three years, beginning this spring, twelve (four each year) experimental tutorials will be developed and offered to Amherst students. There will be two types of tutorials, the Dean said, though both will be linked to the research interests of the Amherst faculty who are teaching them, and the courses will generally have six students per tutorial. The first type, for sophomores, will present research on a series of related questions in the faculty member's area of expertise. The other type, for juniors, is intended to facilitate students' identification and pursuit of a research topic. The Dean said that, in the sophomore tutorials, by investigating how different scholars approach a topic, students will learn to frame a research question, develop research strategies, and identify and use sources. The tutorials for juniors aim to facilitate students' engagement with a research topic that intersects closely with the scholarly interests of the faculty member who is teaching the tutorial. Dean Call noted that, in most cases, faculty are teaching the tutorials as overloads and are being paid a modest honorarium (the equivalent of a Five College "borrow") through the Mellon grant. In some instances, faculty members are teaching the tutorials as part of their regular course load. In these instances, the honorarium will be used to support a visitor to teach an additional course within the faculty member's department.

Professor Umphrey asked if the College plans to implement a tutorial program on a larger scale if this experiment is successful, or if more generally it has an interest in the model of tutorial-style teaching. Dean Call said that it is too early to make any determination, and explained that the tutorial experiment arose as a result of interest expressed by a small group of faculty; most of these colleagues will be teaching tutorials during the grant period. The success of the Amherst Academic Intern Program and the increasing number of student research proposals in the humanities and social sciences, he suggested, indicates that there is a desire to foster additional opportunities for students and faculty to collaborate on research within these disciplines. Professor Loinaz asked how the success of the tutorials will be measured. The Dean said that one measure will be whether students continue with their research projects over the summer and make them the focus of their honors theses. Professor Ciepiela suggested that courses within the Mellon program should be listed together in the course catalog since their parameters are so distinctive.

Turning to the other course proposals, Professor Basu noted that, as she reviewed them, she became concerned that the criteria for determining which students will be admitted to over-

Amended October 26, 2010

enrolled classes are not clear. Professor Saxton agreed, commenting that there is wide variation when it comes to clarity, and that it is best if the criteria that will be used for selection are as specific as possible. Professor Rockwell concurred, commenting that he feels that it is not in the best interest of the institution to allow faculty to choose their students. Professor Umphrey noted that, in her experience, every year the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) had discussed this issue and considered ways to give students greater clarity about how these decisions are made.

Dean Call next asked if Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services, could attend the October 19 Faculty Meeting as an invited guest, as the new science center project would be under discussion. The members agreed that Mr. Brassord should be invited. The members turned to personnel matters for the remainder of the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 28, 2010

The eighth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Tuesday, October 19, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with the Committee discussing three committee nominations. The Committee spent the remainder of the meeting on personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 29, 2010

The ninth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, October 25, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The members voted to approve the Committee's minutes of October 14, 2010. Dean Call next reported back on the responses he had received to invitations to colleagues to serve on three committees.

In response to the Committee's request, the Dean provided additional information on the Croxton Fund. The members asked about the parameters for using Croxton funds to support visiting faculty. President Marx said he would review relevant documents and report back to the Committee. The members discussed briefly [the draft of the advising manual](#) prepared by Ben Lieber, Dean of Academic Support and Student Research, which will be distributed to the Faculty. The Dean noted that the manual was reviewed previously by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). The Committee suggested several changes, which Dean Call agreed would be made to the document before it is distributed to the Faculty. The members then turned briefly to a personnel matter.

Discussion turned to the draft titled [Optimizing the Consortial Advantage by 2020: A Strategic Plan for Five Colleges, Incorporated](#) and [the responses by the CEP and the Committee on Priorities and Resources \(CPR\)](#) (in the form of minutes) to this strategic plan. The members praised the two committees' responses and agreed with the CEP and CPR's general view that the College should support the principle of Five College cooperation, but that any specific proposals that are considered within the plan or which may emerge from this document would need to be reviewed carefully by relevant College governance structures. The three committees agreed that the draft plan represents a broad vision that does not provide the details that would be needed to generate a response from the College to particular proposals. There was hesitancy expressed about endorsing the document in any way because of this lack of specifics and because of concern about indicating a commitment to a number of ideas put forward in the plan.

Professor Basu expressed the view that some directions outlined in the plan could be fruitful, while others were controversial. She expressed enthusiasm for the plan's support for exploring consortial approaches to a range of academic-support functions, such as disability services, strengthening intellectual communities through Five College faculty symposia, and expanding opportunities for faculty members to teach on other campuses. While she appreciated Five College certificate programs in area studies and other interdisciplinary programs, Professor Basu questioned the proposal to consider a five-year master's and other post-baccalaureate degrees. She expressed concern that the intellectual rationale for this program was weak and that it appeared to be marketing the consortium. In terms of the master's proposal, President Marx commented that participation by the College in such a program would depend on faculty approval of such an effort, and that the Amherst Faculty would consider each proposal via its governance structures.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Umphrey asked about steps that might be planned to follow the stage of gathering feedback on the strategic plan from the campuses: she asked who would operationalize the plan? Who would work on developing specific proposals? Professor Umphrey stressed the importance of making the answers to these questions clear. Dean Call noted that the planning document represents ideas that have been proposed and discussed by faculty and administrators at Five College institutions, and that the relevant governance

Amended October 29, 2010

structures of each institution would consider, and, when appropriate would vote, on any concrete proposals that are brought forward.

The Committee noted that, in their responses to the plan, both the CPR and the CEP had commented on the view expressed in the document that difficulties with transportation pose an impediment to collaboration and the interrelated issue of aligning calendars among the campuses. The members, the Dean, and the President agreed that the current transportation system is an obstacle to students who wish to take courses on other campuses, while noting that no specific proposals for improvement have been put forward. The Committee agreed that, while some coordination of class schedules could possibly be explored, it would be difficult to implement a fully aligned class schedule. It was noted that Amherst is currently in the process of developing proposals to make fuller use of the class schedule on its own campus, and that trying to do so among the other campuses would be challenging. Professor Rockwell noted, as did the CEP, that difficulties with transportation and scheduling were in fact a curricular issue, since such impediments to taking courses on other campuses have to date made the coordination of curricula unfeasible in practice.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Ciepiela commented that she shares the concerns of the CPR and the CEP about the plan's emphasis on "greater integration and coordination of upper-level curricula in selected disciplines consistent with disciplinary needs and resource limitations on each campus; ...Through thoughtful, cooperative planning, we can achieve even greater academic preeminence while reducing unneeded duplication of effort." Professor Ciepiela noted that she has observed that this approach has moved beyond rhetoric and is beginning to have an effect on academic programs in the form of not replacing some positions upon colleagues' retirement. Professor Rockwell noted that the concept of not duplicating positions could, in a worst case scenario, lead to a tendency for Five College institutions not to hire in any academic field in which there might be even proximate coverage by faculty on one of the other campuses. The Committee discussed the possibility of other institutions, which may lack Amherst's resources, coming to rely on Amherst to fill their curricular voids. Professor Ciepiela, like the CEP, stressed the importance of Amherst continuing to be able to mount its own majors and not depend on courses on other campuses for major requirements. The President agreed. Offering the example of the sciences, Professor Umphrey pointed out that often courses at Amherst are taught at a different level and through different approaches than at other Five College institutions.

President Marx asked what the basis should be for Five College collaboration. Professor Rockwell stressed that demand in the form of enrollments should not drive decisions about the make-up of Amherst's curriculum and the allocation of faculty positions. Professor Umphrey agreed that enrollments are often an unreliable metric when it comes to making such decisions, and the members concurred that the intellectual integrity of arguments should drive such conversations. President Marx asked the members if they would agree that, when it is not possible for Amherst to hire a full FTE in a particular field that would enrich the curriculum, it is beneficial to share a faculty position between or among the schools, rather than not being able to offer courses in the field at the College at all. He cited as a successful outcome of such an approach the recent hiring of a medieval historian, who is based at Amherst and teaches two courses here and two at Mount Holyoke. Professor Saxton noted, however, that this was a net loss for the history department.

Amended October 29, 2010

Continuing the conversation, Professor Ciepiela said that she also shares the concern of the CEP and the CPR about the strategic plan's proposal to prioritize Five College collaboration in the review of individual Amherst College departments. Professor Umphrey agreed, noting her concern about the proposal to: "coordinate reviews of departments and programs across institutions, charging those departments and programs to include a report on current and potential complementary and parallel programs at the consortium partner schools, and charging visiting review teams to include resources across the five institutions in their investigations and deliberations, and to assess the most appropriate articulation." Professor Umphrey urged caution in the College's response to this suggestion and to other aspects of the strategic plan. Professor Basu stressed that there is a danger that Amherst could be perceived as being narrowly self interested if it simply expresses skepticism about the proposal. She thought it would be a good idea to express broad support for increasing Five College collaboration since the College is not making any commitments to specific proposals. Professor Umphrey agreed that there was much of value to embrace in many of these proposals. President Marx reiterated that, in regard to all aspects of the plan that would require a faculty vote, Amherst is not now making any commitments, and that, if such specific proposals are put forward, Amherst will make decisions about them through its regular governance structures. Professor Umphrey wondered who would vet aspects of these proposals not obviously related to the curriculum that might, nevertheless, potentially affect the College's curricular organization (for example, current deliberations among the Five Colleges concerning the coordination of academic calendars or the potential online intermingling of the Five Colleges' course catalogs). Professor Loinaz asked what would occur after each campus provides feedback on the plan. President Marx said that the Faculty's responses to the plan would be communicated to the Five Colleges. Professor Basu said that she is curious about the mechanisms that will be used during upcoming stages of the review process for the plan.

The members next reviewed a draft agenda for a Faculty Meeting on November 2 and voted six to zero to forward it to the Faculty. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 29, 2010

The tenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Tuesday, October 26, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The entire meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 1, 2010

The eleventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, November 1, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Dean began the meeting by reporting back to the members about a committee nomination. The Committee turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 2, 2010

The twelfth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 9:30 A.M. on Thursday, November 4, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

In light of the request made by Professor Staller at the November 2 Faculty Meeting, the Committee had a discussion about procedures, considering whether any individual faculty member should be permitted to have a written statement that she or he had read aloud at a Faculty Meeting appended to the Faculty Meeting minutes. Dean Call noted that faculty members sometimes read from statements as a means of making comments at Faculty Meetings. He said that the practice has been to summarize such statements and to incorporate them into the Faculty Meeting minutes as recorded remarks attributed to the individual who read them. President Marx noted Professor Staller's opinions of peer institutions but also that he has heard from other faculty that they disagree. Professor Saxton asked who is able to read the Faculty Meeting minutes and expressed concern that, if the statement were to be appended to the minutes, it might appear that the College is endorsing its substance. Dean Call responded that, those faculty members and administrators who are entitled to attend Faculty Meetings are the individuals to whom the minutes are distributed; however, it is possible that the substance of this and other statements appended to the minutes could be circulated far more broadly in ways over which the College has no control. Professor Rockwell noted that the minutes belong to the Faculty as a corporate body and are approved by the Faculty. He expressed the view that no individual should have undue control over the minutes or a disproportionate voice within them. The Committee agreed that it would have been appropriate for the document in question to have been submitted to the Committee of Six, as the body that sets the agenda for Faculty Meetings, before the Faculty Meeting, so that the members could have commented on the document through the Committee's minutes and could have decided whether the document should be discussed at the Faculty Meeting as part of the agenda. President Marx said that he would forward Professor Staller's statement to the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, as she had requested. The Committee turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 1, 2010

The thirteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, November 8, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with the Committee discussing the possibility of having a Faculty Meeting on December 7 and likely agenda items, including a proposal from the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) for a revision to the honors system involving students who receive a summa recommendation on their thesis, but whose cumulative GPA falls below the top 25 percent but within the top 40 percent of the class, and a College calendar proposal from the College Council. The members agreed to set the agenda for the meeting at the Committee's meeting on November 19. The members then turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 1, 2010

The fourteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Tuesday, November 9, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 2, 2010

The fifteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 1:00 P.M. on Friday, November 19, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Committee turned to personnel matters.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Umphrey asked about the decision that had been made about the English department's request that the Creative Writing Program's Writer-in-Residence position be restructured from a rotating ongoing position to a permanent one. President Marx said that he has asked the English department to structure the Writer-in-Residence position as either a rotating or a tenure-track position, and informed the Committee that he has agreed to allow the current structure to continue for another two years while the department re-considers the organization of the Creative Writing Program. Professor Loinaz asked if a decision had been made about the request made by Professor Staller at the November 2 Faculty Meeting that the written statement that she had read aloud at the meeting be appended to the Faculty Meeting minutes. Dean Call said that, following regular practice, Professor Staller's statement would be summarized and included in the minutes. He said that he plans to contact her before the Faculty Meeting to convey this information.

Discussion turned to the letter and proposal ([appended via link](#)) from the College Council regarding the calendar for the Spring semester for the next several academic years. Professor Ciepiela noted that information is not included in the proposal about the intentions of the University and Mount Holyoke vis a vis the calendar after 2012. Dean Call said that it is his understanding that all of the Five College institutions are moving in the direction of the UMass calendar, with regard to the start of the Spring semester. According to the proposal, in the five out of seven years in which the university begins the Spring semester on the Tuesday after Martin Luther King Day, Amherst would start on Thursday of that week and would have Thursday and Friday and the next five days for an add/drop period. The first Friday would be treated as a Wednesday. The last Wednesday of the term would then count as a Friday. During the two years out of seven that the University begins on the Monday after Martin Luther King Day, Amherst would start on that day as well, and there would be an eight-day add/drop period and thus a second Wednesday would be included in add/drop period. Professor Umphrey asked if some Tuesday seminars meet only once a week and whether all classes meet more than once during add/drop. She wondered whether the proposal would exacerbate the problem of students having to make decisions about whether to keep a class after it had met only once during the add/drop period. The Dean said that his recollection is that Wednesday has more classes with once-a-week meeting times so that it is desirable to have two Wednesday meetings during add/drop. It was noted that the specific dates of spring break are not yet known in the coming years at some of the Five-College institutions. Professor Rockwell suggested that the Faculty vote on the proposal with the understanding that, by 2014, the Faculty would be asked to decide whether to accept the dates for spring break. Dean Call said that he expects that the breaks will be in sync among the schools. The Committee then voted six to zero to forward the calendar proposal to the Faculty.

The Committee turned once again to personnel matters. President Marx left the meeting at 2:15 P.M.

Discussion turned to the letter and proposal ([appended via link](#)) from the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) for an adjustment to the honors system. The change would grant

Amended December 2, 2010

magna cum laude honors to students who had received summa recommendations from their departments and whose G.P.A.s fell into the 25 to 40 percent range. Professor Rockwell expressed concern that all G.P.A. cut-offs are arbitrary, so that, no matter how they are adjusted, there will always be those who are unhappy and feel that an injustice is being done when a student comes close to the cut-off, but fails to reach it. Professor Ciepiela, who said that she is in favor of the proposal, noted that the adjustment is designed to address the nature of the penalty that has been in place when a student who has done summa-level thesis work, but then fails to meet the G.P.A. cut-off, falls to cum as a result. Professor Umphrey said that she supports the proposal and has observed that there is widespread unhappiness among the Faculty with the current cut-off. She feels that the proposal represents an appropriate response to a perceived injustice, and that it will affect a small number of students who just miss the cut-off and suffer a “two-notch” penalty. Dean Call said that the proposal, in his view, represents a reasonable compromise, while noting the problem of grade compression. Professor Basu said that she supports the proposal, as well.

Continuing the discussion of the CEP’s proposal, Professor Rockwell commented that he has the impression that there are discrepancies among departments in terms of the expectations for a summa thesis and recommendation, and that the proposal is inviting another form of grade inflation. Professor Saxton said that she supports the proposal, commenting that its adoption might lead to a more straightforward evaluation of theses. She noted that the CEP has said that only a small number of students would be affected by this change. Professor Umphrey noted that the problem of summa students dropping down to cum is quite visceral in her department, where most students write theses. Professor Loinaz expressed some distaste for any system of honors and wondered whether honors serve any useful purpose once a student leaves Amherst. He expressed the view that the rewards for doing an honors thesis should be intrinsic to the experience and should not require outside reinforcement. Professor Umphrey argued that law schools and graduate schools in some fields take honors into account when making admissions decisions. Professor Rockwell expressed the view that the cum designation has become devalued and should be seen as an honor, rather than as a punishment. Professor Umphrey reiterated that the drop from a summa to a cum is a substantial one. Dean Call suggested that a partial solution to grade compression is that the standard for summa could be raised.

Professor Ciepiela said that, while she would not advocate a re-imagining of the honors system (and the other members agreed), she would support this proposal as a “quick fix” and relatively minor change that could rectify the problem at hand. Professor Umphrey agreed, commenting that there is no perfect system, but that the proposal offers a helpful modification. Professor Rockwell said that he is not persuaded that this change is necessary, though he favors bringing the proposal before the Faculty for consideration and vote. Professor Basu commented that departments could explore how best to raise standards for theses, if there is a desire to strengthen the honors system at the College. She suggested that, if departments wish, they could institute requirements for honors students that could ensure that only the most capable students undertake honors-level work and that overall standards would be raised. The Committee voted four in favor (Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Saxton, and Umphrey) and two opposed (Professors Loinaz and Rockwell) on the substance of the honors system proposal (and the motion contained therein) and six in favor and zero opposed to forwarding the proposal to the Faculty.

The Committee reviewed proposals for new courses, asked the Dean to clarify one question with a colleague, and voted six to zero to forward the courses to the Faculty. The

Amended December 2, 2010

members then reviewed a draft agenda for the Faculty Meeting of December 7 and voted six to zero to forward it to the Faculty. Professor Umphrey suggested that the Committee should, perhaps, consider adding as a regular feature of Faculty Meeting agendas, occasional and very brief updates from major committees. She noted that such updates could be valuable as a communication vehicle for the Faculty and has seen this mechanism used as a feature of other colleges' agendas for faculty meetings. Dean Call said that it could be useful to think about this idea, including having committees offer short written reports that could serve as updates and be appended to agendas, in the context of considering whether Faculty Meetings should be held more regularly. Professor Umphrey said that she feels that these reports could offer an informative sense of what is going on across the landscape of the College. Professor Rockwell commented that he would be cautious about having ideas that had not been fully digested by a committee put forward through such reports. Professor Umphrey agreed that doing so could be problematic and wondered if the reports might focus on committees' completed work, for example. Dean Call said that he could imagine a handful of major committees, which constantly have matters before them and that meet regularly, reporting and inviting the Faculty's comments. The Committee agreed to explore at a future meeting whether this and other suggestions might enable Faculty Meetings to become more informative.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 1, 2010

The sixteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:15 P.M. on Monday, November 29, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended January 10, 2011

The seventeenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, December 6, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with Announcements from the Dean. Dean Call informed the members that the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, has set the date of its Commencement this year for Friday, May 13. He then asked the Committee to suggest nominations for a committee assignment. With sadness, Dean Call informed the Committee that James E. Wallace, Jr., who had served as an attorney for the College for many years, passed away on December 1, 2010. On behalf of the College, he expressed his deep appreciation for Mr. Wallace's work on Amherst's behalf. The Committee next voted six to zero in favor of forwarding a course proposal to the Faculty. The members spent the remainder of the meeting on personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended January 6, 2011

The eighteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:15 P.M. on Wednesday, December 8, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended January 4, 2011

The nineteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:15 P.M. on Friday, December 10, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Robyn Piggott, Recorder.

The members reviewed the Committee's schedule of upcoming meetings and then discussed committee nominations. The members devoted the remainder of the meeting to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended January 4, 2011

The twentieth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, December 13, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended January 10, 2011

The twenty-first meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Tuesday, December 14, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended January 4, 2011

The twenty-second meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 10:30 A.M. on Friday, December 17, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended February 17, 2011

The twenty-third meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, December 20, 2010. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Dean informed the members that he has learned that Smith College may change its original intention to move the start of its spring semester to coincide with the dates of the beginning of the spring semester at the University of Massachusetts, and with the other Five-College institutions that have decided to do so. Dean Call noted that he has spoken with the deans at Mount Holyoke, Hampshire, and the university, and with colleagues at Five Colleges, and that they plan to continue spring calendar conversations with colleagues at Smith. Currently, Amherst, Mount Holyoke, Hampshire, and the university are scheduled to start their spring semesters within two class days of each other every year beginning next year. One saving grace is that, for the next two years, spring 2012 and 2013, taking Smith's current plans into account, all five institutions are scheduled to start their spring terms within two or three days of each other. President Marx said that he had communicated his concern about this decision to Smith's president, stressing the negative impact that an out-of-sync calendar could have on Five-College collaboration. Dean Call said that he would share Smith's decision with the College Council. Several members wondered if the Faculty should be asked to reconsider its vote on the calendar, in light of Smith's decision. Dean Call said that he imagines that the College Council would consider this possibility but that no action is necessary for at least a year. After discussing a committee nomination, the Committee turned to personnel matters. The members then discussed possible agenda items for the Spring semester.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended February 21, 2011

The twenty-fourth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, January 31, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with Announcements from the President, who shared with the members highlights of the Trustees' winter meetings, which were held in Los Angeles on January 21 and 22. Among the topics discussed at the meetings were national trends in the area of student health and the generational transition that the Amherst Faculty will undergo in the coming decades as a result of a significant number of retirements. In addition, as is typical at its winter meeting, a report on admission was presented to the Board.

