

Amended September 17, 2013

The first meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 2:30 P.M. on Wednesday, August 28, 2013. Present were Professors Corrales (via Skype), Harms, Kingston, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, Provost Uvin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

President Martin opened the meeting by welcoming new and returning members of the Committee of Six and said that she looks forward to working with the Committee this year. Noting that it has been the Committee's tendency to have lengthy meetings without taking time for breaks, the President, the Dean, the Provost, and the members agreed to run the Committee's meetings as efficiently as possible, and to take breaks, as needed.

Continuing her remarks, President Martin informed the members that she would soon be sending a letter to the Amherst community in which she would reflect on the events of the 2012-2013 academic year and outline areas of focus for the year ahead. She asked the Committee whether it would be helpful if she summarized the substance of this document. As an alternative, the members could choose to ask her any questions that they might have about the letter after they read it. The Committee agreed that there was no need for President Martin to review the letter with them before it was sent. The President expressed regret that the Committee's meeting would mean that she would miss the College's commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the August 28, 1963, March on Washington and The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "I Have a Dream" speech. The Committee, the Dean, and the Provost, also wanted to attend the commemoration, and it was agreed that everyone should walk over to Memorial Hill and then return to the meeting when the event concluded.

Prompted by comments by Professor Schneider regarding a lack of clarity that he feels exists surrounding some aspects of the role and work of the Committee of Six, as well as questions posed by Professor McGeoch about the Committee's practices in regard to its minutes, the members spent some time discussing these matters. Professor Schneider explained that, in his experience as a member of the Committee of Six, it is sometimes difficult to know whether one should be representing himself or herself as an individual, or the Faculty as a whole, when offering recommendations and making decisions. The relationship among the members of the Committee in regard to the Committee's responsibilities has also been ambiguous to him, at times. President Martin commented that the Committee has a set of formal, well-articulated responsibilities that range from making recommendations regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion, to setting the agenda for Faculty Meetings. As a governance structure with a representative function, its role is less formalized than other committees of its kind, in her experience. The President and the Dean noted that they regularly seek the advice of the Committee about a broad range of issues and share ideas that are at a formative stage of development, in order to gain the member's valuable feedback and counsel. Professor Harms expressed the view that, while one might conjecture that setting the agenda for Faculty Meetings might be among the more straightforward of the Committee's responsibilities, there are often complexities and differences of opinion associated with this endeavor, as well as a range of responses from the Faculty to the agendas that are approved.

Continuing the conversation, Dean Call noted that each Committee of Six with which he has worked has come to its own understanding, often based on the issue under discussion, of how best to balance the members' role as representatives of the Faculty with their advisory role to the President and the Dean. The Dean reviewed issues of Committee of Six confidentiality and attribution in the minutes and discussed what matters other than personnel matters are kept confidential. He said that minutes of discussions of certain sensitive or unresolved matters and plans in their formative stages, about which the President and the Dean are seeking the advice of

Amended September 17, 2013

the Committee of Six, are sometimes kept confidential. Generally, discussions of these issues are made public once the matter is in a less tentative state. The Dean noted that very few conversations (with the exception of personnel matters and committee nominations that are under consideration) have been kept out of the public minutes of the Committee. The members agreed that, for reasons of transparency, there should be direct quotation in the minutes.

While on the subject of the operations of the Committee, Professor Kingston asked if the Provost would be attending all Committee of Six meetings. President Martin explained that last year's Committee of Six (see the Committee's [minutes of June 5, 2013](#)) had decided that Provost Uvin should be permitted to attend the meetings of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR), and the Committee of Six on a trial basis for the 2013-2014 academic year. Having him attend meetings of these committees on a regular basis beyond this timeframe, and/or serve on any or all of the committees would require discussion and a change in the *Faculty Handbook*, it was noted. It had been agreed that the Provost should not attend Committee of Six meetings in which tenure, reappointment, and promotion are discussed.

Under his announcements, Dean Call discussed with the members a new "topping up" policy that he had developed. Tenure-line faculty members who take a leave of absence to conduct scholarly or creative work under the auspices of an external grant or fellowship are now eligible, with the approval of the Dean of the Faculty, to receive up to one-half of their salary for the period of their leave, up to one year, to bring the fellowship or grant stipend to the faculty member's full salary for that time frame. Provost Uvin asked the Dean if he is concerned about adding a program that will enable faculty to take funded leaves beyond their regular sabbatic leaves, noting that one-third of the Amherst Faculty are already on sabbatic leave during any given year. The Provost wondered if a limit had been set on the number of times a faculty member could take one of these new leaves. The Dean said that he anticipates that the number of faculty who will receive fellowships and take advantage of this program will be relatively small, and he noted that the program would be tracked and assessed. Since this is a pilot program, changes could always be made, as needed, Dean Call explained. It was also noted that requests for these new leaves, like any other, would be submitted to the Dean of the Faculty for approval.