Prompted by President Marx's reference to expected retirements, Professor Basu asked if there is a College policy regarding the allocation of FTEs to replace retiring faculty. Is there an expectation, for example, that a retiring faculty member's position will be replaced with a new FTE within the department in which he or she had taught? Dean Call replied that, upon a faculty member's retirement, the FTE returns to the FTE pool. The process that a department would use to request a replacement FTE would be the same as the one that would be followed for a new FTE—a request for a position would be made to the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). The CEP prioritizes FTE allocations and makes a recommendation to the President and the Dean, and the President and Dean, taking into consideration the recommendations of the committee, decide on the allocation of FTEs. Professor Basu asked if a department that is seeking a replacement FTE has any advantage in the allocation process. Dean Call noted that many departments view the retirement of a colleague as a transitional moment, an occasion to reconfigure a position to meet shifting curricular needs and/or to offer courses in a new field. Departments that have undergone external reviews have found that process to be informative and valuable when developing an FTE request, President Marx and Dean Call noted.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Umphrey asked whether many departments will experience a high proportion of retirements among their faculty over the next decade. Dean Call said that a number of departments will be affected in substantive ways by retirements. Noting the departmentally-based nature of curricular change, which often occurs on an individual basis through the hiring process at the College, Professor Umphrey wondered how the Faculty can most effectively drive broad and interdisciplinary conversations about the shaping of the curriculum. Dean Call noted that many departments have taken advantage of the external review process to consider the curriculum across fields; he said that, when considering FTE recommendations, the approach of the CEP is to take an overall view, thinking about how a set of positions across the College will contribute to the curriculum as a whole. Professor Umphrey suggested that it would be valuable for the CEP to have a direct conversation with the Faculty about how the curriculum is evolving and will evolve.

Professor Ciepiela offered the view that, in order for the Faculty to consider and oversee the curricular changes that will result from the generational transition of the Faculty, it would be helpful to make information available about the departments/fields in which retirements are expected to occur over the next decade. Dean Call agreed and said that he would provide the Committee with information in aggregate, both by department and College-wide, on the percentage of faculty who are in five-year age spans beginning with age thirty and under and continuing through age eighty and over. Dean Call said that providing greater specificity would not be possible because of the need to maintain confidentiality surrounding the retirement plans

Amended February 21, 2011

and ages of individual faculty. In addition to the information on the distribution of faculty within particular age ranges, Dean Call agreed to provide the members with data on the number of faculty who would be entering phased retirement over the next year and a half. Dean Call reviewed the phased retirement program with the Committee, including the substance of the grant that the College received in 2008 from the Mellon Foundation that extends (between 2008 and 2012) the financial benefit (a stipend that is a specified percentage of an individual's salary) of the phased retirement program for a three-year period to faculty entering the program at age sixty-five and older. Ordinarily, faculty members must elect to enter phased retirement when they are between age sixty to sixty-five to receive a salary-based stipend.

The Committee next discussed a Committee nomination. Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the members that an external review of the Department of Information Technology will take place February 13 through 15. Michael Roy, Dean of Library and Information Services at Middlebury College, will chair the review committee, which will also include Robert Juckiewicz, Vice President for Information Technology at Hofstra University, and Joanne Kossuth, Vice President for Operations and Chief Information Officer at Franklin W Olin College of Engineering. Dean Call said that the review will consider a range of issues, including those surrounding organization and structure, interactions among IT and other areas of the College, and ways of facilitating innovation. The Committee then turned to a personnel matter.

The members discussed their agenda for the Spring semester. They first agreed on a schedule for reviewing reappointment cases. The members next discussed their meeting time and agreed to meet on Mondays at 3:30 P.M. The members decided that the following dates should be held for Faculty Meetings: March 1, April 5, April 19, and May 3, and May 19 (the Commencement meeting). Since pre-registration is set for April 4–April 8 and there will be a need to approve Fall-semester courses, the members considered whether there should be a Faculty Meeting on March 1 and whether a demonstration of the procedures for online registration should be on the agenda. The Dean said that he would research what plans have already been put in place to provide for training the Faculty about online registration to inform the members' decision about the date for the next Faculty Meeting. The Committee agreed that it is useful to have regular Faculty Meetings. In the context of setting the schedule for the Committee's consideration of committee assignments, Professor Rockwell asked the Dean when the online election would be held for the Committee of Six. The Dean said that it is now possible to compose the ballot for the election, since leave plans are known and the election for the Advisory Committee to the Committee on Trusteeship and the Advisory Committee on Honorary Degrees has been completed. The election can be held as soon as the ballot is prepared, the Dean said.

Continuing with the discussion of the Committee's agenda for the spring, Professor Loinaz reminded the members that, earlier in the year, prompted by a request by the Board, faculty governance had been raised as a topic on which the members might focus some discussion. Suggesting that there might be concrete issues that the Committee could identify and address within this and other areas, Professor Umphrey wondered what the questions surrounding faculty governance and other issues might be, and what the Committee might accomplish this semester. The Committee decided to consider tenure procedures and issues relating to the demographics of the Faculty, including the upcoming wave of retirements and faculty diversity.

Amended February 21, 2011

The Committee next discussed an email communication from Professor Sarat ([appended](#)), in which he requested that the members forward a motion to the Faculty to create a rule that, with the exception of changes made by the Dean of the Faculty in his role as the person responsible for the Faculty Meeting minutes, all changes to the Faculty Meeting minutes be made publicly during meetings of the Faculty. Beginning the conversation, Dean Call said that he wished to make a statement about the Committee of Six minutes, more generally. He noted that, over time, the minutes have become more extensive and detailed, and that he worries that colleagues may not be wading through these dense and lengthy documents. Dean Call expressed the view that the goal of ensuring transparency might be better served by having summary notes that have less detail. Professor Umphrey agreed, noting the communicative value of succinctness in minutes. In regard to Professor Sarat's reference in his note to a comment made by Professor Rockwell during the Committee's meeting of November 4, Professor Rockwell said that his comment (that the minutes belong to the Faculty as a corporate body and are approved by the Faculty, and that no individual should have undue control over the minutes or a disproportionate voice within them), if accepted in principle, makes the proposed rule unnecessary. When first circulated, the draft of the Faculty Meeting minutes, he said, does not become part of the record until the Faculty votes to approve them. In his view, the timing of any changes in the draft is less important than the Faculty's vigilance in assuring the minutes' accuracy. If, for example, any voting member of the Faculty Meeting felt that a statement by the President had not been portrayed accurately in the draft of the minutes, that member has the right to propose an amendment to the draft during the meeting, Professor Rockwell remarked. The final arbiter of any disagreement concerning the accuracy of the draft is the vote that establishes the draft as the official record. Dean Call noted that the question has been raised as to how a colleague might offer a revision to his or her comments if he or she is not present at the Faculty Meeting in which the minutes containing these comments are approved. The Dean said that, in such a circumstance, the colleague can propose a revision to those minutes at a subsequent Faculty Meeting, and that the Faculty could vote on the amendment to the previously approved minutes.

Continuing the discussion of Professor Sarat's proposal, Professor Basu expressed the view that the timing of this proposal is awkward because of the impending transition in the presidency of the College. She suggested that, rather than deciding on this question now, it would be preferable for the new president to participate in the discussion about it. Professor Umphrey noted that the Faculty does not adhere to Robert's Rules of Order with strictness, often departing from the rules during Faculty meetings. For example, colleagues do not amend other colleagues' comments. The chair of the Faculty Meeting does not step out of the chairmanship if he or she wishes to speak. Minutes, in the traditional sense, are understood to be a record of what is done at the meetings, Professor Umphrey commented. While acknowledging the value of our customary detailed record, she expressed concern at the amount of time recently consumed by discussions of minutes—discussions about discussions—rather than the substantive business of the College. President Marx noted that the volume of minutes—of various committees and the Faculty Meetings—and the regular need to review them can be counterproductive. He suggested that the Faculty might consider with his successor ways to have less detailed and voluminous minutes that can be circulated in a more timely manner. He wondered whether it would be beneficial to inform discussions at Faculty Meetings by having colleagues submit questions to the administration in advance of the meetings. With the benefit

Amended February 21, 2011

of time for thought, and the ability to research questions raised, such a system might allow the President and the Dean to offer more constructive responses to the Faculty, President Marx suggested. Professor Ciepiela commented that what happens in Faculty Meetings is not determined by having detailed minutes. In her view, it is important for the minutes to be a record of Faculty Meetings, for the Faculty to “own” it, and for there to be mechanisms for making sure that the minutes are accurate, along the lines described by Professor Rockwell.

Returning to the topic of the Committee of Six minutes, Professor Ciepiela expressed the view that having detailed minutes that portray the nuances of the Committee’s discussions and the views of individual members is important for transparency; the minutes also are a valuable source of information for later members when revisiting issues. Professor Loinaz asked for the source of the sense that many faculty members are not reading the Committee of Six minutes. He said that any complaints that he has heard have focused on the delay in distributing the minutes, but not their substance. The members agreed that the evidence for this view was anecdotal.

In terms of the Faculty Meeting minutes, Professor Rockwell commented that the substance of these minutes is rarely discussed and that there have been few objections to the minutes over the years. The Committee agreed that moving in the direction of a transcript or tape-recording of Faculty Meetings would not be desirable. The President was asked about changes that he has made in the past to drafts of the minutes before they have been circulated to the Faculty. President Marx said that he has limited his revisions to his own comments, and that changes to them have been minor, involving a word here or there. Returning to Professor Sarat’s proposal, Professor Saxton said that it suggests a level of suspicion that seems divisive. Professor Rockwell commented that he would be disinclined to forward a motion to the Faculty because he does not feel that the proposed rule would accomplish anything other than shifting a potentially unpleasant discussion over the accuracy of the draft minutes from the floor of the Faculty, where, he feels, such discussions belong, to a private conversation in the Dean’s office. He noted that, if Professor Sarat disagreed with his position, he would have the option of proposing the motion from the floor of a Faculty Meeting. The Committee then voted on a motion to forward Professor Sarat’s proposal to the Faculty, with the members voting one in favor (Professor Loinaz) and five opposed.

Discussion turned to the recommendation ([appended](#)) from the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) that the College adopt an enhanced parenting-leave policy. Professor Rockwell asked if it is within the purview of the Faculty to revise the current policy, since it is a benefit. Dean Call said that the Faculty cannot effect a change to the current benefit, but can vote on whether to endorse the proposal as an important policy change, and on whether to recommend to the Board that the proposal be adopted. He noted that there are financial implications to such a change in policy, estimating that the proposed plan would cost an additional \$150,000 per year. Professor Umphrey noted that, at the time that the current policy was recommended, the Faculty felt that the policy should move in a direction of greater inclusivity. She also recalled that some concerns had been raised about the policy being an “unequal benefit.” Professor Umphrey wondered whether the distinction made in the proposal between parents who give birth and those who don’t, in terms of benefits outlined, reflects a strategic approach adopted by the committee to take advantage of the potential for pregnancy-related medical leaves, or a substantive argument about inherent differences between birth parents and other parents; that is, whether the approach proposed (using an existing benefit, medical leave, to enhance the parenting leave benefit) is reflective of awareness by the

Amended February 21, 2011

committee of current economic times and the accompanying challenge of adding benefits. Dean Call suggested that the Committee refer to the minutes of the discussion of the CPR, noting that some members of the committee argued that there is an important distinction between parents who give birth and other parents. In particular, some members of the CPR expressed the view, the Dean said, that those who give birth experience challenges, in terms of loss of time for research, that other parents do not. While expressing her support for a more generous parenting leave policy, Professor Basu said that she found the biologically-based argument divisive and unpersuasive, for all infants are equally demanding. As the College's parenting leave policies recognized, shared parenting has become more common. Professor Saxton said that she had some sympathy for the argument that those who give birth experience unique physical challenges. Professor Umphrey, noting the CPR's judgment that Amherst offers the least generous parenting-leave policy of all of its peers, asked why Amherst is not a leader in this area.

President Marx noted that any proposal to add or enhance a benefit should consider the full array of benefits currently offered by the College and should guide policy-making. In terms of the view that the College may not be a leader in the area of parental leave, he noted that Amherst is a leader when it comes to other benefits. Adjustments to benefits should be considered within a context of the full range of offerings, the President said. Professor Umphrey said that the view that the College's parental leave policy is inadequate pre-dates the recession and has been percolating for many years and noted that the current policy may disadvantage the College in the recruitment of faculty. Professor Loinaz said that there should be a discussion of the distinctions that are being made within the CPR's proposals and the principles that underlie the form of benefits that the College chooses to offer. The Committee agreed that it would be helpful to have more context about benefits issues and costs before proceeding with its discussion. They asked the Dean to request that Shannon Gurek, Associate Treasurer and Director of the Budget, provide additional information about Amherst's benefits and their costs. He agreed to do so. The Committee also asked if any research had been done on the parenting leave policies of other schools and for information about how Amherst's policy compares. The Dean said that such research had been done, and that he would be glad to share it with the Committee, though he would offer again that, from a financial point of view, it is important to consider benefits as a package, rather than isolating one benefit for purposes of comparison. The members agreed to review the minutes of the CPR's discussions of parental leave to inform the Committee of Six's conversation.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended February 25, 2011

The twenty-fifth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, February 7, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with the Dean reporting back to the Committee that he had learned at the meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) the previous Friday that there is an extensive plan in place for providing training to the Faculty as part of the implementation of online registration, including a presentation for a Faculty Meeting.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Umphrey asked about the status of discussions about the Five-College calendar. Dean Call responded that the Five-College deans have met, and that the Five-College presidents will soon do so, to discuss Smith’s decision to start its spring semester later than had been agreed upon previously. If Smith pursues its plans, the dates of the start of the spring semester would be out of sync among the Five College schools during some years. The Dean said that the deans and presidents are studying the implications of this situation and are requesting that Smith reconsider. Since the calendars that are in place for the next two years are in sync, the Dean told the members that there is no need to rush to reconsider the Amherst College calendar that was approved by the Faculty at its meeting of December 7. The College Council is being alerted to this issue and will be asked to consider it, Dean Call said.

Continuing with “Questions from Committee Members, Professor Umphrey inquired about the next phase of the Five-College strategic planning process. President Marx said that he is not aware of significant outcomes at this point, while noting that there is information about the progress of the plan on the Five-College web site (http://www.fivecolleges.edu/sites/planning/documents/5college_strategic_initiatives1-7-11.pdf). Dean Call reported that he has been told that Five Colleges Executive Director Neal Abraham has been reviewing bus schedules with the director of the Pioneer Valley Transit Authority (PVTA) in an effort to synchronize bus schedules with class schedules. The Committee next turned to a personnel matter.

As part of a discussion of the changing demographics of the Faculty, the Dean reviewed with the members data ([appended](#)) on faculty age ranges and the method by which faculty members are “counted” in the FTE count during the period of phased retirement. (Faculty members in phased retirement are counted as half an FTE if the colleague is sixty or sixty-one and are not included in the FTE count if they are age sixty-two or over.) The Dean noted that, due to the number of retirements (despite robust tenuring and reappointment rates, an excellent retention rate for faculty, and significant hiring in recent years), the Faculty FTE cap of 168 has not been reached. At present, the FTE count is 163, the Dean said. He reviewed once again (see Committee of Six discussion of the program in the [January 31, 2011, minutes](#)) the details of the enhancement of the phased retirement program that is being supported through a grant from the Mellon Foundation. The Dean noted that the program, which is scheduled to end on June 30, 2012, will aid in efforts to plan for the new hiring that will be necessitated by transitions within the Faculty, as more faculty choose to enter phased retirement and their schedule for retirement is set. At present, the Dean said, one third of the Faculty is on phased retirement or is eligible for

Amended February 25, 2011

it. Professor Loinaz asked whether the requirement that Faculty who own College houses must sell their homes back to the College within two years of retiring serves as a disincentive to retirement. The Dean said that this policy could influence some colleagues' decisions, as do many other factors, the state of the economy and financial markets among them.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Rockwell asked about the optimal distribution of ranks within the Faculty. Dean Call noted that it is desirable to have a balanced distribution of experience across the Faculty, and he offered that the distribution at present is fairly good. In the future, as faculty retire, President Marx commented that it may be desirable to make some senior faculty hires, in order to maintain the distribution within faculty ranks. Professor Umphrey asked if the level of experience within a department could be taken into account when making FTE allocations. President Marx said that it is possible for the CEP and the administration to take the level of experience of faculty into account as one of the factors that is considered as part of an FTE request. For instance, departments can be informed that the CEP and the administration would welcome requests for senior faculty hires; departments would be free to submit such requests, if they wished.

Professor Loinaz said that it has been his understanding that the College has been reluctant to make senior faculty hires in the past and wondered whether there would now be more flexibility in this regard. Professors Umphrey and Ciepiela agreed that senior faculty hires have been rare, on the theory that departments often prefer to hire tenure-track assistant professors so that colleagues have time to adjust to the Amherst culture and to the College's expectations for scholarship, teaching, and service. President Marx noted that hiring at the senior level can allow for bringing in different perspectives. Professor Basu said that some departments in which significant numbers of senior faculty were retiring might benefit from senior hires, particularly in mentoring tenure-track faculty. She noted that the College does not, at present, have mentoring policies and suggested that models for mentoring at other institutions be explored. Professor Umphrey expressed concern that a wave of retirements will occur at the same time that the student body has been enlarged. She suggested that resources be applied more aggressively toward faculty hiring and urged that there be faculty-led conversation about this once-in-a-generation moment to determine the shape of the curriculum. Dean Call commented that phased retirement permits retiring colleagues to remain at the College to teach a reduced load for three to ten years, depending on when they enter the program. When a replacement is hired, a department may have the teaching equivalent of 1.5 FTEs during the overlapping years. Bridge appointments also provide this opportunity, he said. Professor Ciepiela noted that faculty on phased retirement most often do not participate in committee work or in advising.

While discussing the other end of the experience spectrum, the Committee agreed that, in many fields, it is more common for new Ph.D.s to have post-docs, and for this reason and a range of others, tenure-track faculty are often older when they are hired now than they may have been in the past, depending on their field. Dean Call commented that the College's Mellon-Keiter postdoctoral program allows Amherst to support recent Ph.D.s in the humanities and humanistic social sciences by bringing them to campus in two-year positions to teach one course per semester—introducing them to teaching at a liberal arts college—while they conduct research.

Amended February 25, 2011

The College also participates in the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) New Faculty Fellowship Program, which allows recent Ph.D.s in the humanities to take up two-year positions at universities and colleges across the United States. In addition, Amherst annually hosts one of the three to five thesis-completion fellowships that are made available through the Five Colleges.

The Committee turned to the topic of the diversity of the Faculty and the related subject of target-of-opportunity hiring, which has been discussed by the CEP on a number of occasions, most recently at its October 1, 2010 ([see the CEP's minutes](#)) meeting. Dean Call noted that the CEP's conversation has centered around ways to attract a more diverse pool of candidates for faculty positions and the best approach to take when outstanding candidates are identified. The committee has developed some procedures to guide departments and the CEP in this area, Dean Call said. For example, the Dean noted that it is possible to make more than one hire from an individual search (hiring a second colleague, for example, who does not meet the precise needs of the authorized search but would be able to contribute in important ways to the department and one that does meet the precise needs that had been outlined in the FTE request), while consulting the CEP and respecting the FTE allocation and search processes. President Marx noted that the two target-of-opportunity FTEs that were recommended by the Committee on Academic Priorities and approved by the Board have thus far not been allocated. The President said that it would be possible for departments—outside an authorized search—to bring an outstanding candidate to the attention of the Dean, who could work with the CEP and the President to move forward with the hire via an accelerated process, if all agreed that doing so would be advantageous to the College. Professor Basu requested information about the racial and gender composition of the Faculty to inform discussions of this issue, and the Dean said that he would be glad to gather information. It was agreed that the members should also review the Report to the President on Diversity and Inclusion at <https://www.amherst.edu/offices/diversityoffice>, which was authored by Professor Cobham-Sander in her former role as Special Assistant to the President for Diversity. The members suggested making chairs aware of the possibilities and procedures surrounding target-of-opportunity hiring. The Dean agreed, noting that he plans to include this topic on the agenda for a meeting of department chairs this spring. The Committee also felt that it will be important for the Faculty to have a conversation about the shape and demographics of the Faculty at an upcoming Faculty Meeting.

The members discussed a proposal from Professor Sarat and Deans Hart, O'Hara, and Lieber ([appended](#)) to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee on Advising. Professor Rockwell, who agreed that constituting such a committee would be desirable, wondered whether it might be preferable to delay doing so until there can be an assessment of how advising has been affected by the introduction of online registration. Professor Umphrey noted that any effects of online registration would likely not drive a conversation about the larger questions that have been raised about advising. She suggested that, perhaps, the committee be formed now, with a charge to focus on larger questions this spring, and to consider any matters related to online registration in the fall. She commented that other technological tools, beyond those related to online registration, have been introduced to enhance advising. Professor Ciepiela expressed concern that the shift that online registration will bring could have a significant effect on the quality of pre-majoring advising. Professor Basu expressed a preference for having the advising committee

Amended February 25, 2011

begin work in the fall. She asked whether it would be useful to have administrators and staff who provide informal advising to students join faculty on the committee. The Committee agreed to discuss the scope of a charge to the committee, and the timing of the group's formation, at one of its upcoming meetings. The members asked the Dean to provide any background information that might inform this discussion, and he agreed to do so.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended February 25, 2011

The twenty-sixth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, February 14, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Returning to the discussion of increasing diversity within the ranks of the Faculty that began at the February 7 meeting, President Marx reiterated that departments that identify outstanding candidates who might be brought to Amherst through a target-of-opportunity hiring process are encouraged to bring a request to the Dean, who will discuss it with him and the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). As the Committee and the CEP had discussed, it is also sometimes possible to make more than one hire from an individual search, while respecting the FTE allocation and search processes. Professor Basu asked whether the allocation of a target-of-opportunity FTE would affect administrative decisions about subsequent requests that a department might make for new and/or replacement FTEs. Dean Call responded that all FTE requests would be considered in the context of departments' curricular needs and the strength of their arguments for an FTE. While expressing support for the opportunities described by the President, Professor Umphrey wondered whether they risk making the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) target-of-opportunity FTE process less attractive and relevant. She noted that the CEP guidelines concerning those CAP FTEs were drafted with Professor Cobham-Sander's advice about the importance of deliberateness and early planning in proposing target-of-opportunity hires. President Marx responded that having the flexibility to move forward expeditiously when presented with the opportunity to hire a candidate can be essential. If pursued by the Faculty, these hires would be significant for the College, but would be small in number, he said.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call reported back to the members about a committee nomination. He then informed the members that Professor Wolfson has been nominated by the Lecture Committee to deliver the Max and Etta Lazerowitz Lectureship this spring. The Lazerowitz Lecturer, a member of the Amherst faculty below the rank of full professor, is appointed annually.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Umphrey asked about the status of the report of the Class Scheduling Task Force. In his response, Dean Call first noted that Professor L. McGeoch, Chair of the CEP, has developed a helpful computer tool that generates a grid that displays the times in which all classes are offered. The committee is in the process of reviewing the recommendations of the task force and deciding which proposals it will endorse and forward to the Committee of Six and the Faculty as a whole.

Dean Call next provided the members with an overview of plans for implementing online registration. He noted that the CEP had met with Kathleen Goff, Registrar, and Sandra Miner, Director of Database Services, to discuss training for the Faculty. It is hoped that an instructional presentation on online registration will be given at the next Faculty Meeting, which would be followed by training for faculty during the week of Spring Break and during the week following the break. Advising would occur during the last week of March, and training could be completed, at least in its initial phase, by the time of preregistration (April 4-8). Dean Call noted that the number of students registering at given times would be staggered. Professor Loinaz asked if a special help desk for online registration questions would be established or whether staffing for the regular help desk would be enhanced. Dean Call said that he believes that staffing for the standard help desk would be supplemented during the online registration.

Amended February 25, 2011

Returning to the topic of the recommendation put forward by the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) that the College adopt an enhanced parenting-leave policy, the members reviewed some comparative data that had informed the CPR's thinking at the time it developed its proposal. Professor Umphrey wondered about the degree to which the CPR had weighed the need to enhance this benefit against other budget priorities such as, for example, salaries and funds to support research. Dean Call said that the CPR felt that enhancing the parenting-leave policy should be a priority and did not make comparisons in the ways that Professor Umphrey was describing. Professor Basu said that it would be helpful to have information about the policies of other institutions that had more generous parental-leave policies, for example Wellesley, Smith, and UMass. Professor Ciepiela said that she believes that the CPR's proposal echoes Smith's policy, including the distinction made between birth mothers and other parents in relation to benefits. Professor Basu suggested that it would be useful to compare the policies of schools with endowment-per-student figures that are similar to Amherst's. She expressed the view that the financial effects of offering course reduction appear to be a core issue in terms of the cost of the CPR proposal, while noting that the cost of implementing the proposal would be relatively low. Dean Call noted that the cost to implement the proposal on an annual basis would be around \$150,000 in its present form and about \$200,000, if the benefit were to be extended to all faculty who are serving as the primary care-giver for an infant.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Loinaz asked if there were compelling issues raised by the CPR about College benefits other than parenting leave. Dean Call said that this year's committee (the proposal, he noted had been formulated by last year's CPR) had just begun budget conversations recently and would soon discuss needs and requests. He noted that this coming year, fiscal year 2012, is the final year of the planned financial constraints that were recommended by the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC). The plan calls for a nearly flat budget and modest salary increases for this final year; adding to the budget would be challenging, he said. President Marx emphasized the importance of being mindful of the agreement that emerged from the ABC process and the continuing need to exercise restraint in spending and to monitor the budget closely, even as the College continues to invest where necessary. He asked whether the CPR's proposal would result in enhancing a faculty benefit beyond what staff receive, and, if so, whether this is likely to cause sensitivities. Professor Ciepiela said she understood from the materials provided that the proposal would bring the benefit for faculty in line with what staff already receive. Dean Call noted that it is difficult to make comparisons among faculty and staff benefits because of the complexities involved, including different units of work that exist for the two groups. Professor Rockwell wondered whether the CPR considers its proposal optimal, or whether it would have opted for a more generous policy (i.e., release from two courses at 100 percent salary for both birth- and non-birth parents) if it had not formulated recommendations during a period of financial constraint. Professor Umphrey, while noting that it would be important to learn more about the process that led the CPR to decide to put a parenting-leave proposal forward and the decision about the timing of the proposal, pointed out the importance of having a policy that would aid in recruiting faculty. Dean Call noted that the Committee might want to consider meeting with the members of this year's and/or last year's CPR to get their views, but said that it is his sense that some members of the CPR have a strong belief that distinctions exist between the birth mother's experience and that of other parents, and that the College's leave policies should reflect these differences, while others on the CPR felt that it would be prudent to have a less generous enhancement because of the need to exercise

Amended February 25, 2011

financial restraint. Professor Basu reiterated her concern about the proposed policy's lack of inclusivity, arising from the distinction being made between birth parents and other parents.

Concluding the discussion, the Committee agreed that it needed more context and information before it could judge how best to proceed in this matter, including how and when to present information to the Faculty, and decided to forward questions to the CPR and to meet with faculty, student, and staff representatives from the committee. It was agreed that the current members of the committee should be invited (later, by request of the CPR, an invitation to meet was also extended to members of last year's committee). The Committee agreed to forward the following questions to the CPR:

1. Does the CPR consider its proposal optimal, or would it have opted for a more generous policy (i.e., release from two courses at 100 percent salary for both birth- and non-birth parents) if it had not formulated recommendations during a period of financial constraint?
2. Please describe the parenting and pregnancy-related medical leave policies for staff. Does the CPR proposal increase a faculty benefit beyond what staff receive, and, if so, is this likely to cause sensitivities?
3. Since it is important to consider this proposal in the context of the overall budget, and the College currently is operating under financial constraints imposed by the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC), have you weighed the need to enhance this benefit against other priorities? If so, which have you considered? Either now or after the ABC constraints lift, how might we find the additional funding that would be needed on an annual basis to implement this benefits change?
4. Would you consider waiting to implement a policy change until after the ABC's spending limits have expired next year?
5. How do Amherst College's parenting leave policies today compare with those of our peer institutions? We would like clarification on whether the information you reviewed is up to date and whether you could describe the policies of other colleges which were not included in the survey.

In addition, the Committee asked the Dean for more information about Smith's parenting-leave policy, including whether written policy and practice may differ. Professor Basu asked the Dean if Amherst adheres strictly to the parental-leave policy or if there is some flexibility in how it has been applied. Dean Call said that, in the interest of fairness, the College adheres to the policy strictly.

Returning to the topic of the demographics of the Faculty, the Committee discussed issues surrounding faculty hiring over the past and in the future. Dean Call expressed the view that broadening the pools for searches as much as possible and hiring candidates through searches that allow for the flexibility to hire more than one candidate may be the best approach to enhancing the diversity of the Faculty, while noting that doing so will take time. Having reviewed the Report to the President on Diversity and Inclusion at Amherst, <https://www.amherst.edu/offices/diversityoffice>, which had been authored by Professor Cobham-

Amended February 25, 2011

Sander in her former role as Special Assistant to the President for Diversity and Inclusion, the members expressed support for many of the proposals that are included in the document, including the proposal that both academic and non-academic departments develop and follow diversity plans.

The President and the Dean noted that plans to hire a Director of Diversity and Inclusion were not realized, at first because of an unsuccessful search and later because the economic downturn led to a suspension of the search for this position. Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel, has been assisting with diversity efforts, but has many other duties and cannot devote sufficient time to this area. Professor Saxton asked if most colleges have diversity officers. The Dean said that most schools do, and President Marx noted that there is some evidence that having a single affirmative action officer, who works to enhance the diversity of the staff, which is also a goal of the College, and of the Faculty, may not be an effective model, given differences in the challenges of achieving diversity in those two different categories. The Committee agreed that many Amherst faculty care deeply about enhancing the diversity of the Faculty and that it might be best for a faculty colleague to lead efforts to increase diversity within the ranks of the Faculty. Professor Basu argued that, in addition to having these colleagues collaborate on efforts to enhance the diversity of the Faculty and staff, it would be important to have the oversight of a committee—perhaps adding a focus on diversity to the charge of an existing faculty committee on the faculty side, and the Department of Human Resources on the staff side. President Marx noted that a search is under way for a new Director of Human Resources and that encouraging diversity efforts for staff will be a priority for the person who assumes this position. Professor Basu asked about the status of the recommendations regarding target-of-opportunity hiring that have been made by the CEP and stressed that the College needs to have a broad vision and to set directions. Dean Call said that, as a first step, he will meet with chairs to discuss hiring procedures and diversity planning and will be meeting with the CEP to discuss the demographics of the Faculty and the consideration of diversity during the FTE allocation process. Professor Umphrey noted that this is an educative moment for the Faculty, a time to consider how best to proceed with this initiative in the context of larger demographic shifts in the Faculty.

Discussion turned to the challenges that the College faces in hiring faculty who have partners who are also academics, who may face challenges in reaching their own professional goals if they move to Amherst. Professor Loinaz asked what tools the College has to address this issue. The Dean said that there is an Academic Career Network that includes about twenty schools within a two-hour radius of Amherst. The network facilitates the sharing of information in the hope of facilitating partner-hiring. In addition, the Dean noted, partners of new hires are sometimes able to teach at Amherst as visitors or on a single-course basis, with departmental approval. Efforts in this area have had only modest success, the Dean said. Professor Umphrey, noting that the issue of academic couples and partner-hiring is an important one, expressed the view that enhancing the parenting-leave policy would make working at the College more attractive to prospective faculty and their families. President Marx said that, while another family-oriented issue, childcare, is part of an interconnected suite of issues that have an effect on recruitment, an evaluation of the College's childcare offerings had to be put on hold during the economic downturn. He said that it is his hope that plans to examine this issue can now move forward.

Amended February 25, 2011

The Committee returned briefly to the topic of the proposal to form an Ad Hoc Committee on Advising ([appended](#)). President Marx asked whether it would be better to review advising in the context of the larger educational experience, rather than isolating this topic. Professor Basu agreed that it would be important to review advising in context, while noting that this issue is significant enough to be isolated for purposes of close examination. She commented that, at present, advising is not considered as part of faculty members' reappointment and tenure dossiers; this lack of evaluation may lead to less attention being focused on advising. Professor Basu said that she saw great value in the pilot project on intensive advising, which Dean Hart, Professor Sarat, and she had developed. Each faculty member who participated in this initiative worked with one advisee, helping him or her to identify specific learning goals. The advisors monitored the students' progress toward these goals by consulting with their professors and with the students themselves, during the course of the first year, and now beyond. An assessment component has been built in to this project, and it will be interesting, Professor Basu said, to see the results, as this small group of students advances through the curriculum. The challenge of broadening this approach to include all students and advisors would be the time and expense involved, she said. The members discussed when it would be best to constitute the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising, noting that the Task Force on Academic Support had done a significant amount of work on the issue of advising in 2009-2010 and that this and other research, would need to be gathered and reviewed by the Ad Hoc Committee. The members decided to consider appointments to the Ad Hoc Committee concurrently with those to other faculty committees, in early April. If it wished, the Ad Hoc Committee could start work over the summer. The members agreed to formulate a charge to the Ad Hoc Committee in the coming weeks.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended February 25, 2011

The twenty-seventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, February 21, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Committee was joined by the following members of the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR): Professors Catherine Epstein (Chair), Robert Benedetto, and Nasser Hussain, who joined the meeting at 4 P.M.; HVAC Technician Kevin Gladu; Associate Treasurer and Director of the Budget Shannon Gurek; Associate Director of Human Resources Pat Long (who is serving on the committee until a new Director of Human Resources is hired); and former student member Chris Anderson '12. Benefits Administrator Ernie LeBlanc also attended to provide information about the College's benefits, as required, as the two committees discussed the CPR's parenting-leave proposal.

Professor Epstein responded to the questions that had been posed by the Committee of Six to the CPR in advance of the meeting. Discussion began with the question of whether the CPR considers its proposal optimal, or would have opted for a more generous policy (i.e., release from two courses at 100 percent salary for both birth- and non-birth parents), if it had not formulated recommendations during a period of financial constraint. Professor Epstein explained that the committee's examination of the parenting-leave policy had been prompted by a letter from a faculty member, which had been sent to the CPR in 2007, requesting that the committee review the policy. Professor Epstein noted that the current parenting-leave policy for faculty does not allow for a leave at full pay and thus can pose financial hardships. Tenure-track female faculty may be most vulnerable under the current policy, Professor Epstein said, and may delay having children as a result. This constituency is often not represented on committees that may consider this issue, she noted. At present, Professor Epstein said, the policy (which is described fully at https://www.amherst.edu/academiclife/dean_faculty/fph/fachandbook/facstatus/leaves) offers three options. One: A faculty member may elect to continue working according to the terms of his or her appointment and receive his or her regular compensation. In return for this arrangement, it is expected that, under normal circumstances, he or she will return to his or her full-time teaching duties within a reasonable period of time. No special leave is necessary in this case and no adjustments are made to compensation. Two: A member of the Faculty who holds a regular full-time appointment may elect to take a one-course reduction for the semester (January-June or July-December) of leave. In this case, the College will pay 72 percent of that semester's salary, and the College will maintain its regular contribution to fringe benefits. Three: The faculty member may elect to take a leave for a whole semester during or immediately following birth or adoption, in which case the College will pay 44 percent of that semester's salary. The College will pay its share of the fringe benefits as it does for a leave of absence, provided the faculty member pays his or her share. Professor Epstein noted that, after a review of comparative data on parental leave policies at Amherst and other colleges, which had been compiled by the former Director of Human Resources, Katie Bryne, the CPR had agreed that the College's parenting-leave policy appears to be less generous than that at most other schools.

In response to the faculty colleague's letter, the CPR began to discuss this issue prior to the economic downturn, in fall 2008 (see CPR minutes of [October 8](#), [October 15](#), [October 22](#), 2008). At that time, the CPR was considering putting forward a proposal of a policy in which all faculty members who received a parenting leave would receive a one-course reduction at 100 percent salary, and that any faculty member who wished to receive two courses off during such a

Amended February 25, 2011

leave would receive 85 percent of his/her pay during the semester in question. Due to the downturn, the committee did not consider the matter again until the fall of 2009/spring 2010 (see the CPR minutes of [September 16, 2009](#), [November 4, 2009](#), [December 16, 2009](#), and [April 21, 2010](#)).

When it returned to its consideration of parenting leave in 2009-2010, Professor Epstein noted that the CPR had considered a number of different ways in which the benefit for faculty members could be expanded, taking into account factors that included equity issues for faculty and staff and for women and men, the additional demands that pregnancy and post-natal care make on women who give birth, and the estimated costs of implementing different options. Ultimately, the committee decided to put [its proposal forward in the current form](#) after weighing these factors and with awareness that there would be advantages in terms of cost if the leave policy for birth mothers could encompass pregnancy-related short-term disability/medical leaves. The committee noted that the College already had a medical leave policy in place, and the committee decided to propose for birth mothers a paid leave of up to eight weeks to recover from pregnancy and giving birth, which is already available to staff birth mothers. Under a medical leave, as described in the CPR's proposal, a birth mother could have a medical leave of at least eight weeks but less than a full semester and would have the option of taking a one-semester leave from her teaching with full compensation. Paid medical leaves would run concurrently with leave to which the faculty member may be entitled under the Family Medical Leave Act of 1993 and the Massachusetts Maternity Leave Act. Professor Epstein explained that, while some members of the committee believe that the leave policy for Faculty should specifically reflect the additional demands that pregnancy and post-natal care make on women who give birth, those members would certainly not be opposed to a more generous policy that offered a one-semester leave from teaching for all faculty parents. The current CPR proposal is that non-birth parents be offered the option of taking a one course reduction for a single semester (during or immediately following birth or adoption) at full pay or of taking a leave from teaching for a single semester (during or immediately following birth or adoption) at 72 percent of that semester's salary.

Professor Epstein, noting that at present the College currently pays only a portion of the salaries of those on parenting leave, said that the cost of implementing the CPR's proposal is estimated to be \$45,000 per year, which is a relatively low figure to implement a benefit that is a high priority for many faculty, she and the other members of the CPR believe. Dean Call said that the cost of the proposal is best estimated by comparing the actual expenditures that the College makes under the current policy to the costs anticipated under the proposal. In particular, the estimated additional annual expense of adopting the CPR's proposal would be \$147,000, which includes the cost of hiring approximately six per-course replacement faculty (estimated at \$45,000 per year) combined with the cost of paying some faculty full salaries, rather than partial salaries, for a semester in which they would not be teaching (a cost estimated to be about \$102,000). If the CPR's proposed benefit were extended to all parents, the estimated additional cost would be greater. The conjectured number of per-course replacements would rise to nine (an expense estimated to be \$67,500) and the additional cost in salary is estimated to be about \$137,000, for an additional expense totaling about \$204,000.

At the request of both committees, Mr. LeBlanc described the parenting benefit that is available to staff. He noted that short-term disability pay is available for a birth mother following the birth of a child. The first ten days are used to satisfy a waiting period and are paid (if available) from accumulated time, such as medical/family or vacation banks. Payment

Amended February 25, 2011

thereafter, usually for another six weeks, is pro-rated based on years of service, from 70 to 100 percent of pay. Accumulated time (from medical/family or vacation banks), if available, may be used to remain at full pay. Disability payments may continue for a longer period if a medical condition persists. Extended family leave, consisting of four weeks at 100 percent pay, may be taken immediately following the end of the disability period. A non-birth parent who certifies himself or herself as the primary caregiver may apply for an extended family leave of four weeks of 100 percent pay, after a two-week waiting period. The employee must use accumulated time such as medical/family or vacation during the waiting period in order to remain in pay status. When the College also employs the employee's spouse or partner, combined leave under this policy will not exceed four weeks for any one reason. If the two-week wait has been met for any one reason, the second partner does not need to fulfill this waiting period.

Professor Epstein expressed the view that the CPR's proposal would enable faculty birth mothers to have a parenting-leave benefit that would be equivalent to that of staff women. (A member of the Human Resources staff offered a clarification after the meeting, noting that, under the CPR's proposal, faculty birth mothers could receive full pay for eight weeks of short-term disability/medical leave, plus four weeks of extended family leave, plus (in order to have the full semester off) an additional six weeks at full pay. If the proposal is applied to all faculty parents, Professor Epstein noted, faculty non-birth parents would be offered a benefit that would be more generous than that available to staff non-birth parents. In addition, questions around having more generous leaves for care-giving situations other than pregnancy and birth might arise, she said. Professor Ciepiela asked how many members of the College community might be interested in a benefit that would focus on other kinds of care-giving. The Dean noted that a previous CPR had discussed this issue and had decided at that time not to bring a proposal forward.