The Dean also reviewed the Project in Innovative Curriculum and Teaching (PICT), explaining that the new program has been created to support, stimulate, and advance faculty driven experimentation with the curriculum, pedagogy, and a broad range of other disciplinary and interdisciplinary endeavors. The Dean noted that, for his own teaching, he is particularly excited about the possibility of exploring the flipped classroom model, commenting that he had started to experiment with this format in his teaching during the Summer Science Program. Professor Miller asked about the relationship of this new initiative to the Academic Technology Development Program (ATDP), which was launched last spring, and about possible structures for a faculty committee that will provide oversight for the PICT. Dean Call, who noted that the PICT will complement the ATDP and run concurrently with that program, said that he plans to send a letter to the Faculty that will offer details about the full range of IT resources that are available to support the use of technology in teaching and research, and to support curricular and pedagogical innovation, more generally. He will also explain the procedures for requesting these resources and the committee structure that will be put in place to oversee and assess this endeavor. President Martin commented that she has had occasion to meet Professor Candace Thille, the first speaker in the upcoming (November 13) PICT lecture series, and had been very impressed with her. Professor McGeoch asked if PICT proposals will be vetted by the Faculty

Amended September 17, 2013

Computing Committee or the Dean's office. Dean Call said that these procedures are being worked out, but that it is his hope that the process for requesting resources will be an expeditious one. The Associate Deans will reach out to colleagues to solicit proposals, and the Dean said he would be delighted if the need arises to increase the already generous funding that is available to support projects proposed by the Faculty. Professor Miller noted that the availability of IT resources may make it necessary to make choices about which proposals can be supported. Professor Harms stressed that, if choices need to be made about which proposals will be funded, faculty members should be involved in the decision-making process. Dean Call said the goal is to support as many proposals as possible, and he said that the Faculty Computing Committee will continue to play an important role in prioritizing the allocation of IT resources. The Committee left the meeting at 3:00 P.M. to attend the King commemoration and reconvened at 3:45 P.M.

Continuing with his announcements, the Dean informed the members that as a follow up to the College's conversations about online learning and consideration of joining edX last spring, Provost Uvin and he had made efforts to learn whether there might be peer institutions that are exploring online learning. As a result of these efforts, beginning early this summer, Amherst joined an informal consortium of presidents and provosts who are discussing online learning. That group, which now consists of Amherst, Carleton, Claremont McKenna, Pomona, Swarthmore, Vassar, and Williams, is focusing on clarifying its goals and the general principles that will guide its consideration of online learning. The Dean said that the Provost and he agree that it will be informative for Amherst to continue to participate in the consortium, and that it will be important to share with colleagues these goals and principles, beginning with the Committee of Six. They plan to do so very soon.

Provost Uvin next discussed with the Committee a proposed structure, including areas of focus and a timeline for the strategic planning process, and asked for the members' feedback. He noted that the President, Dean of the Faculty and Associate Deans, and the Senior Staff had already offered their input, and he emphasized that he is trying to get as much feedback as possible about how to approach and implement this project. The Committee offered a wide range of suggestions about the ways in which guiding questions could be framed and about the committee structures that will be put in place as the underpinning of the effort, including their charges, their composition, and approaches that they could adopt to working with the community on this important process for setting priorities for the College.

Provost Uvin commented that, in designing a planning process, he feels that it is important that the central themes are "cross-cutting," spanning constituencies (faculty, students, staff) and breaking out of traditional silos. He offered suggestions of colleagues to serve on four core committees and one supporting committee (two other supporting committees are already constituted and have begun their work), as well as a steering committee. Provost Uvin said that the aspiration is to include on the committees members of the community who have different backgrounds and roles at the College. None of the individuals, including the suggested chairs, has been contacted yet, as the President, Dean, and Provost wanted to share information about the planning process and the committees with the Committee of Six first. Dean Call noted that, if some colleagues agree to serve on a planning committee and are currently on another major committee, the Committee of Six may be asked to find replacements for those committees. Professor Harms, commenting on the list of proposed members for the committees, stressed the value of including staff on as many committees as possible. Professor McGeoch expressed some concern about the feasibility of meeting with committees of the sizes that are being proposed, and as frequently as is being suggested. Professor Harms noted that the committees might be more nimble if they are divided into subcommittees early on. Professor Miller, who expressed

Amended September 17, 2013

some concern about replicating the expertise that faculty gain by serving on standing faculty committees, and with the view of working most efficiently, asked if it might be preferable to make use of existing committees, rather than creating new