Professor Basu asked if the CPR would consider waiting to implement a policy change until after the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC)'s spending limits have expired next year. Professor Epstein responded that this year's CPR has not discussed this issue and that, because of the budget cycle and the committee's schedule for considering budget requests and priorities, the proposal might easily languish year after year (commenting that she first began contacting the CPR about a revision of the current benefit in 2000), unless action is taken. She urged the Committee to forward the CPR's proposal to the Faculty as soon as possible and stressed that the current policy is an embarrassment for the College, which is an outlier among its peers when it comes to parenting leave for Faculty, and may be affecting faculty recruiting. Professors Benedetto and Hussain also argued that the proposal should be brought to the Faculty as soon as possible. Professor Loinaz asked whether the CPR had weighed the need to enhance this benefit against other priorities. Professor Epstein responded that the cost of enhancing the current policy would be relatively low, and that the CPR had judged this proposal to be a high priority. She noted that, last year, while still under the constraints of the ABC, additional funds were allocated to enhance food offerings at Valentine.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Loinaz noted that, while the College might be an outlier in terms of the generosity of its parenting-leave policy, he wondered if the CPR had considered this benefit in the context of others offered by the College. Was the College more generous in terms of other benefits it offers to Faculty, he wondered. Mr. LeBlanc noted that making comparisons among benefits packages—as well as between faculty and staff benefits packages—can be difficult because of the complexities involved. However, he judged that

Amended February 25, 2011

Amherst is more generous than peer institutions in some areas. Dean Call agreed, noting that the support that Amherst provides for faculty research, the sabbatical policy, the phased retirement program, and the rental housing program are quite generous and in most cases exceed those offered by peer institutions. Professor Basu asked Professor Epstein how Amherst's parenting-leave policy compares with those at other institutions. Professor Epstein reiterated that it is the least generous of all that the committee had researched.

Assuming that the College is an outlier in terms of the generosity of the parenting-leave benefit, but is a leader in terms of some other benefits, and, if the College assumes that spending more in one area would be offset by spending less in another, for purposes of the discussion, President Marx asked in what areas the CPR might consider reducing spending in order to be able to offer a more generous parenting-leave benefit to the Faculty. Professor Epstein responded that, faculty on leave might not be replaced, though this would mean offering fewer courses, which would be regrettable for students.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the Committee thanked the CPR for meeting, and the committee left at 4:00 P.M.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the members that the date, time, and topic of Professor Wolfson's Lazerowitz Lecture are now known. He will speak on the topic of "Secret Lives of the Stalinist Stage: Self and Theater in the Soviet 1930s" on April 27 at 4:30 P.M.

The Committee next met briefly with Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel, to discuss legal issues surrounding target-of-opportunity hiring and initiatives to diversify the Faculty and staff. The Committee agreed that it would be helpful for the Committee also to meet with Professor Cobham-Sander at an upcoming meeting to hear her perspectives on this issue. In addition, it was agreed that the Dean would organize a chairs meeting, to which the members of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) would be invited, to discuss the issue of target-of-opportunity hiring. The Committee thanked Mr. Murphy for meeting with the members. The Dean asked for nominations for a committee assignment.

The members next reviewed proposals for new courses. Professor Rockwell expressed some concern about a small number of proposals that indicated that over-enrollment would be addressed on a "case-by-case" basis," that is that there would be no stated criteria by which the College would know how the instructor planned to choose from among the "applicants" who pre-enrolled for his or her course. Professor Rockwell stressed that he has no suspicion that the instructors who have included this provision in their current course proposals have done so with malicious intent. He argued, however, that to allow any instructor to deal with over-enrollment on a "case-by-case" basis sets a precedent that could conceivably be used by other instructors in the future in ways that the Faculty might find inappropriate. Professor Rockwell expressed the view that to allow instructors to select their students on a "case-by-case" basis is a problematic policy. For example, he said, it is possible that some instructor might decide that she or he does not want to include a student who holds political or religious beliefs that the instructor finds objectionable. If a course is highly over-enrolled, an instructor who might harbor a bias against a certain subset of students on campus could decide to exclude them systematically from his or her course, Professor Rockwell suggested. Or, for example, certain instructors might decide that they would rather not teach students known to complain about grades, or students who are reputed not to write well, or simply a given student whom the instructor finds unpleasant in some way. To allow instructors to choose from among the "applicants" for a course on a "case-by-case" basis

Amended February 25, 2011

opens the door to the exercise of all sorts of problematic biases, Professor Rockwell argued. Continuing, Professor Rockwell said that he recognizes that prerequisites for certain courses are necessary for students to succeed in specific programs. Why one might give priority to majors in certain circumstances is also evident to him, and he said that he recognizes that there are legitimate reasons for giving priority to sophomores in one class and juniors in another. As a matter of principle, however, he said that he objects to the prospect of any instructor being allowed to select her or his students on an individual basis.

In response, Dean Call noted that the CEP had discussed some of these same concerns, while noting that it is sometimes necessary to cap courses for reasons surrounding resource constraints. Professor Rockwell reiterated that he understands the reasons for enrollment caps, but he feels that instructors should publish clear criteria by which they will choose students for their classes among those who have pre-enrolled, if it is necessary to do so. Dean Call said that the course proposals at hand are within faculty guidelines. Professor Basu said that she appreciated Professor Rockwell's concern, but that it was sometimes difficult to know whether students had the appropriate background and skills for a course unless faculty interviewed them before admitting them. This was often the case with interdisciplinary courses. She also said that she was struck by the relatively large number of courses that are capped and by the inconsistent criteria that faculty used in capping courses. She wondered if chairs routinely discuss with departmental colleagues how many courses individual faculty should cap, thereby exercising some oversight of the overall number of courses that would have enrollment caps. She also raised the question of whether departments should decide how many courses they wanted to cap in a given semester. The Committee agreed that it would be informative to meet with the CEP to discuss the issues that had been raised during the review of the course proposals and asked the Dean to extend an invitation to meet with the committee's members. Though the course proposals under discussion had raised some concerns, the members agreed that these issues did not warrant a delay in forwarding the courses to the Faculty. The members then voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the proposals to the Faculty. Professor Umphrey asked if the new online system would prevent students who had not met the stipulated pre-requisites for a particular class from pre-registering for it. The Dean noted that the CEP had discussed this question in January (See CEP minutes of [January 25, 2011](#)), and that the plan for this spring's pre-registration is to flag students who don't have the stipulated pre-requisites and share that information with instructors.

The Committee reviewed the draft of the agenda for the Faculty Meeting of March 1. Commenting on the meeting with the CPR, Professors Umphrey and Saxton said they found the argument that the proposal before them would bring the benefit offered to faculty birth mothers in line with that offered to staff birth mothers to be compelling. Professor Ciepiela said she supported the benefit change for faculty birth mothers in principle, hoping it might eventually be extended to all parents. Professors Loinaz and Basu said that, while they would favor a more generous and inclusive benefit that would recognize the needs of all parents, perhaps this is not the moment for suggesting a more expensive proposal, particularly if doing so would jeopardize the gains that would be made from endorsing the proposal before the Committee. On the other hand, a motion outlining such a proposal could be proposed at the Faculty Meeting or could be forwarded to the Faculty at a later time, it was agreed. The members then voted on the substance of the motion that the Faculty endorse the CPR's proposal. The vote was four in favor (Professors Ciepiela, Rockwell, Saxton, and Umphrey), one opposed (Professor Loinaz), with

Amended February 25, 2011

one abstention (Professor Basu). The Committee voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the proposal to the Faculty. The members then voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the agenda to the Faculty.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended March 28, 2011

The twenty-eighth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 2:15 P.M. on Monday, February 28, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with President Marx informing the members that he had been contacted by the family of a decorated World War II veteran who had interrupted his education (which began in 1940) at Amherst at the end of his junior year to serve during the war. Upon his return from the war two years later, the individual was offered admission to Harvard Business School, which waived the college degree requirement for veterans, and he had accepted. The family reported that, while grateful to have had the opportunity to go to the business school, the man, who is now ninety, has always regretted that he did not receive a B.A. from Amherst. The family has asked if the College would consider awarding this member of the class of 1944 a degree at Commencement this year. President Marx noted that there are three other individuals who are still alive who left the College during World War II to serve in the armed forces and did not return to Amherst to complete their degrees. He informed the members that he planned to get a sense of the Faculty's views about this matter by requesting a vote on the question at the March 1 Faculty Meeting. He asked the members for their opinion about how best to move forward. President Marx explained that the College could either choose not to grant degrees to these individuals, to grant regular bachelor's degrees, or to grant honorary bachelor's degrees. He explained that there was some precedent, supported by a vote of the Faculty in 1945 (supported by the Board of Trustees that same year), for awarding degrees, under certain conditions, to former Amherst students whose course of study at the College had been interrupted by entry into the armed services. The College has also, under certain conditions, granted degrees to a small number of students who left the College before graduating, by recommendation of the Faculty, in order to enter graduate school, after having exhausted the College's offerings in their disciplines. The Committee discussed the pros and cons of the approaches outlined by the President. The members also considered the Dean's view that those who had left the College to serve in World War II and who had not returned to Amherst should be given honorary bachelor's degrees, rather than regular degrees, and recommended that honorary degrees be bestowed. The President thanked the members for their advice.

Under "Announcements from the Dean, Dean Call informed the members that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) would soon be forwarding to the Committee of Six the recommendations that had emerged from the committee's review of the report of the Class Scheduling Task Force. Professor Loinaz asked if the Committee would also receive the report itself, and the Dean said that the members would indeed be provided with the report.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Umphrey asked if plans were in place for the Committee to meet with the CEP. The Dean said that he is working on scheduling the meeting. He noted that he and members of the CEP plan to discuss the target-of-opportunity hiring process with department chairs at a chairs meeting that will be held on March 25. In addition, the Dean will give a presentation on the demographics of the Faculty to the chairs and said that it is his hope to give a similar presentation to the Faculty at a Faculty Meeting this spring.

Returning briefly to the topic of target-of-opportunity hiring, President Marx noted that he has already been contacted by a number of departments about particular candidates. The President asked whether sufficient systems are in place to move forward with hiring. He noted that the CEP has developed processes for departments—both within and outside an authorized search—for bringing outstanding candidates whom they have identified to the attention of the

Amended March 28, 2011

Dean and the President, who could work with the CEP to move forward with the hire via an accelerated process, if all agreed that doing so would be advantageous to the College. Continuing, the Dean said that the CEP has developed procedures for making more than one hire from an individual search (hiring a second colleague, for example, who does not meet the precise needs of the authorized search, but would be able to contribute in important ways to the department and the College, in addition to an individual who does meet the specific needs that had been outlined in the FTE request). The Faculty and Board of Trustees had approved the mechanism of target-of-opportunity hiring earlier, by approving the recommendation of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) that a rotating bank of two FTEs be allocated for such hiring. Depending on how quickly this rotating bank of two FTEs is repaid by retirements, additional FTEs could be allocated for target-of-opportunity hiring, if needed.

Professor Basu said that, while she is in favor of moving forward with such hiring, departments will need to think about how to identify the fields in which they search for target-of-opportunity hires, since these positions would not be defined by FTE requests. President Marx responded that the departments would have to come to a consensus about any proposals they would bring forward and would have to make a convincing argument, as they do for any FTE request. Dean Call said that the strongest proposals for target-of-opportunity hires would relate in some ways to previously discussed departmental goals. Professor Rockwell said that he supports the target-of-opportunity hiring process as a mechanism for bringing outstanding scholars to the College, but wondered if other FTE requests would be in any jeopardy if target-of-opportunity hiring brought the College close to the FTE goal. The Dean said that, with impending retirements, and because the FTE cap would be raised by three FTEs per year over five years (beginning in 2012, at the conclusion of the period of planned financial constraints that were recommended by Advisory Budget Committee), it would be unlikely that the cap would be reached in the near term. The Dean said that the Board has indicated that, as long as it is possible to pay for a cohort of FTEs, there will be flexibility in terms of the number that can be hired, and that it may even be possible to exceed the cap, if there are compelling reasons to do so. The Committee agreed that it will be important to make departments aware that additional resources are being directed toward target-of-opportunity hiring, and the President and the Dean said that this information is being conveyed through these minutes and would be shared during the March 1 Faculty Meeting and at the March 25 meeting of department chairs. The Committee then reviewed proposals for new courses and voted six to zero in favor of forwarding them to the Faculty. The members turned to personnel matters.

The voting faculty members of the Committee and the Dean then reviewed proposals for Senior Sabbatical Fellowships. The Dean noted that the review process should yield feedback when necessary. He said that his office would work with colleagues to respond to any recommendations that might be offered and to make all proposals viable for funding.

The members began a conversation about whether to propose to the Faculty some revisions to some tenure procedures.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended March 31, 2011

The twenty-ninth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 2:30 P.M. on Monday, March, 21, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

President Marx began the meeting by asking the members for their views about Professor Staller's request, which she had made at the Faculty Meeting of March 1, that a statement from which she had read aloud at the Faculty Meeting of November 2 be appended, retroactively, to the minutes of that meeting. The November 2 minutes had been approved at the December 7 Faculty Meeting; Professor Staller had been absent from that meeting due to an illness. The President noted that it had also been suggested at the March 1 meeting that the statement might be appended to that meeting's minutes instead. President Marx reminded the members that the Committee had discussed earlier (see the Committee of Six minutes of November 4, 2010) the issue of whether to append the statement. It had been noted then, and was reiterated now, that the practice has been to summarize in the minutes comments made by faculty, including those that they may read. The members also noted once again that it would have been appropriate for the statement in question to have been submitted before the Faculty Meeting to the Committee of Six, as the body that sets the agenda for Faculty Meetings, so that the members could have commented on the document through their minutes and could have decided whether the document should be discussed at the Faculty Meeting as part of the agenda. The members agreed that the statement should not be appended to either set of Faculty Meeting minutes. Professor Rockwell noted that, if she had desired, Professor Staller had the procedural option of proposing a motion at the March 1 meeting on whether or not to append the statement to the Faculty Meeting minutes.

The Committee discussed having a conversation about faculty governance, in anticipation of its meeting with the Board of Trustees on April 1, and decided to have an additional meeting on March 23 to discuss this matter and several other agenda items.

President Marx asked the members for their views about asking the Faculty to consider the question of teaching evaluations for tenured faculty. He reminded the members that the Faculty had voted in 2007 (see [Faculty Handbook IV., B., 2.](#)) to require that each tenured faculty member (other than those on phased retirement) evaluate his or her teaching in one course each year by means of her/his choice. (Those holding half-time FTE appointments evaluate one course every two years.) It had been agreed that, whatever the form(s) of evaluation, the content and results would belong to the faculty member and would be confidential, and that any record could be destroyed by the faculty member at any time. The President wondered if the Committee would consider proposing a motion that the Faculty adopt a policy that requires tenured faculty to use the same system for all of their courses, for the continuing purpose of informing their own pedagogy. President Marx noted that he had asked the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) to consider this question when meeting with the committee this fall, and that the CEP had expressed interest in discussing the question this spring, but had recently declined to bring a motion forward. Professors Basu, Rockwell, and Saxton said that they would not object to such a motion, but wondered whether this was the right time to bring this matter forward. The Committee suggested that it would be valuable and informative to assess the current policy before proposing any enhancements to it. (When the Faculty voted in the new teaching evaluation program in May 2007, it had been agreed that it would be assessed six years after its implementation.) Professor Rockwell said that he would be interested in asking the CEP

Amended March 31, 2011

why it had chosen not to bring the issue forward, and he suggested that the two committees might have a discussion about this matter at the meeting that has been planned for March 28. The other members agreed that doing so would be useful.

Continuing with the conversation, Professors Ciepiela and Umphrey stressed the need to have broader faculty discussion about teaching evaluations for tenured faculty, including a consideration of other ways of supporting pedagogy and helping colleagues flourish in the classroom. Laying some groundwork before moving forward with a motion such as the one that the President had described would be important, they argued. President Marx wondered why the Faculty would not want to engage in a discussion and debate about the question of teaching evaluations. Professor Saxton noted that some colleagues feel that student evaluations are deeply flawed and do not value them as a way of providing useful feedback about teaching. Professor Ciepiela agreed that many colleagues see problems with this instrument of evaluation and find greater value in attending workshops on pedagogy and in other methods of supporting teaching. She also expressed the view that, by requiring teaching evaluations for all classes, we might be inviting students to consider their learning experience at Amherst in narrow, evaluative terms.

Dean Call said that he would like to see programs developed to support teaching, including innovation, experimentation, and a range of the most informative methods of assessment. President Marx stressed that considering the question of student teaching evaluations does not preclude thinking about other ways to inform teaching. He expressed the view that having feedback about learning experiences from both the student and faculty perspective creates a culture of openness. Professor Basu agreed and said that she favors having a system that encourages some form of self-evaluation and reflection for all faculty. She commented that, under the current system, there is significant inequity in the ways that teaching is assessed for tenured and tenure-track faculty. Professor Basu said that she is aware that some Amherst departments solicit teaching evaluations from all students in all classes, and that it might be informative to ask departments that do this about the merits of this system. Professor Umphrey noted that it would also be useful to review some of the research that has been done on student teaching evaluations and the efficacy of this tool as a means of improving teaching. The members agreed to return to this topic during their meeting with the CEP on March 28. Professor Loinaz asked that the Committee be provided with background material about the Faculty's consideration of the issue of teaching evaluations for tenured faculty. The Dean agreed to provide such information, noting that an Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluation and the Improvement and Teaching, which had been charged with exploring ways to support the improvement of teaching at all ranks, including proposals for the evaluation of tenured faculty by students, issued a report in 2007. The members also discussed the possibility of offering departments a model teaching evaluation form for students, in the hope of creating an instrument that could elicit student feedback consistently and effectively for all departments. The form could include a series of questions that would be relevant for all departments, and departments could add other items that would be tailored to departmental/discipline-specific assessment needs.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call noted that he had extended to March 28 the deadline for the report of the Task Force on Copyright, Reserves, and Coursepacks. He also informed the members that Treasurer Peter Shea had asked to make a presentation about new rules affecting the investment of individual retirement funds at an upcoming Faculty Meeting. In addition, he asked the Committee if Ernie LeBlanc, Benefits Administrator, and Pat

Amended March 31, 2011

Long, Associate Director of Human Resources, could attend the next Faculty Meeting as guests to offer their expertise, if needed, about the proposal of the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) regarding parenting and medical leave. The members agreed that it would be helpful to have these colleagues present at the meeting.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Loinaz asked whether there is a transition plan for the position of the Director of the Career Center, now that Allyson Moore, the current director, has announced plans to become the Director of Undergraduate Career Services and Associate Dean of the College at Yale. The Dean said that a search for a new director is already under way, and that Allen Hart, Dean of Students, will soon name acting co-directors of the Career Center, who will serve until Dean A. Moore’s replacement is named. In addition, some members of the staff of the Dean of Students office will provide additional support to the Career Center during this time of transition. The Committee expressed gratitude to Dean Moore for her service to the College.

Turning to the topic of the Little Red Schoolhouse, President Marx noted that he will soon meet with the Chairman of the Board and the Director of the school to discuss the need to cease operation of the school at its current site by the time (summer 2012) that construction begins on the new science center. Professor Loinaz asked about the nature of the College’s relationship with the school. President Marx said that the College owns the school building (a gift to the College enabled it to be built) and the land on which it was constructed and provides an endowment (through another gift) that supports the school’s operation. While Amherst provides the space to the school, the College does not participate in running it.

Conversation turned to the recommendation of the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) that the College adopt a new parenting/medical leave policy. The members discussed the [CPR’s letter of March 9, 2011](#), (appended via link), in which the committee provided responses to questions that had been raised at the March 1 Faculty Meeting about the proposal, as a means of clarifying details that had been seen as confusing during the presentation of the motion and in the discussion that followed. The Faculty had referred the proposal back to the CPR for purposes of clarification. The motion, in its original form, is now being proposed again the Dean said. Professor Basu noted that, in her role as an individual faculty member rather than as a member of the Committee of Six, she had written to the CPR to request that the committee draft two motions to be forwarded to the Faculty, one along the lines that had been brought forward by the CPR, and a second that would provide the same benefits to the primary parent, whether or not that person is the biological mother and whether or not that person is faculty or staff. She had also asked that the CPR provide estimates of the costs to the College of each option. Professor Basu said that she had expressed the view that the CPR could endorse the option it preferred, but could allow the Faculty to consider both proposals.

Continuing, Professor Basu said that she had informed the members that she had not suggested this course earlier to the CPR because she had been convinced by the committee’s wish to bring a motion before the Faculty as soon as possible. However since the Faculty had requested that the CPR clarify the proposal, she had felt that it was appropriate for her to make her request of the CPR. She had noted in her communication to the CPR that she was also making this request because the Faculty had seemed enthusiastic about the committee’s proposal, and might support a more generous policy. The CPR had declined this request, Professor Basu noted. She said that she was now in a quandary, since she would like to see a proposal for a more robust policy brought forward, but if that is not going to occur, she would not want to

Amended March 31, 2011

derail efforts to improve the current policy in the ways that the CPR has proposed. Professor Basu noted that she would support having the CPR study the questions that she had raised and wondered if there would be time for it to do so without jeopardizing the possibility of having a Faculty vote this spring. Professor Rockwell asked the Dean to characterize the agenda of the CPR for the spring. Dean Call said that gathering the comparative data that would be needed to answer these questions could take some time, adding that it might not be possible to complete such research during the Spring semester. In addition, he commented on the challenge of making equivalent comparisons among categories of individuals who have different units of work.

The Committee discussed whether consideration of the motion might be postponed until next year, allowing the CPR to conduct research and to consider the development of a second proposal, such as the one Professor Basu described. Alternatively, the members wondered whether it might be possible to bring the current motion forward to the Faculty now, and if it is approved, to bring this recommendation to the Board. Later, perhaps, another motion for a more expansive policy could be brought before the Faculty and the Board, if the Faculty wished to do so. The Committee agreed that requesting that the Board consider multiple requests for enhanced benefits could be a problematic approach. Professor Ciepiela expressed the view that this issue should be brought forward now, as it has been pushed aside repeatedly over the past decade. Professor Basu expressed some disappointment that research on this question had not been undertaken to inform faculty deliberations about alternative parenting leave policy options. She wondered if it might also be informative for the CPR to consider the issue of parenting leave in the context of broader issues surrounding childcare. President Marx said that Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research and Planning, had earlier begun to assess the College community's childcare needs, but that the economic downturn had led to a postponement of this project. He has now asked Ms. Matheson, in consultation with Peter Shea, Treasurer, and Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services, to return to this issue. Once data have been gathered, there may be facilities questions and issues that could come before the CPR, he said.

At the conclusion of its discussion of the CPR's proposal, the Committee decided to bring the current motion before the Faculty now so that a vote could be taken on whether the proposal should be brought forward to the Trustees as the Faculty's recommendation. The members voted six to zero to forward the motion. On the substance of the motion, Professors Ciepiela, Saxton, and Umphrey voted in favor; Professors Basu and Rockwell abstained; and Professor Loinaz was opposed. The Committee then reviewed proposals for new courses and voted six to zero in favor of forwarding them to the Faculty. The members turned to personnel matters.

The members next discussed some tenure procedures and revisions to the Dean's letter to the department chairs of tenure candidates.

The meeting adjourned at 6:35 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 11, 2011

The thirtieth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx at the President's house at 6:30 P.M. on Wednesday, March, 23, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The Committee first turned briefly to a personnel matter.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the members that Professor Griffiths has agreed to return to the Dean's office as an Associate Dean of the Faculty on a half-time basis beginning in July 2011. Professor Courtright will be returning to the Faculty full time at the conclusion of the academic year, and Professor Cheney will continue with his half-time appointment as an Associate Dean for the next academic year.

The members spent the majority of the meeting discussing the issue of faculty governance. Conversation focused on both particular aspects of faculty governance and on the broader questions of the current system's strengths and weaknesses in raising and addressing issues of importance to the College. Dean Call noted that he would like to explore the workload of the Faculty. In this regard he posed the following questions to prompt discussion: Is the Faculty's time being used most effectively under the current system? Is the committee structure optimal for the Faculty and for the College? It was noted that the Committee expects to have a discussion with the Trustees about faculty governance when the members meet with the Board as part of Instruction Weekend, which will occur April 1 and 2.

Professor Rockwell began the conversation by noting that he would not be comfortable making a value judgment about whether Amherst's governance system is effective. Underlying such a judgment implicitly would be the consideration of whether other systems might be more effective, he said. He wondered whether the Committee was being asked to evaluate whether the current system is broken. Professor Rockwell noted that, since he has spent his entire career at the College, his experience with faculty governance has been limited to Amherst's system; therefore, he cannot make comparisons. Dean Call commented that the College has high expectations for Faculty in many areas—from their own scholarly work, to teaching, to involving students in their research, as well as in sharing in the collective responsibility of governing the College. While the Faculty cherishes all of these roles, the workload of the Faculty is a heavy one, the Dean pointed out. Professor Loinaz asked about the purview of faculty governance, specifically what the College governance structures are, how these structures fit together, and whether there may be overlap among various structures. The Dean replied that the Faculty, administration, Trustees, and the recently created Employee Council play governance roles. The newly created Managers' Council (which is made up of administrative colleagues who report directly to the members of the Senior Staff), has been, and has the potential to be, another effective governance structure, Dean Call noted.

Continuing with the conversation, Dean Call said that he believes that the Faculty should be at the core of the College's decision-making processes, but that administrators can also play important roles. Professor Loinaz asked if there is a sense that faculty governance has changed over the past decade. Professor Umphrey expressed the view that the Faculty is being asked to do more and more in this realm, and that the burden is particularly great for faculty in the career stage that follows promotion to associate professor. Professor Saxton agreed, commenting that some colleagues feel that they would like to spend more of their time on scholarship and teaching, rather than governance. Professor Rockwell said that there is a tension that has long existed in this regard. Continuing, he noted that, in times past, he had observed the following scenario repeated: a faculty colleague with a particular interest was enthusiastic about joining an ad hoc committee to explore an issue. The committee worked hard sifting through information

Amended April 11, 2011

and making recommendations, but since the Faculty is generally reluctant to delegate decision-making authority to committees, all of the positions on the issue were revisited during long Faculty Meeting deliberations and the recommendations sometimes rejected. Over time faculty who have had such experiences might have come to feel that their work was not valued, and that faculty colleagues were suspicious about the committee's motivations and/or decisions. As such, the experience of serving on ad hoc committees for some faculty could well have been an exercise in frustration.

President Marx asked about the sharing of effort between the administration and the Faculty and whether the College should more often seek administrative proposals that would be reviewed by committees and, when appropriate, revised or rejected. The Dean posed the question of whether Amherst might shift toward such a model over time. He noted that the work of the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC) is an example of bringing representatives of the College community together to participate in an inclusive process to develop proposals to address a problem facing the College. President Marx noted that, while the Trustees and many others view the ABC process as a success, as hard decisions were reviewed through a collective deliberative process, some faculty members do not see this process as an example of good governance.

Professor Umphrey suggested that any conversation about the burdens of faculty governance should focus on the following set of issues—the intensification of committee work for faculty, the increasing governance workload for mid-career colleagues, the operatic quality of Faculty Meetings, the issue of some committees operating more effectively than others, and the fragmentation of work among committees—elaborating on the last issue to note that committees may not communicate with one another about the issues on which they are focusing and/or may only communicate with the Faculty about their activities through the imperfect mechanism of minutes. Professor Ciepiela agreed that it is important to clarify what the problems may be with faculty governance, to read these challenges with care, and not to blur issues. She spoke to the admirably strong culture of faculty engagement in governance at the College and the differing perspectives on governance that may be held by faculty at different career stages. Professor Basu commented that recently tenured, and even untenured faculty, are becoming increasingly vocal at Faculty Meetings, which is to be encouraged. Still, she feels that there is not sufficient genuine exchange at Faculty Meetings. Some faculty members hesitate to challenge strongly if not widely held views of their colleagues. Professor Rockwell proposed that a solution to the problem of a small number of colleagues dominating discussion is to have stricter adherence to *Robert's Rules of Order*. He expressed the view that it is unfortunate that the rules of order have come to be seen as a repressive mechanism. In fact, in his opinion, they are a means to permit everyone to participate in a meeting in an efficient way. Once colleagues have expressed their views succinctly, they should allow others to speak. Limits should be set, and colleagues who do not adhere to the limits should be called to order by the chair, Professor Rockwell said. Agreeing that there might be some value in closer adherence to the rules, Professor Umphrey noted that, to facilitate discussion effectively, the chair—as the rules require—should not make comments during discussions, something that has been permitted at Faculty Meetings.

President Marx asked how to judge whether faculty governance is working, in particular at Faculty Meetings. Professor Rockwell responded that it is important that there be a forum (the Faculty Meeting) for all faculty members to express their opinions. While having such a forum may encourage the operatic quality of Faculty Meetings, the cacophony of views expressed can be seen as the normal “noise” of a democratic system, Professor Rockwell continued, and can serve as a release valve for the pent up pressures surrounding important issues. Professor Saxton

Amended April 11, 2011

wondered what issues are appropriate to bring before the Faculty for consultation. Professor Rockwell responded that, in his view, Faculty Meetings should be reserved for the consideration of issues on which the Faculty has the authority to vote. He is not in favor of having meetings only for the purpose of discussion. He said that he finds the mechanism of the Committee of the Whole not to be productive, and he has found it difficult to follow the logic of arguments that are put forward and discussed within this structure. Professor Rockwell attributed a fall off in attendance at Faculty Meetings among senior faculty, in particular, to the increasing tendency to use Faculty Meetings to discuss issues on which the Faculty may not be asked to vote.

Professor Umphrey disagreed that Faculty Meetings that are held for the purpose of communication cannot be productive. She stressed that there are no other vehicles for broad faculty conversations other than Faculty Meetings. The members discussed whether it would aid faculty governance to have more frequent Faculty Meetings with fewer action items; some members favored this approach while others did not. The question was raised about whether the Faculty should always be asked to vote on recommendations that have been formulated by an ad hoc committee, or whether, at times, the recommendations of a group of colleagues who, after being charged by the Faculty to explore a particular issue or set of questions and, after careful review, come to a set of conclusions, could be discussed in general ways and then implemented. Professor Saxton commented that faculty differ on what kinds of information and questions should come before it. Some faculty favor a very broad range of issues, and the tone of Faculty Meetings can become aggressive if members feel they have not been sufficiently consulted. This can silence others who may feel differently. The members noted that it is impossible to legislate the tone of deliberations at Faculty Meetings.

Professor Ciepiela suggested that there are ways to focus conversation at Faculty Meetings, with a result being a less confrontational debate, for example, through the ways presentations are structured by committees. Committees can strengthen proposals by including in them the pros and cons of the issue being brought forward. This approach acquaints the Faculty in advance of the meeting with the basic issues that should be considered, demonstrating that a committee has thought through different sides of an argument, Professor Ciepiela suggested. In response to a question from the President, the members discussed whether questions to the administration might be submitted to the administration twenty-four hours in advance of Faculty Meetings, giving the administration time to think through reasonable answers and to do research, if necessary. Professor Loinaz said that such questions could be invited, but the Committee agreed that, at times, colleagues will want to ask questions at Faculty Meetings and should not be precluded from doing so because they did not provide advance notice. Professor Basu said that she has been less concerned about spontaneous questions than about the abrasive tenor and tone of questions at Faculty Meetings.

In response to the President's suggestion that Faculty Meetings feature theater and not just substance, Professor Ciepiela asserted that they nevertheless do feature substance, and she commented that a number of good proposals had been approved by the Faculty in recent years, and that sound decisions had been made. Professor Rockwell reiterated that it is important to provide colleagues with the opportunity to speak their minds, and he noted that, if the opportunity to do so is not a part of Faculty Meetings, colleagues might use alternative forums for this purpose. The President asked if the Committee thought that the current system of faculty governance allowed the Faculty to consider and make decisions on hard issues. The Committee noted that the Faculty has concluded difficult and sometimes divisive deliberations by voting and has been guided by the views of the majority. In terms of the criteria for successful faculty governance, President Marx noted that he agrees that one aspect must be that faculty members

Amended April 11, 2011

are given the opportunity to have their say, but also the ability to arrive at a resolution, collectively, that is not necessarily consensual.

Returning to the issue of committee work, President Marx asked whether one of the functions and values of committee work, outside of the purpose of governance, is socialization for faculty with colleagues outside their fields/departments. He asked whether more such socialization should occur around intellectual work. Professor Loinaz, noting that, while the efficiency of faculty committees is an entirely separate question, he has found that committee work is an effective and important way for colleagues, particularly those who are new to the College, to engage with one another, to make connections outside their departments, and to learn about the processes for getting things done at the College. Professor Saxton noted that some colleagues would prefer not to engage in committee work for these purposes yet have no choice. Professor Loinaz said that for tenure-track faculty, committee work is most often not onerous.

The members next discussed whether changes to the committee structure might alleviate some of the burden that committee work places on the Faculty. President Marx wondered whether having a smaller number of committees that are invested with more authority and with longer terms for the members of such committees would lead to more effective and powerful faculty governance, while enabling the Faculty to focus on teaching and research. Professor Basu commented that the Faculty has, in the past, been reluctant both to delegate power to the administration and to delegate power to faculty colleagues. She expressed support for having a small number of more powerful committees, but stressed the need to provide the members of such committees with more time for scholarship, in recognition of their service. The Committee noted that there has been among the Faculty some unwillingness in the past to centralize faculty power and a general resistance to delegate authority. Some members suggested that this view might evolve with the generational shift that is about to occur within the Faculty, but that this takes time. Dean Call noted that his recent analysis of the shape of the Faculty today, and upcoming changes that will occur as a result of a wave of retirements, has demonstrated that currently a somewhat smaller proportion of Faculty are in the middle of the age distribution (ages forty-five to sixty) than are in slightly younger or older cohorts. Since these are the colleagues who are often asked to take on most of the administrative work of the Faculty and there are fewer of them proportionally, these colleagues may have a disproportionate burden, he noted. The Dean said that he would support having fewer committees to help alleviate some of this burden.

Continuing the conversation, the members discussed the possibility of developing a structure in which there would be, perhaps, five major committees—the Committee of Six, the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR), the College Council, and the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA)—to which all work would be funneled, and which would have three-year staggered terms for their members, who would be compensated for their service. Professor Saxton wondered about the desirability of the proposal, which has been put forward at various times in the past, of splitting the Committee of Six into two committees, an executive committee and a personnel committee. President Marx expressed the view that the current structure of the Committee of Six might be preferable, as it should concentrate faculty power.

Professor Ciepiela commented that, at present, ad hoc committees are charged with much of the most intensive committee work. She asked how that burden would be addressed by the proposed scheme. President Marx suggested that, if committees were limited to the five under discussion, more faculty would be free of service for a significant period when they were not on these committees. The President said that ad hoc committees could undertake this work, when

Amended April 11, 2011

appropriate, but that, if more often administrators with particular expertise could research questions and develop proposals and options, laying out the pros and cons for the Faculty to consider, some of the burden that service on ad hoc committees places on the Faculty could be alleviated. The members noted that additional administrators would likely be needed if such an approach were to be adopted. Professor Umphrey wondered, would the Trustees be supportive of requests for the additional resources demanded by the President's proposals, for both a larger number of administrators and compensation for faculty? As it stands, the College asks the Faculty to carry a heavy governance burden on the cheap, as it were. It may be that enhancing governance structures cannot be done without more material support. Professor Rockwell expressed concern that the approach proposed could result in information being hidden from the Faculty, and he expressed the view that a spirit of distrust could result if this circumstance occurred. Professor Basu stressed that it is not always clear which issues should come before the Faculty and which are purely administrative questions. She wondered whether having fewer layers of committees and greater clarity about the respective rights and responsibilities of the Faculty and administration might be helpful. The Committee agreed that, if a decision were to be made not to have ad hoc committees or fewer of them, there would have to be a process put in place to set priorities for the five large committees each year, and to limit the number of issues that would be addressed and the number of questions that could be delegated to ad hoc committees or task forces. It was felt that by doing so, the duplication of effort that often occurs under the present committee structure might be prevented.

Continuing the conversation, Professors Rockwell and Ciepiela questioned any view of the Faculty as unable to make decisions. Professor Umphrey commented that the Faculty has not avoided all difficult questions and decisions and pointed to the implementation of an all-College writing requirement through the First-Year Seminar program, voted in by the Faculty after significant disagreement about the issue. Dean Call commented that he does not believe the suggestions being offered would lessen the preeminence of the Faculty in decision-making at the College. Professor Rockwell reiterated that the mechanism of having the administration generate proposals that would then be brought to the Faculty for a "check" could lead to an adversarial relationship between the Faculty and administration.

President Marx offered the example of the faculty housing system. In earlier years, he noted, the Housing Committee did not meet, and faculty remained dissatisfied about the system, while some houses still remain vacant and others deteriorate. Under a system with fewer committees, the issue of faculty housing would become an issue that could be addressed regularly by the CPR, which could be charged with overseeing the system and requesting administrative proposals. Professor Loinaz expressed the view that the Housing Committee has been active and doing important work in recent years, and he noted that the committee is an important vehicle for representing the needs of tenure-track faculty, who provide regular input to members of the committee, who represent their needs. Professor Rockwell agreed.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Umphrey suggested that there might be better ways to foster communication among tenure-track colleagues than assignments to such a committee, perhaps through the creation of a tenure-track faculty forum. Professor Umphrey also expressed the view that at present, department chairs at Amherst serve mainly a bureaucratic function, have little power, and are not used effectively. She suggested, for example, that chairs could serve as a vetting device for certain kinds of proposals before they are forwarded to the full Faculty. The Committee discussed whether department chairs might be elected, serve lengthier, rotating terms, meet with the Dean more frequently, and/or receive some incentives and/or compensation, as another way of improving communication and strengthening governance

Amended April 11, 2011

structures. In addition, the Committee discussed briefly whether it might be more convenient and/or productive for Faculty Meetings to take place at a time of day other than the evening, perhaps in the afternoon.

The members next agreed to invite the CEP to its meeting on March 28 for the purpose of discussing the issue of class scheduling, including the committee's recommendations for addressing scheduling challenges and the problem of course-bunching, as well as several other topics. To inform the discussion, the Dean agreed to provide the members with a consultant's report on classroom space allocation and utilization at the College, to which the CEP and Class Scheduling Task Force also had access. Recommendations within this report included having the Registrar aid the Faculty in its choice of class times and classrooms and expanding the number of available time slots to provide students with broader access to the curriculum and to make better use of available space. The Dean and the President, while noting that the CEP's report offers some interesting information and suggests that the College should begin to address space and utilization issues as soon as possible, said they worried that the recommendations might not go far enough. The Dean noted that, as a result of the consultant's report, which offered detailed information about the failings of individual classrooms, the College is currently making a modest investment to modify some classrooms so that they provide better learning environments and scheduling flexibility can be enhanced. The members then reviewed the draft charge to the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising, offered some revisions, and agreed to approve the charge (by a vote of six in favor and zero opposed), which appears below with the revisions included.

Charge to The Ad Hoc Committee on Advising

The Committee of Six charges the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising with conducting a broad review of the advising system at the College, considering the meaning, purpose, and efficacy of advising at Amherst. We ask that College and major advising be assessed on their own merits, as well as in the context of the Amherst educational experience as a whole.

The review should include an examination of the advising work of faculty, deans (especially the Dean of New Students) and other administrators, coaches, and staff. In the process of evaluating existing systems for advising and considering new ones, we suggest that you consider the distinction that has traditionally been made between academic and non-academic advising, in light of the impact that those with less formalized advising roles have on our students' academic and co-curricular lives.

As part of its work, we ask the committee to review the efforts that have been under way over the past several years to improve academic advising at the College, including the development of new programs to adapt advising practices to better meet the needs of our diverse student body—which encompasses in greater numbers than in years past international students, community college transfers, first-generation students, and students who have come through the Summer Science and Summer Humanities and Social Science Programs.

We provide the following questions for you to explore:

Amended April 11, 2011

1. What are the purposes of academic advising? Is academic advising primarily an adjunct to the student course selection and registration process? Should advising focus more specifically on the articulation and assessment of student learning goals?
2. What priority should faculty give to their advising responsibilities in relation to their work as teachers and scholars?
3. Should all faculty continue to be required to serve as College and major advisors?
4. Is the allocation of advising responsibilities among faculty equitable and fair?
5. What are the virtues and problems with the Orientation advising system?
6. Should the effectiveness of advising be evaluated and considered as part of reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions?
7. What roles do/should non-faculty (e.g., coaches, deans, administrators, peer advisors) play as advisors about academic matters?
8. What are the new questions and challenges for advising posed by online registration?

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 11, 2011

The thirty-first meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, March, 28, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Rockwell, noting that the question that he was about to pose had been prompted by reading a consultant's report on space use at the College, asked President Marx about the intended use of the property that had previously been known as the Fiber Arts Building (which the College now refers to as 79 South Pleasant Street), which is located in Amherst's town center. The President responded that Amherst had purchased the building prior to the economic downturn in order to free up space at the core of the campus for faculty offices, by moving some administrative offices to this property. The renovations that would permit the move had been delayed until recently because of the economic downturn, he noted. The offices of Public Affairs and Human Resources, currently located in Converse Hall; the College's investment group, currently located on separate floors within College Hall; and the Five College Center for the Study of World Languages (which offers courses in less-commonly-studied languages to Five-College students) will occupy the renovated space. The move will free up at least eleven (and possibly more) spaces in Converse that will be used as faculty offices. Dean Call noted that the Converse space has been offered to the Department of History, but that no final decisions have been made. Should the department choose to move to Converse from the Chapin basement, plans are under consideration to create office space there for newly hired tenure-track faculty on a temporary basis. Since the College plans to do a considerable amount of hiring in the coming years, and since these new colleagues will often overlap for several years with colleagues on phased retirement, it is anticipated that space will not permit some newly hired faculty to have offices in departments, at least initially, Dean Call said. The Committee agreed that it could be desirable for the cohorts of new faculty from different disciplines to get to know one another by sharing office space for a time.

At 3:45 P.M., the Committee was joined by members (Professors Heidi Gilpin, Lyle McGeoch, Javier Corrales, and Anthony Bishop and student members Pranay Kirpilani '12, Rose Lenehan '11, and Andreas Shepard '11), of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and the CEP's recorder, Nancy Ratner, Researcher for Academic Projects and Associate Dean of Admission. Dean Call thanked the CEP for meeting with the Committee of Six and said that the members looked forward to discussing a range of issues.

Conversation turned first to some questions that Professor Rockwell had raised previously when reviewing proposals for new courses and in a letter that he had written to the CEP, and shared with the members of the Committee of Six. Professor McGeoch, noting that Professor Rockwell had brought important points to the attention of the committee, commented that this fall, the CEP had voted to adopt a class size of fifteen students as the lowest number that should be used routinely for a seminar. It had been agreed that proposals for classes with limits of this size would not require that faculty provide elaborate justifications for this enrollment limit. Professor McGeoch said that, when classes are proposed with enrollments that are limited to fewer than fifteen students, the CEP will examine with great care the justifications for such limits. Among the rationales that are commonly viewed as acceptable for these small class sizes are needs surrounding language instruction, writing-intensive courses, and limitations imposed by facilities/technology. Professor McGeoch noted that the CEP hoped that careful attention to

Amended April 11, 2011

proposals for small courses would help the College maintain broad student access to its curriculum.

Professor McGeoch noted Professor Rockwell's concern that over-enrollment in some classes is being addressed on a "case-by-case" basis," and that there most often are no stated criteria by which the College would know how the instructor planned to choose from among the "applicants" who pre-enrolled for his or her course. Professor McGeoch said that next year's CEP will refine its request for information on handling of over-enrollment and increase the size of the relevant box on the course proposal form. This would make it possible to provide to the Committee of Six the additional information that the CEP often solicits from faculty about how they will choose among over-enrolled students. Professor McGeoch commented that, in the future, the CEP would like to see the College publish, as part of course descriptions, the criteria that will be used in each class if it is over-enrolled. In answer to Professor Rockwell's concern about giving priority to particular categories of students, in terms of registration for a particular class, Professor McGeoch commented that the committee hasn't questioned this practice, as the categories of students who are advantaged have seemed reasonable.

Professor Rockwell shared another concern. He noted that, currently, there is no policy that requires that final course lists be established by any particular point in the add/drop period, and he wondered whether such a policy should be established. Some faculty, he noted, do not finalize their class lists until well into the semester, and as a result some students do not learn that they have been dropped from a course until late in the period. Students must often then scurry to find another course. The last several days of add/drop can become challenging for faculty, who must pick up students who may have missed a number of class meetings, and for students, who may be unable to set their schedules until late in the add/drop period. Professor Rockwell said that he does not understand why faculty need more than a couple of days at the beginning of the add/drop period to finalize their class lists. Professor Gilpin noted that faculty who teach courses that meet only once a week may need additional time to determine which students will remain in their classes. Professor Basu commented that it may take some time, as students shift their schedules, to determine which students are enrolled in a course and which are not, before a colleague can determine whether to add other students. Professor Umphrey suggested that it might be helpful if faculty establish waiting lists for over-enrolled classes. Professor Corrales said that he believes that, at one point, there was some discussion about asking the Registrar to communicate with faculty to encourage them to finalize their class lists by the second day of classes, so that students will know whether they have been accepted into their classes. Professor McGeoch, who said that he shares Professor Rockwell's concern about this issue, said that the Registrar has not yet been asked to communicate with faculty about finalizing their lists on this timetable, and that the CEP will consider ways of communicating broadly with faculty to encourage them to do so in the future.

Conversation turned to the issue of class scheduling. The members thanked the CEP for its work considering this question and the Class Scheduling Task Force for its efforts. Those members of the committees who had experimented with the online course scheduling tool that has been developed by Professor McGeoch offered high praise for it. The tool is available at <https://www.amherst.edu/people/facstaff/lamcgeoch/scheduler> (please note that you may need a Java applet to access the scheduler) and offers a quick and easy way to access detailed information on course schedules over a number of semesters, including preliminary schedules for future semesters. It is hoped that faculty and departments will find the tool helpful and will use

Amended April 11, 2011

the information that they obtain from it to inform their consideration of adjusting schedules before they are finalized, and to enhance their understanding of long-term scheduling patterns. Professor McGeoch said that the CEP believes that improving the availability of information about scheduling is essential; the committee expressed hope that a new level of awareness about under-used time slots will encourage faculty and departments to make better use of such slots.

Professor McGeoch reviewed the CEP's deliberations and conclusions about class scheduling, which are outlined in its [report](#) to the Committee. (The report of the Class Scheduling Task Force is included as part of the CEP's report.) Professor McGeoch pointed out that students' access to the College's course offerings is being limited by the current uneven distribution of courses within the week. In addition to increasing opportunities for students to choose from among a greater array of courses, another advantage of spreading courses more evenly across the week will be a more balanced utilization of classrooms. Growth in the curriculum that is anticipated as a result of the hiring of at least 18 new FTEs will (if classes are not spread more evenly across time slots and days of the week) result in the demand for classrooms exceeding the supply at peak times, Professor McGeoch noted. Among the problems that the CEP has identified with the current schedule are the following: there is too much clustering of courses in the middle part of the day, from 10:00 to 3:30, with a brief lull at noon; there are too few timeslots available for courses that are eighty minutes or longer; and there are too few courses taught before 10:00 and on Fridays. The CEP chose to propose some changes in the times at which courses of different lengths could be offered. The committee decided that it would be helpful if slots on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons are adjusted to create a new 80-minute slot at 1:00, and new possibilities are created for scheduling longer classes on Tuesday and Thursday mornings and on Fridays. The committee also chose to make a number of recommendations, rather than proposing any requirements at this time.

Professor Rockwell asked about the CEP's views on evening classes. Professor McGeoch said that the CEP's approach was to propose a circumscribed expansion of evening courses and a loosening of some previously imposed constraints, as outlined in the committee's second motion. The committee is recommending that the Dean be responsible for considering all requests for courses to be held at non-standard times and has proposed guidelines for him/her to apply when making these decisions.

Professor Ciepiela asked what issues the CEP considered before deciding not to propose that departments be required not to re-use a timeslot until all have been used. Professor McGeoch responded that it is hoped that voluntary measures can solve the problem with the clustering of courses; he said that the CEP does not believe that there is a crisis, at present, that would justify taking this step. Thus the committee, at present, feels that departments should be encouraged, but not required, to spread their courses fully. It was noted that there were different perspectives among those on the committee about this question. Professor Bishop commented that another reason for not proposing such a policy is that there would be a large number of exceptions (e.g., language and science departments) to such a rule. He noted that departments with structured curricula have good reasons for scheduling multiple courses in the same or overlapping time slots. In fact, he said, doing so opens up other timeslots within the day for other courses. In some disciplines, it was noted, different levels of introductory courses are taught at the same hour. This causes no conflicts for students and permits shifts of students among levels, even after the add/drop period. Dean Call noted that, at present, there are different practices among departments about distributing courses across time slots, and that some

Amended April 11, 2011

departments tend to cluster courses in particular slots. Professor Rockwell felt that it would be useful for the Committee to know which departments tend to have significant clustering and what the pedagogical impediments may be for spreading courses across time slots. He also wondered how these departments' clustering of their courses contributes to the overall problem of clustering across the curriculum, and by extension students' access to the curriculum. The practice among multiple departments of offering seminars on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Wednesday afternoons, was offered as an example of how individual departments' scheduling affects student access to the curriculum in an overall sense. Mr. Shepard commented that it is his impression that many seminars are being offered on Wednesdays at 2:00.

President Marx expressed the view that, based on the evidence, and on the fact that enrollment has increased and faculty hiring is increasing, there is a growing crisis in the amount of classroom space and available classroom seats at the College; he emphasized that a contributing factor to this challenge is the fact that the College is not using fully all of the course time slots that are available. He noted that the classrooms reserved for particular departments are not used as efficiently as they would be if they were assigned by the Registrar. This situation, the President said, promises only to get worse, as the supply of classrooms and seats goes down, and demand (as a result of increases in enrollment, some classrooms going offline, and an expected increase in the size of the Faculty) goes up. The shortage of space available for classes and reduced number of student seats will be exacerbated during some periods by the loss of a number of classrooms during the construction of the new science center. President Marx urged that additional ways to ensure that the courses be distributed across time slots be considered as soon as possible. He noted that the alternative of building additional classrooms, which is implied by the current pattern of under-utilization of space, would mean that the College would have fewer resources to devote to other needs, such as faculty positions, salaries, or financial aid, in addition to having a pedagogical cost. The President commented that course-bunching, which may cause everyone to eat at the same time, also adds pressure to increase the size of Valentine. Professor McGeoch said that he believes that providing more information about patterns of class scheduling and the growth of the College, and the possible repercussions of not taking action on this front, will serve as an inducement for departments, voluntarily, to spread their courses more broadly across time slots. Mr. Shepard suggested that moving some classes from high-use time slots to other slots would have a significant impact on improving students' access to the curriculum. It was also noted that, if faculty would be more flexible about the size of the classrooms in which they are willing to teach, that would also help to alleviate the problem of the availability of classrooms.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Basu asked whether the CEP had explored creating additional time slots during some late-afternoons, which have traditionally been preserved for athletics and labs. Professor McGeoch noted that it is his understanding from the Class Scheduling Task Force that there are hard limits in terms of how late in the day athletics practices and events can occur. The committees discussed the extent to which faculty, when planning the academic schedule, should take into account restrictions on time slots that may be imposed by needs surrounding athletics. Professor Rockwell suggested that the Faculty should be asked to consider whether more classes should be permitted to be held late in the afternoon into early evening. He noted that, if the proposal is not brought forward, the Faculty will not discuss this option. Professor McGeoch noted that extending classes later into the day is an option that

Amended April 11, 2011

has been incorporated into the committee's first motion, which allows for some time slots that will result in classes being held beyond 5:00 P.M.

Conversation turned to the possibility of having more classes at the other end of the spectrum, that is in the early morning. Professor Rockwell noted that, when he has offered classes at 8:30 in the morning, enrollments diminish. Offering such a course and not having students enroll has no mitigating effect on the problem of bunching, he noted. Professor Saxton agreed and said that she had had a similar experience when offering an-early morning class and had found it frustrating. The committees discussed whether offering additional courses that are popular and/or required courses at 8:30 in the morning might be an approach that would result in higher enrollments and serve the goal of spreading courses across time slots. The student members of the CEP offered the view that most students would adjust to a morning schedule in order to take required courses and/or popular courses. The committees agreed that the CEP should continue to monitor closely any changes that are implemented in the course schedule in order to determine their impact on mitigating the issues of course bunching and classroom utilization. It was noted that the CEP has recommended as part of its second motion that the Registrar report to the Faculty annually about course scheduling, assess the College's efforts to balance its schedule, and provide information about peak and non-peak times. Professor Bishop emphasized that the new course scheduler created by Professor McGeoch is an excellent way for everyone to monitor the magnitude of the class bunching problem, by department and across the College.

The committees next discussed the agenda for meetings with the Board on April 1. Included will be a conversation about the future of the library, the liberal arts, and the humanities; a discussion with the CEP about the committee's work this year; and a presentation by Dean Call about the demographics of the Faculty. The Dean noted that he had had a good conversation with department chairs on March 25 about the demographics of the Faculty, the FTE allocation process, and target-of-opportunity hiring.

The committees had a brief discussion about faculty hiring, including expectations for target-of-opportunity hiring. Professor Umphrey suggested that, to inform the FTE allocation process, it would be helpful for the Faculty to engage in a College-wide conversation about curricular directions, as the ways in which faculty positions will be prioritized will essentially have the effect of shaping the curriculum (the ten FTES left to be allocated for priorities recommended by the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP), are relatively few in relation to the overall number of FTES that will be allocated as a result of retirements). It was noted that the FTES made available as a result of retirements will not be automatic replacements for retiring faculty, and may be allocated for already established or new priorities, which makes even more important the need to consider the curriculum in broad ways. The Dean noted that, with the number of planned retirements by faculty in many departments, the CAP's revolving FTE bank for target-of-opportunity hiring (to which two FTES were initially allocated) could be quickly repaid in many cases. Thus the total number of FTES hired over time through this bank could be much higher than two, though he would expect that the target-of-opportunity process would only be used for exceptional opportunities. Professor McGeoch commented that proposals for target-of-opportunity FTES will require departments to bring forward a convincing case and a compelling candidate. He noted that the CEP has not yet had the opportunity to discuss the ways in which this tool may be used more broadly, since a number of constraints are no longer in place. President Marx, who commented that the target-of-opportunity program represents

Amended April 11, 2011

additional resources that are being provided for faculty hiring, noted that a number of departments are already bringing forward proposals for target-of-opportunity hires. Three such proposals will be reviewed this spring, according to the Dean, who noted that furthering the diversity of the Faculty should also be a consideration in all faculty searches. Professor McGeoch said that the committee will have a discussion on this topic very soon.

In response to the question of what proportion of faculty hiring will be done through the target-of-opportunity process, the President stressed that the procedures developed by the CEP will enable the College to take advantage of exceptional opportunities that may arise to hire stellar candidates who would be attractive to many institutions. The procedures will provide the flexibility that is often needed to respond and act quickly when making such a hire. Dean Call noted that, given current faculty demographics and planned FTE growth, he would anticipate that the College could hire approximately ten new FTEs per year for the next five years and thus there should be ample capacity within that cohort to include some target-of-opportunity hires. The President commented on the relative efficiency of the target-of-opportunity hiring process, since there is likely to be only one candidate put forward by a department for a position.

Conversation turned briefly to the topic of teaching evaluations for tenured members of the Faculty. Professor McGeoch noted that the CEP has not yet considered this issue, which was recently discussed by the Committee of Six. It has been suggested that all tenured faculty should evaluate their teaching in all of their courses each year by means of their choice, with the results belonging to them. Professor McGeoch noted that he would be in favor of considering such a proposal. At present, there is a requirement voted by the Faculty in 2007 that tenured faculty evaluate their teaching in one course each year, with the same parameters. Mr. Shepard noted that students would be strongly in favor of such a proposal. Professor Bishop said that he would support having teaching evaluations for all tenured faculty for all courses, but would only be interested in raising this issue again if there were some sense that there would be an outcome that was substantive. Professor McGeoch said that there would not be time for the CEP to discuss this issue this spring because of other pressing agenda items. It was noted that when the current requirement for teaching evaluations for senior faculty was approved by the Faculty in May 2007, it had been agreed then, by Faculty vote, that the policy would be evaluated six years after its implementation. Professor McGeoch, who commented that he has always found course evaluations to be informative, noted that he would like to see greater uniformity between the ways that the teaching of tenured and untenured faculty is evaluated. It would make sense to him for tenured faculty to evaluate all of their courses. Many members of both committees agreed, while noting that a cultural shift might be required if all faculty were to be required to evaluate all courses. Professor McGeoch agreed that the CEP would consider this issue in the fall of 2011.

The members of both committees agreed that the meeting had been productive and that the two committees should plan to meet once or twice per year going forward. The members thanked the CEP, and the committee left the meeting at 5:30 P.M.

The Committee returned briefly to the topic of the CEP's proposals regarding class scheduling. Noting the current inefficient use of the College's resources in terms of classroom utilization, which results partially from course-bunching, and the effect that bunching has on students' access to the curriculum, the members discussed the CEP's recommendations that departments would begin voluntarily to spread their courses across a greater number of time slots. The members decided to consider more carefully whether, perhaps, departments should be

Amended April 11, 2011

required to do so. As a first step, the members asked the Dean to consult with the Registrar to get a better sense of individual departments' distribution of courses, and with the CEP to try to determine which departments have valid pedagogical reasons for offering multiple courses in the same or overlapping time slots. In this way, the Committee could get a better sense of the number of exceptions that would need to be made if a requirement were to be put in place that departments not reuse a timeslot until all have been used.

The Committee next reviewed proposals for new courses and voted six to zero in favor of forwarding them to the Faculty. Conversation turned to the draft Faculty Meeting agenda for April 5. The Committee next voted to approve the final minutes of its meeting of February 28. The members voted six to zero in favor of forwarding the agenda to the Faculty.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 18, 2011

The thirty-second meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, April 4, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with the President providing a brief summary of the meetings of the Board of Trustees that had occurred on April 1 and 2. Topics of conversation had included continuing discussion about the science center project; the need for additional faculty FTEs; issues surrounding support for students and how to meet growing needs in this area, while being conscious of budgetary limitations; and the budget, more generally.

Dean Call noted that a number of circumstances had arisen during the previous week that had, as the members are aware, delayed the review of the Committee's minutes of March 23 and March 28. The process had already been proceeding under the expedited schedule that is always required during the week before a Faculty Meeting, in order to approve minutes in time to distribute them to the Faculty before the meeting. Instead of rushing the approval process, it had seemed preferable, the Dean had decided, with the President's advice, to read abbreviated minutes of the relevant Committee of Six meetings at the April 5 Faculty Meeting. Taking this approach would allow the Committee the time that would be needed to review two complex sets of minutes, and will enable the Faculty to have sufficient time to read and digest these minutes before the next Faculty Meeting, at which time any questions that colleagues may have about them can be discussed.

In the context of discussing possible revisions to the Committee's minutes, the members returned briefly to issues surrounding faculty governance. Since the Committee has had its own minuted discussion about this topic and has now spoken with the Board about it, as well, President Marx wondered how the conversation about faculty governance would move forward.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Basu requested that the Committee place on its agenda a discussion of release time and other flexible accommodations for faculty who have significant administrative and/or governance burdens. President Marx asked whether this issue might be discussed in the context of other proposals that had been suggested during the Committee's discussions about faculty governance. Professor Basu next asked if the Dean would inform the members of the agenda items that remain for this academic year. After some discussion of these items and the schedule for considering them, the Dean said that he would provide the members with a written draft agenda by the time that the Committee next met.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Umphrey asked the President if he would provide a general characterization of the finances of the College, since it appears that the Board had some discussion of this topic. President Marx responded that the endowment has recovered about three quarters of the loss incurred two-and-a-half years ago, which is positive, but which means that the growth during these years that had been projected before the downturn has not occurred. Dean Call noted that the endowment has performed better than projected for this fiscal year so far. President Marx said that, if the College continues to base its projections on the same set of assumptions and if the return for this year is maintained, it appears that the goal for the endowment spend rate will be reached for the next two years, but that it will be above the targeted limit thereafter. The Board is comfortable, at this time, with an assumption of a 6.8 percent return on the endowment moving forward, President Marx said,

Amended April 18, 2011

while noting that there is significant debate, generally, about the degree to which the economy will recover in the near and long term.

Profess Loinaz next asked the President whether there is any sense that changes will be made to the College's faculty housing policy. President Marx said that, while he has encouraged the development of proposals to improve the policy, no proposals have been brought forward. He noted that some discussions of this issue have taken place within the Housing Committee and the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR). Dean Call, noting that the Housing Committee had discussions with the CPR about a possible proposal in 2008-2009, said he believes that the economic downturn slowed efforts to bring forward a proposal. He commented that the Housing Committee had met with the CPR earlier this year and that the two committees will meet again this spring. The members then turned to personnel matters.

The Committee next reviewed an additional proposal for a Senior Sabbatical Fellowship and recommended that it be approved.

The Committee reviewed proposals for new courses and voted six to zero in favor of forwarding them to the Faculty. The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 25, 2011

The thirty-third meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, April 11, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, Umphrey, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Committee reviewed the final minutes of its March 23 meeting and voted to approve them. Under “Announcements from the Dean,” Dean Call informed the members that he is seeking feedback from Gina Rodriguez ’11, the first (and only) recipient of the Mellon Senior Thesis Prize, and Professor Frank, who advised her as part of the award, about their experience working together. The Dean explained that the Committee would soon be asked to consider whether the prize should be continued, and that it is his hope that feedback from Ms. Rodriguez and Professor Frank would inform the members’ discussion of this issue. Providing some background, Dean Call reminded the members that the Mellon Senior Thesis Prize had been created in 2009-2010 with a modest amount of funding that the College had received for one year only from the Mellon Foundation to encourage student research. It had been agreed that the prize would be awarded to a graduating senior who had completed an honors thesis that had been judged by his or her major department to be of exceptionally high quality. The winner would receive a \$2,000 stipend and \$1,500 toward living expenses in the summer after graduation, to enable him or her to spend the summer at Amherst doing work to turn the thesis into a publication, under the supervision of the original thesis advisor or another member of the same department. As part of the award, the advisor would receive a \$500 grant toward research expenses or as an honorarium. Each department had been offered the opportunity to nominate one of its theses to be considered for the prize, and the winning thesis had been selected by the Committee of Six on the grounds of intellectual quality, originality, and potential for publication. Explaining more about the origins of the prize, the Dean said that he regularly receives requests to support students’ continuing thesis work for the summer after they graduate. It had been decided to develop and award one prize, using the Mellon award as seed funding to support a student in this way as an experiment, with the possibility of continuing to award the prize in the future. The Dean said that he would soon share Ms. Rodriguez’s and Professor Frank’s impressions with the Committee and looked forward to having a discussion with the members about whether to continue the prize in future using College funds.

The members next reviewed a draft agenda for an April 19 Faculty Meeting and decided that there was insufficient business to warrant a meeting. The Committee next turned briefly to a personnel matter.

Under “Questions from Committee members, Professor Basu noted that departments are routinely asked to host individuals as visitors, often to teach a single course, for reasons such as accommodating the partner of another Amherst faculty hire and/or through initiatives such as the Croxton and Simpson Lectureship or McCloy Professorship. She asked the Dean whether hosting such a visitor, which can often involve substantial work for a department, is counted against other departmental requests for visitors. Professor Basu noted that a department’s request for a visitor often includes expectations of advising and other responsibilities that may not be part of a visiting position that is offered to a department. Dean Call responded that there are many considerations that are weighed when decisions are made about visitor requests, including the overall number of requests and the reasons for offering/circumstances surrounding any visitors that may have been offered to a department. He noted that the visitor budget had reached its peak immediately prior to the economic downturn and that, while the budget has

Amended April 25, 2011

rebounded somewhat, it is now at the level it was nearly a decade ago. This level is consistent with plans that call for allocating and hiring an increasing number of tenure line FTEs in the coming decade, which is expected to reduce the need to rely as heavily on visitors.

Continuing with “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Umphrey asked the Dean about the outcomes of faculty searches that had been authorized for 2010-2011. Dean Call reported that the hiring season had been successful. There were nine searches, and the College has hired seven of the first-choice candidates recommended by departments. He noted that he is impressed with all of the candidates who have been hired. One of the searches failed and another produced two offers, one of which has been accepted and the second of which is in negotiations, he noted. Professor Umphrey asked if the target-of-opportunity process had been used to hire any of these new colleagues. Dean Call said that these procedures were used to make a second offer in a single search. Professor Umphrey asked if one of the two FTEs that had been reserved for target-of-opportunity hires through the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) process has now been allocated. The Dean said that one of these FTEs has been allocated, but that the “bank” for these FTEs would be “repaid” almost immediately as a result of a phased retirement.

Professor Loinaz next noted that Professor Jaswal had asked him how best to ensure that the comments that she had made at the April 5 Faculty Meeting, as part of the discussion of the proposal of the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) regarding parenting and medical leave, could be distributed to the Faculty in their entirety. He had advised her to write to the Committee of Six, which she has now done. The Committee agreed to append (via link) [Professor Jaswal's letter](#) to the minutes of today's meeting. In terms of next steps, President Marx noted that a summary of the Faculty's discussion of the CPR's proposal, including the Faculty's vote and a discussion of the constituencies that would not be included if the voted proposal were approved by the Trustees and implemented, would be forwarded to the Human Resources Committee of the Board of Trustees. In addition, the administration plans to provide the Trustees with an analysis of the costs of several different models of parenting leave. Dean Call noted that the CPR's proposal, which was endorsed by vote of the Faculty, is estimated to cost approximately \$147,600 annually. Extending the same benefit (a release from teaching for one semester) to all faculty parents who are primary care-givers is estimated to cost approximately \$204,000, or about \$56,000 more, the Dean said. He noted that it is difficult to get a sense of what an equivalent benefit would be for staff, and thus of any additional costs that would be incurred if an additional benefit were extended to the staff, given the different units of work of faculty and staff, but that some options would be developed and costed out for further discussion. The Dean said that the administration is gathering information on parenting leave policies for staff at peer institutions.

Continuing the discussion, Professor Basu asked if the Committee of Six and the Faculty would be asked to consider any parenting leave proposals for staff. She noted that she had written to the CPR to request that the committee conduct research on costs and develop a more inclusive parenting leave proposal for the Faculty to consider. Professor Basu expressed the view that, in its deliberations about the CPR's proposal, the Committee of Six and the Faculty as a whole had raised issues surrounding faculty/staff equity that were an implicit part of past deliberations about this issue, and which should continue to be discussed in relation to any future proposals that may be developed. Professor Saxton agreed, commenting that she does not want to see the issue of faculty/staff equity de-coupled from future proposals about parenting leave. Professor Rockwell commented that he feels uncomfortable with the increasing tendency for the

Amended April 25, 2011

Faculty to use Faculty Meetings as a means to weigh in on, negotiate, or vote on benefits for staff, or for faculty for that matter. It seemed to him that the CPR's charge provides a forum for the Faculty's voice in setting institutional priorities, but that transforming the Faculty Meeting into a forum for management/labor negotiations could have regrettable, unforeseen consequences for the entire community in the long term. Professor Umphrey agreed, commenting that it would likely be understandably difficult for the Faculty to vote, for example, for a benefit decrease. Summarizing the current state of the issue and steps going forward, President Marx noted that, through regular processes of the Faculty, the CPR had put a motion forward for a parenting and enhanced medical leave policy, the Committee of Six had forwarded the proposal to the Faculty, and the Faculty had voted to endorse it. The Board will now consider this proposal and the issue of parenting leave more generally. Professor Umphrey asked if the President and the Dean would share with the Committee their recommendations to the Board regarding parenting leave. They agreed to do so for the faculty benefit. The Committee then turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 27, 2011

The thirty-fourth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, April 18, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Saxton was absent.

The Committee reviewed the final minutes of its March 28 and April 4 meetings and voted to approve them.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Marx informed the members that he had not had at hand the College's policy (which can be found at <https://www.amherst.edu/offices/it/about/policies/acceptable>) regarding the privacy of emails when responding to a question posed at the April 5 Faculty Meeting as to whether the administration planned to make a statement regarding recent attempts to obtain the emails of a Wisconsin professor through the open records law. The President noted that the College's policy is consistent with those of peer institutions and said that its purpose is not to allow investigations into the scholarly work of faculty or political views and actions, which would threaten academic freedom, but to comply with requests for information under certain articulated conditions. If the Committee wants more information about this matter, Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel, would be happy to meet with the members to answer questions, President Marx said.

Continuing with his remarks, President Marx asked the members whether the Committee of Six ought to bring forward a proposal that all tenured faculty members should be required to evaluate their teaching in all of their courses each year by means of their choice, with the results belonging to them. The Committee on Education Policy (CEP) has agreed to consider in fall 2011 whether to develop such a proposal, according to the committee's chair, Professor Lyle McGeoch. Professor Umphrey, while praising the progress that has been made in recent years on this issue and noting the likelihood that such a motion would be brought forward in the near future, expressed the view that it would be best during this period of presidential transition not to require a proposal in the fall. She commented that the incoming president may have other agenda items he or she wishes to prioritize in the first months on campus. Professor Basu, noting the importance of this issue, suggested that a first step might be to assess the Faculty's views on the requirement for teaching evaluations for senior faculty, which was approved by the Faculty in May 2007. Professor Basu suggested that the Dean's office and/or the CEP write to department chairs in the fall to ask them to poll colleagues about whether they have found the new system to be informative and/or discuss this issue at a Faculty Meeting. She favors gathering data to inform any future deliberations and/or proposals, she said. Dean Call responded that he would be pleased to assist with the organization of such an evaluation. As a matter of faculty governance, Professor Ciepiela raised the issue of whether it would be appropriate to evaluate this new policy regarding teaching evaluations on a schedule that would be inconsistent with the one that the faculty had approved. She noted that the Faculty had voted to evaluate the new policy six years after its implementation. In a related matter, President Marx informed the members that a group of students had met with him recently to express their concern about this issue. Professor Basu suggested that the students be invited to share their views with the Committee of Six and the CEP.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the members that, in accordance with the charge to the Copyright, Reserves, and Coursepack Task Force, the task force report will be sent first to the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR). It is likely

Amended April 27, 2011

that the Committee of Six will consider the report in the fall. The Committee then turned briefly to personnel matters.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Loinaz asked if there was support available for tenured colleagues who might want to develop online teaching evaluations for their courses. The Dean said that many Academic Department Coordinators can provide such assistance and/or that the Department of Information Technology could also provide support, if needed. Professor Loinaz suggested that having a link to sample online evaluation forms from faculty course pages might be helpful for tenured colleagues who are considering formats for soliciting feedback on their teaching. Professor Basu suggested that the forms that are posted on the Teaching and Advising Program (TAP) web site should be updated. Particularly valuable as models, she said, are forms that the Amherst faculty and Harvard’s Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning have used.

Conversation returned to the issue of class scheduling, and the members discussed the possibility of bringing forward additional motions beyond the CEP’s proposal for a circumscribed expansion of evening courses and a loosening of some previously imposed constraints, and the committee’s proposed changes in the times at which courses of different lengths could be offered. The CEP has proposed that timeslots on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons be adjusted to create a new 80-minute slot at 1:00 and new possibilities for scheduling longer classes on Tuesday and Thursday mornings and on Fridays). (See the [CEP’s report on class scheduling](#) for specific motions.)

In its consideration of this issue, the Committee focused on thinking about possible solutions that could enhance students’ access to the curriculum and ease pressures on classroom spaces. The members discussed how to address challenges surrounding the need for a greater number of eighty-minute timeslots; the current situation of too few courses being taught before 10:00 A.M. and on Fridays; and an inefficient use of classroom space. The members noted that creating an additional evening timeslot(s) would help free up time during the day for classes and would offer students additional options and suggested that, perhaps, an evening timeslot could be created on Mondays. President Marx wondered whether consideration should be given to creating evening timeslots on all weekday evenings, leaving it up to students to make choices from among a range of options for curricular and co-curricular offerings. The Committee favored creating an evening timeslot for one day of the week to minimize conflict with arts performances, which, under such a plan, would have one “dark” evening, a schedule that is common at other schools. The members also favored the creation of an additional eighty-minute timeslot on Tuesdays/Thursdays, as proposed by the CEP, while noting that longer classes that started at 2:30 P.M. might push into late-evening early-afternoon time periods that have traditionally been reserved for athletics. Under such a plan, students could make choices as to whether to take classes during such a slot or whether to take classes at other times that would not interfere with early evening activities including athletics, it was noted. Professor Basu wondered whether having more Amherst classes in the evenings would negatively affect the ability of Five-College students to enroll in Amherst classes. The Dean said that it is his understanding, from conversations with other Five-College Deans, that adding more evening courses at Amherst would most likely enhance the accessibility of Amherst classes to Five-College students. The members also discussed the possibility of recasting the schedule using ninety-minute timeslots—increasing flexibility, with the result that classes could more easily be offered for fifty, eighty, or ninety minutes within a series of longer blocks. Distributing large, popular classes throughout the

Amended April 27, 2011

day, including in the morning, would be helpful in using classrooms of different sizes most efficiently it was noted.

The members discussed whether there might be ways of using the class schedule to shape students' choices when enrolling in courses. Proposals included requiring all students to take some classes in the early-morning and on Fridays or requiring first-year students to do so. It was noted that, if students were required to take classes in the morning and/or on Fridays, it would be necessary for more courses to be offered at these times. Several members commented that the prospect of low enrollments have been the most significant barriers for them when they have considered teaching in the morning, and it was agreed that, if there were more student demand for courses in the morning (either because required courses were offered in the morning or as a result of requiring students to take some courses in the morning), more faculty would likely be willing to teach courses in the morning. Professor Umphrey noted that some colleagues with children might find it difficult to teach in the morning because of family obligations. President Marx commented that the College would incorporate consideration of needs in this area into its review of questions surrounding opportunities that should be offered to the community for daycare.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Basu suggested that departments could be urged to schedule required courses across timeslots; electives, on the other hand, could be scheduled in overlapping slots or within one or two slots, thereby limiting overlaps among required courses for a major within a department. The Committee also discussed the possibility of increasing the number of timeslots for seminars by allowing seminars to be taught on Fridays, as well as Wednesdays, and/or in the evenings, with an anticipated result being that students' access to these classes would be enhanced and the pressure for small classrooms for these courses would be eased. The Committee also discussed the possibility of offering First-Year Seminars in more than one timeslot, perhaps in morning slots (e.g., dividing First-Year Seminars among Monday/Wednesday 8:30 A.M., Wednesday/Friday 8:30 A.M., and Monday/Friday 8:30 A.M. slots, thereby requiring only two-thirds the number of classrooms on each day for First-Year Seminars and ensuring that each first-year student has at least one class out of the way before 10 A.M. every day). If this approach were taken, it would be important for other courses that first-year students typically take to be scheduled so as not to conflict with the seminars, it was agreed. Dean Call noted that scheduling First-Year Seminars in the morning would affect the schedule for other courses (particularly in multiple levels within languages, mathematics, and the sciences) for first-year students. Professor Umphrey expressed some concern that it might be difficult for faculty with young children to participate in the First-Year Seminar Program if the seminars were taught in the early-morning, while commenting that if it were possible to schedule courses at 9:00 A.M., it would be quite desirable for parents to teach at that time. The members also discussed the possibility of scheduling First-Year Seminars once a week for two-and-a-half hours, but Professors Basu, Ciepiela, and Umphrey said that they were disinclined toward adopting such a schedule, noting that first-year students, in particular, benefit from more frequent class meetings and opportunities for classroom interaction with their professors.

Professor Ciepiela asked whether the decision to implement some of the changes under discussion might be largely administrative. Professor Umphrey commented that the decision to change the schedule for First-Year Seminars, for example, seemed to be a purely administrative matter that would not require a faculty vote. The Committee agreed that, while some decisions about scheduling would be administrative ones, any proposals that resulted in changing or adding

Amended April 27, 2011

timeslots for class meetings would require a vote of the Faculty. Since the academic year is drawing to a close, the members wondered whether it might be best to bring the CEP's motions before the Faculty at this time and to charge the administration with developing additional scheduling proposals to bring to the Faculty. President Marx suggested that, if such an approach were taken, it would be important for the administration to be given parameters. For example, based on the discussion so far, the administration could be asked to develop proposals that would include a strategy for spreading classes with a history of having large enrollments across timeslots and/or that would result in all students, or perhaps just first-year students, taking classes on Friday mornings.

Professor Ciepiela stated that she preferred the measures being discussed, and the measures proposed by the CEP, to requiring departments not to reuse a timeslot until all had been used, a policy for which exceptions would have to be made when there were pedagogical reasons for departments offering multiple courses in the same timeslot. The members agreed that it would be informative to confer with the CEP about its rationale for considering but not recommending some ideas and, more generally, about whether the committee had considered some of the ideas that the Committee had been discussing. In addition, the Committee agreed to consider making additional proposals, if necessary.

The members spent the remainder of the meeting considering nominations for faculty committees.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 28, 2011

The thirty-fifth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, April 25, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Saxton was absent.

The Committee reviewed the final minutes of its April 11 meeting and voted to approve them. The members turned briefly to a personnel matter. The Dean next reviewed with the Committee responses to invitations to Faculty to serve on faculty committees.

The Committee returned to personnel matters. Following those discussions, the members reviewed proposals for new courses and voted five in favor and zero opposed to forward them to the Faculty.

Conversation turned to the issue of class scheduling, and the members returned to their consideration of the possibility of bringing forward additional motions beyond the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP)'s proposal for a circumscribed expansion of evening courses and a loosening of some previously imposed constraints, and the committee's proposed changes in the times at which courses of different lengths could be offered. The CEP has proposed that timeslots on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons be adjusted to create a new eighty-minute slot at 1:00 and new possibilities for scheduling longer classes on Tuesday and Thursday mornings and on Fridays). (See the [CEP's report on class scheduling](#) (appended via link) for specific motions.)

The members reviewed the possible solutions to problems with class scheduling that they had developed at their last meeting, with the goal of enhancing students' access to the curriculum and easing pressures on classroom spaces. The members agreed that implementing some of their ideas would require a vote of the Faculty, while others could be considered by faculty committees and/or the administration and possibly implemented, when faculty votes were not required. Professor Rockwell noted that, before asking the Faculty to vote to implement some of the ideas—for example, requiring all students to take some classes in the morning or requiring first-year students to take classes on Fridays, he imagines that the Faculty would want to have data on the effects of taking such significant steps, before making a decision. Professor Rockwell suggested that, for some proposals, it would be necessary, in his view, to gather these data and to explore these ideas in greater detail, perhaps in the fall.

The members agreed on the value of making as much progress on the class scheduling front as is possible, while allowing enough time for evaluating proposals, as needed. The Committee decided to forward [motion one](#) (appended via link), which had been developed and forwarded by the CEP, to the Faculty, which will have the effect, among other things, of creating an additional eighty-minute timeslot on Tuesdays/Thursdays. In addition, most members agreed that it would be helpful to create an additional evening timeslot(s) to help free up time during the day for classes and offer students additional options. The Committee discussed the possibilities for days of the week to which an evening time slot could be added and that would interfere least with curricular and co-curricular activities, particularly the arts. The members felt that Sunday and Monday were the best possibilities, and, after discussion, agreed to put forward a motion, now called [motion two](#) (appended via link) that an additional timeslot be added on Mondays from 7 P.M. to 9:30 P.M. Sunday evenings, the members felt, were used by many faculty and students to prepare for classes and would be a less desirable time for class meetings as a result. No matter when evening timeslots were added, students could make choices as to whether to take classes during such a slot or whether to take classes at other times that would not interfere with evening activities. Professor Umphrey expressed some concern that adding an evening timeslot could have a negative effect on students' ability to participate in artistic practices and performances.

Amended April 28, 2011

Continuing the conversation, the members agreed that the First-Year Seminar Committee, in collaboration with the CEP and the administration, should be asked to explore a proposal to offer First-Year Seminars in more than one timeslot, perhaps in morning slots (e.g., dividing First-Year Seminars among Monday/Wednesday 8:30 A.M., Wednesday/Friday 8:30 A.M., and Monday/Friday 8:30 A.M. slots, thereby ensuring that each first-year student has at least one class out of the way before 10 A.M. every day). The members reiterated that, if this approach were taken, it would be important for other courses that first-year students typically take (particularly in multiple levels within languages, mathematics, and the sciences) to be scheduled by departments so as not to conflict with the seminars. Distributing the seminars over more slots would be helpful in terms of easing the pressure on the small classrooms that are needed for First-Year Seminars, Dean Call noted, since only two-thirds the number of classrooms on each day would be required for First-Year Seminars.

The members next reviewed the substance that the CEP had put forward as motion two and agreed to retain the language as written, but to re-order the information and to divide it into [three motions](#) (appended via link). Professor Ciepiela suggested that some of the information included in these motion(s) appears not to require legislative action and to be largely instructive. The Dean said that it is his understanding that the CEP believes that there is value to having the Faculty endorse this set of recommendations, which will serve to advise the Dean, departments, and the Registrar, and that doing so would give additional weight to these directives.

Since the academic year is drawing to a close, the members agreed that it would be preferable to charge relevant faculty committees and the administration with developing scheduling proposals beyond these motions, which could be brought to the Faculty, when a vote to implement them would be necessary, presumably in the next academic year. In the context of the Faculty's consideration at the May 3 Faculty Meeting of the motions that the Committee had decided to place on the agenda, President Marx wondered whether it would be informative for the Dean to review other ideas that the Committee had discussed about class scheduling, and which might be researched and/or brought forward to the Faculty in the future. The Dean agreed to offer some remarks at the Faculty Meeting on this subject, and the Committee agreed to append via link its [list of proposals](#) to the minutes of today's meeting.

The Committee then voted on the substance of each motion and on whether to forward them to the Faculty. With the exception of the Committee's motion two, the votes were recorded as five in favor and zero opposed on substance, and five in favor and zero opposed to forward them to the Faculty. For the Committee's motion two, the vote on substance was recorded as four in favor, zero opposed, and one abstention (Professor Umphrey). The vote to forward motion two to the Faculty was five in favor and zero opposed. The members next voted on forwarding the Faculty Meeting Agenda for the meeting of May 3 to the Faculty. The vote was five in favor and zero opposed.

Discussion turned to the question of whether to continue the Mellon Senior Thesis Prize, which was created in 2009-2010 with a modest amount of funding that the College had received for one year only from the Mellon Foundation to encourage student research. To inform the conversation, the Committee had been provided with testimony from Gina Rodriguez '11, the first (and only) recipient of the prize, and Professor Frank, who advised her as part of the award, about their experience working together. Both Ms. Rodriguez and Professor Frank saw great value in the award, it was agreed. Upon the creation of the award, it had been decided that it would be awarded to a graduating senior (ultimately Ms. Rodriguez) who had completed an honors thesis that had been judged by his or her major department to be of exceptionally high quality. The winner would receive a \$2,000 stipend and \$1,500 toward living expenses in the summer after graduation, to enable him or her to spend the summer at Amherst doing work to

Amended April 28, 2011

turn the thesis into a publication, under the supervision of a faculty advisor. As part of the award, the advisor (ultimately Professor Frank) would be offered \$500, either as a grant toward research expenses or as an honorarium. Each department had been offered the opportunity to nominate one of its theses to be considered for the prize, and the winning thesis had been selected by the Committee of Six on the grounds of intellectual quality, originality, and potential for publication.

Professor Rockwell began the conversation about whether to continue the award by saying that he would not be in favor of doing so, expressing the view that, only rarely are theses of a quality and/or in a state or readiness that would make it possible for them to be revised over a summer and be fit for publication. In addition, he noted the difficulty of selecting one thesis from among the many that would be submitted, as comparisons and judgments can be challenging because of the range of subject matter and approaches. Professor Ciepiela questioned whether theses represented the best format to be considering, particularly in the humanities, if the purpose would be to encourage students to revise a piece of academic work over the summer after they graduate, with the goal of publishing it. She suggested that, in the humanities, it would be preferable for a student to focus on an outstanding seminar paper or essay that he or she had written, which might later be published as a journal article, for example. The members agreed that there would be field-specific differences in terms of the format of a student project that might be publishable after a summer spent working toward this goal. Professor Basu said that she would support a prize that would encourage faculty/student research collaborations, building on the College's initiatives in this area, over a summer after graduation. She noted that such an endeavor might result in a joint publication by the faculty member and student. The prospect of such a publication might serve as more of an incentive than a modest honorarium for a faculty member to serve as an advisor. Professor Loinaz expressed support for providing funding for seniors to pursue post-baccalaureate research with a faculty mentor. It was agreed that, if this prize continues, it should be awarded to a student who would build on a project that had already been undertaken, rather than pursuing a new project. The Dean, who said that he sees great value in student-faculty research collaborations of this sort, said that he could provide funding (a \$2,000 stipend and \$1,500 toward living expenses in the summer after graduation for the student to remain at Amherst for the summer and a \$500 grant toward research expenses or as a stipend for the faculty advisor) for up to three Post-Baccalaureate Summer Research Fellowships. It was decided that the Dean would solicit nominations of students for the fellowships from the Faculty, and that each department could nominate no more than one student. In addition to a letter of recommendation (which would describe the strengths of the student's project and speak to its potential for publication) from the faculty member who would serve as the student's advisor, the proposal to the Dean would include the paper, essay, or thesis on which the student planned to focus and the student's transcript. At the Committee's suggestion, the Dean agreed to ask the Faculty Research Awards Committee if its members would select the recipients of the fellowship.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

**The Committee of Six's Ideas that
Could Enhance Students' Access to the Curriculum
and Ease Pressures on Classroom Spaces**

- Create an additional evening timeslot(s) on Monday evening that would help free up time during the day for classes and would offer students additional options
(Motion Two, Faculty Meeting Agenda of May 3, 2011)
- Recast the schedule using ninety minute timeslots—increasing flexibility, with the result that classes could more easily be offered for fifty, eighty, or ninety minutes within a series of longer blocks.
(Research options with the CEP. If desired, the CEP would bring a proposal forward for a faculty vote)
- Distribute large, popular classes throughout the day, including in the morning
(Using new software on class scheduling, encourage departments and ask the Registrar to monitor results)
- Require all students to take some classes in the morning
(Implementation would require a vote of the Faculty)
- Require all students to take classes on Fridays
(Implementation would require a vote of the Faculty)
- Require first-year students to take early-morning classes
(Implementation would require a vote of the Faculty)
- Encourage departments to schedule required courses across timeslots; electives, on the other hand, could be scheduled in overlapping slots or within one or two slots, thereby limiting the courses that students could take that are at the same level within a department.
(Encourage departments to do so, and ask the Registrar to monitor the results.)
- Increase the number of timeslots for once-a-week seminars by allowing seminars to be taught on Fridays, as well as Wednesdays, and/or in the evenings, with an anticipated result being that the pressure for small classrooms for these courses would be eased.
(Motion One addresses this issue in part. If the motion is passed, the Registrar would be asked to monitor results)
- Offer First-Year Seminars in more than one timeslot, perhaps in morning slots (e.g., divide FYS among MW 8:30, WF 8:30, and MF 8:30 slots, thereby requiring only 2/3 the number of classrooms on each day for First-Year Seminars and ensuring that each first-year student has at least one class out of the way before 10 am every day).
(Ask the First-Year Seminar Committee to consider this idea)

- Spread classes with a history of having large enrollments across timeslots
(Using new software on class scheduling, encourage departments and ask the Registrar to monitor results)
- Require departments not to reuse a timeslot until all have been used, while recognizing that exceptions would have to be made when there were pedagogical reasons for departments offering multiple courses in the same timeslot.
(Research options with the CEP. If desired, the CEP would bring a proposal forward for a faculty vote)

Amended May 12, 2011

The thirty-sixth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, May 2, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Saxton was absent. The Committee turned briefly to a personnel matter.

Under “Announcements from the Dean,” Dean Call informed the members that he has accepted the Faculty Computer Committee’s recommendation, which has been informed by the external review of the Department of Information Technology, that the College move away from using its content management system (CMS)—in this context the web-based system for organizing and managing web information—as its learning management system (LMS)—in this context, the web-based system for supporting teaching. The CMS became the LMS of choice for Amherst after the decision was made four years ago to encourage faculty to move away from the use of Blackboard as the College’s LMS. The Dean noted that feedback from faculty indicates that using the CMS as Amherst’s LMS has not effectively met the needs of some faculty, and, as a home-grown system, it has been a drain on the College’s IT staff, which has had to devote considerable time to building the system. This set of circumstances resulted in the Faculty Computer Committee’s recommendation to move to Moodle, a free, open-source LMS used by colleges across the country and three of the Five Colleges, by fall of 2013. The CMS will continue to be the mechanism for organizing and managing other College Web content, Dean Call said. Plans call for Blackboard to continue to be made available until May 2012, when it will be discontinued. In the summer of 2012, IT will work with faculty to begin to migrate to Moodle. By fall 2012, Moodle will be fully functional and will run in tandem with the CMS-LMS system. In January 2013, the migration to Moodle will continue. During the spring of 2013, the College will continue to run both the CMS-LMS and Moodle, but by May 2013 the CMS-LMS will be shut down. The final migration of faculty to Moodle will be completed during the summer of 2013. Dean Call apologized that the Faculty is being asked to transition to a new system again, but said that the amount of dissatisfaction with both Blackboard and the CMS-LMS warrants this change. Noting that it is now clear that the approach of building all of the necessary LMS tools ourselves was flawed, the Dean said that he understands that Moodle has many desirable features that are available to users “out-of-the-box,” and that the system is user-friendly. Plans call for focus groups to be held with the Faculty this summer and fall to introduce colleagues to Moodle. Crucial to a successful transition will be IT’s commitment to provide all the support necessary to Faculty as they learn the new system. This issue will be discussed with the full Faculty at the May 3 Faculty Meeting, the Dean said.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Loinaz asked if it might be advisable to wait until a new Director of Information Technology is in place before making such a dramatic change. The Dean said that it is clear that a new approach is needed in the near term because of the degree of faculty unhappiness with both Blackboard and the CMS-LMS. The Faculty Computer Committee has studied the timing for the transition to Moodle carefully and its recommendation of a two-year phased schedule has been designed to spare the faculty and IT from spending the time required to implement what would have been a necessary update to the College’s existing systems. The Dean noted that the approach to information technology that has been taken in recent years is now viewed as too rigid and stressed that the College needs to be more varied in its approach in the future. Professor Loinaz asked if care will be taken to ensure that the transition to the new system is as efficient as possible and that, to the degree possible,

Amended May 12, 2011

functionality issues have been addressed before the new system is launched. The Dean and the President said that the College will ensure that sufficient support is available to the Faculty for the move to Moodle; plans call for having groups of faculty pilot the system before the larger transition takes place, Dean Call noted. Professor Loinaz asked about the timetable for naming a new IT director. The Dean said that a search firm had recently been engaged to assist with identifying viable candidates, and that it is hoped that finalists for the position will be selected by the time a new president is appointed, so that he or she can play a role in the selection process. Professor Loinaz asked if there are plans to release the findings of the team that conducted the review of IT. Dean Call responded that a summary of the team's report will be made available to the College community.

President Marx next shared with the members the names of individuals who will be honored at Commencement on May 22 and informed the Committee that he would provide the Faculty with this information at the Faculty Meeting the next evening. The recipients of honorary degrees will be John Abele '59, retired founding chairman of Boston Scientific and Trustee Emeritus of the College; Adam Falk, high-energy physicist and seventeenth president of Williams College; Andrew Kendall '83, executive director and president of The Trustees of Reservations, a Massachusetts-based conservation organization; Christine Lagarde, France's finance minister; Gail Kern Paster, retiring director of the Folger Shakespeare Library; economist Paul Volcker, former chairman of the Federal Reserve; Alice Waters, chef at Chez Panisse and advocate for local, organic, and sustainable food; and Kimmie Weeks '05, founder of several organizations that support children affected by war and poverty, particularly in West Africa. The Medal for Eminent Service will be given to Arthur W. Koenig '66, who has helped expand the presence and diversity of international students at Amherst. In addition, three World War II veterans who left the College to serve in the military during World War II will receive honorary bachelor's degrees.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Umphrey said that she had been asked by a colleague to inquire about any progress that may have been made in the area of developing a College policy regarding discrimination based on gender identity or expression. President Marx responded that Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel, has been researching this issue and that Mr. Murphy will propose at the next meeting of the Board of Trustees that the College adopt a formal policy that Amherst does not discriminate on the basis of gender identity or expression.

The Committee next reviewed the nomination from the Department of Physical Education and Athletics for the Edward Hitchcock Fellowship, and voted five in favor and zero opposed to support the awarding of the fellowship to the nominee and to forward the nomination to the Faculty. The members reviewed proposals for new courses and voted five in favor and zero opposed to forward them to the Faculty. The members also decided to forward to the Mellon Foundation a proposal from an emeritus faculty member for a Mellon Emeritus Fellowship. The Dean had solicited proposals from emeriti who met the criteria for the fellowship. The fellowships support the research activities of outstanding scholars in the humanities and humanistic social sciences who, at the time of taking up the fellowships, are retired but remain active and productive scholars. Emeritus Fellows receive funds for a year for research and other related expenses. The Mellon Foundation stipulates that the nominees be selected through an internal competition, Dean Call said.

Amended May 12, 2011

The members next returned to a discussion of possible changes to some tenure procedures. It was agreed that the Dean's office would research end-of-semester evaluation forms used by Amherst departments, at other institutions, and at the Bok Center at Harvard, and that next year's Committee of Six, in the context of continuing the discussion about the evaluation of teaching, would be provided with five templates to evaluate as possibilities for model evaluation forms that could be shared with departments.

Dean Call informed the members that some members of performing arts departments may wish to make an amendment to the motion that the Committee planned to bring to the Faculty at the May 3 Faculty Meeting. Instead of proposing that a timeslot be added on Monday evening, these departments might propose that a slot be added on Sunday evening, colleagues have told the Dean. The members said that they would accept such a proposal as a friendly amendment if it is brought forward. The Dean noted that, if any changes are approved by the Faculty in regard to the schedule for classes, the *Faculty Handbook* would be revised to reflect these changes. The Dean reported that the Faculty Research Awards Committee has declined to review the proposals for Post-Baccalaureate Summer Research Fellowships and that he would instead consult with colleagues within his office to select the awardees. The Committee spent the remainder of the meeting on nominations for faculty committees.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended May 16, 2011

The thirty-seventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by Dean Call in the President's office at 9:00 A.M. on Tuesday, May 10, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, and Umphrey, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Saxton was absent. President Marx joined the meeting for the final forty minutes. The members turned briefly to personnel matters.

Dean Call informed the members that the College had used target-of-opportunity hiring procedures to make one tenure-track hire this spring. The appointment arose from a regular search that resulted in two hires.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Basu suggested that the Committee return this fall to the topic of restructuring faculty committees and the related subject of release time for College service. To facilitate such a discussion, Professor Umphrey suggested that the Committee of Six meet with the current members of major faculty committees, and colleagues who had served on the committees during the past five years, to discuss the issue of committee work. Professor Basu asked those who would be leaving the Committee of Six at the end of the academic year for their views on the issue of committee restructuring. Professor Ciepiela said that she has reservations about the proposal, which had been discussed previously by the Committee, to create a structure of a small number of faculty committees that would have a tremendous workload. She expressed concern about how the selection process for serving on such committees would be handled and about the possibility that colleagues could be required, through election, for example, to take on a heavy burden of committee service during a time in their careers when it would be particularly detrimental. She offered the example of a colleague who might be in the final stages of completing a book project, when that project could be interrupted by intensive committee service.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Rockwell commented that, if committee service were to be consolidated within a small number of committees, he would worry that faculty would lose the valuable opportunity that now exists to become acclimated to the College and to gain important experience, through service on smaller, less burdensome committees. He would be concerned that, under such a system, service on the envisioned major committees would become the burden of the small group of faculty who are recognized as taking committee service seriously. Professor Ciepiela commented that, to some extent, the situation just described exists now in regard to the Committee of Six. Membership on the Committee has, in the past, rotated among a relatively small group of colleagues, it was noted. Professor Rockwell said that he would be open to exploring a structure in which there would be a separate tenure and promotion committee, but that, at the same time, he does not see a compelling reason to adopt such a structure.

Professor Ciepiela wondered whether the possibility of having more administrative support for faculty committees could be explored. She said that it is her impression that faculty, especially on ad hoc committees, spend a good deal of time gathering and analyzing data, and that some of this work might be done by administrators, who would provide the information to the committees. The Dean noted that administrators provide this type of support for the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) and that this model has been effective. Professor Umphrey expressed concern that committees tend to be more reactive than proactive, partially because their workloads do not allow for enough time to think deliberatively about the long term or, in fact, to think about issues beyond those that are considered during the year in which the committee service occurs. She asked that

Amended May 16, 2011

the Committee consider structures that could enable committees to drive larger conversations in a proactive way. Professor Loinaz expressed the view that the lack of communication among committees that currently exists contributes to inefficiencies and to some lack of awareness of issues that may need to be taken up, and how those issues might best be addressed. He noted that meeting minutes can be used to follow the activity of those committees that generate minutes, but that most committees do not generate minutes. He suggested that it would be helpful to have improved vehicles of communication for discussing with committees work that is being considered or under way. Professor Umphrey agreed and wondered whether it might be helpful for the Committee of Six and the Faculty to hear more regularly from chairs of faculty committees, who might also offer short reports of their work, so as to develop a better sense of how the business of the College is being carried out.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Basu asked the Dean if he could provide a sense of the extent to which faculty members' willingness to serve on committees varied at different stages of their professional lives. The Dean responded that, for the most part, faculty view committee service as a shared obligation that they have to the College, and they typically accept invitations to serve. Professor Ciepiela noted that some faculty members appear not to serve on committees. Professor Loinaz asked how widespread a problem this might be. Professor Basu conjectured that some faculty do not view committee service as one of their strengths, while noting that serving on committees is a way of gaining experience and expertise that can inform future committee service. Dean Call said that the College operates under the assumption that committee work should be shared equally by the Faculty, though this is not always the case. Professor Ciepiela expressed the view that, as part of any consideration of new structures, it would be important to have an open conversation with the Faculty about committee work, in order to gain a broader sense of colleagues' attitudes about this subject. Professor Umphrey suggested that committee assignments could be based, at least partially, on the interests of the Faculty. She proposed that the Dean's office conduct a survey each year to try to determine whether faculty have an interest in serving on particular committees, making assignments accordingly.

Discussion turned to the Faculty Meeting Agenda for the meeting of May 19. The members discussed whether to include Motion Two (the recommendation that a new timeslot be added for classes on Mondays from 7 P.M. to 9:30 P.M.), which they had forwarded to the Faculty for consideration at the May 3 meeting, on the agenda of the Commencement meeting. Since the agenda for the May 3 meeting had been re-ordered by a vote of the Faculty, there was insufficient time to consider Motion Two. The members decided that the best course would be to ask the CEP to consider this proposal as part of its review of the Committee's [larger set of ideas](#) (included with the Committee of Six minutes of April 25) for easing pressures on classroom spaces, and to request that the CEP report back to the Committee of Six in the fall about its views on these proposals. The members also agreed that the First-Year Seminar Committee should be asked to consider the Committee's proposal that First-Year Seminars be offered in more than one timeslot and to report back on its views to the Committee of Six. The members then voted five in favor and zero opposed to withdraw Motion Two from the agenda for the Faculty Meeting of May 19. The members next reviewed some proposals for new courses and voted five in favor and zero opposed to forward them to the Faculty. The Committee voted five in favor and zero opposed to forward the agenda to the Faculty.

Amended May 16, 2011

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. The Dean reviewed the theses of students who had received summa cum laude recommendations from their departments and whose overall grade point average was likely to land below the top 25 percent but within the top 40 percent of the class, since these students would qualify for a magna cum laude degree under the new honors guidelines voted by the Faculty last fall. The members voted unanimously to forward these recommendations to the Faculty and offered high praise for the quality of the work done by this accomplished group of students. Professor Basu noted that, among the theses that she had read, quite a number were informed by impressive field work that had been conducted by students during study-abroad experiences. She said that she was impressed with the ways that the student-authors had integrated interviews and observations with secondary sources and wondered if there might be ways to encourage and support more broadly the model of incorporating study-abroad experiences and field work into students' honors work in foundational ways. The members agreed that the Committee on International Education could be asked to consider this issue, and that Janna Behrens, Assistant Dean of Students/Director of International Experience (who is also an ex officio member of the committee), who advises many students about studying abroad, could also be consulted. The members discussed the possibility of launching an interdisciplinary course, possibly a seminar for sophomores, that would focus on ethnographic research methods, since having formal training in these techniques would be helpful to students who wish to incorporate field work into their honors research. The Committee wondered how best to generate interest in proposing and teaching such a course and considered whether the new Ad Hoc Committee on Advising and/or the Committee on International Education should be asked to consider this topic. The Committee turned to personnel matters and then discussed committee nominations.

The members next reviewed drafts of the Dean's letters to department chairs and candidates concerning reappointment and promotion that are sent to department chairs and candidates each spring. The Committee had previously reviewed the letters concerning tenure.

Returning to the topic of mentoring tenure-track Faculty, the Committee discussed possibilities for enhancing and formalizing practices in this area. Professor Basu noted that there are no College-wide mentoring practices beyond annual conversations with chairs and tenure-track colleagues and observations' of junior colleagues' teaching by senior colleagues, both of which are procedures that are included in the *Faculty Handbook* (III., D., 2.), by vote of the Faculty. To gain a better overall sense of departments' mentoring practices, the members suggested that the Dean write to department chairs and ask that they provide information about departmental mentoring practices. In addition, Professor Basu proposed that the Dean's office gather information from peer institutions about mentoring practices and programs. The Dean said that he would be happy to ensure that such research is done.

Continuing the conversation about mentoring, Professor Basu said that it would be useful to consider the effectiveness of having mentors within departments, outside the departments, and/or outside the College (in a tenure-track colleague's area of scholarly expertise). The members agreed that it would be helpful for tenure-track colleagues to receive guidance early in their careers at Amherst about prioritizing research projects, the timing and venues for publications, and balancing research, teaching, and service. Professor Basu commented that it would be helpful if the Dean could remind departments of existing mentoring policies and

Amended May 16, 2011

provide guidance to the chair in this regard (e.g., what information should be covered during annual conversations and how often senior colleagues should observe the classes of tenure-track colleagues), in addition to considering how to regularize offering options such as providing a mentor (who would play a non-evaluative role in a candidate's reappointment and tenure cases) outside a department or outside the College. Professor Umphrey suggested that there be more frequent meetings between the Dean and department chairs to discuss mentoring, as well as other issues, and to share ideas. The Dean noted that past practice has been to have less frequent chairs meetings and to wait until agenda items arise, before scheduling meetings. He wondered whether a change to more frequent lunch meetings, for example, would be desirable. Professor Umphrey said that she would be in favor of such an approach, noting that chairs could and should play a more important role in governance at the College. At present, she continued, chairs are underutilized and serve a purely bureaucratic function. Professor Loinaz asked if there is a handbook for new department chairs. The Dean said that, while there is not a handbook, there is information for department chairs posted on the Dean's web site at https://www.amherst.edu/academiclife/dean_faculty/fph/procedures. On a more general but related note, Professor Umphrey commented that some institutions have established faculty life committees, which generate programming on issues of interest to faculty at different career stages, for example balancing family and career. Amherst colleagues might welcome such offerings, she believes. At the conclusion of the discussion about mentoring, the Committee suggested that it would be desirable to have the oversight of a faculty mentoring program added to the portfolio of responsibilities of one of the Associate Deans of the Faculty. An Associate Dean could be particularly helpful in matching tenure-track colleagues with senior faculty mentors, the members noted.

President Marx joined the meeting at 11:30 A.M. Members of the Committee offered appreciation for the President's service to the College over the past eight years and thanks for his leadership and guidance. President Marx thanked the members for their kind expressions and commented on how much he has valued working with current as well as past Committees of Six. As the meeting drew to a close, President Marx and the members spent some time reflecting on the significant issues, challenges, approaches, and accomplishments during the President's tenure at the College and discussing future possibilities. The meeting concluded with the Committee and the President anticipating the remaining two weeks of the academic year as a time for celebrations and final farewells.

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty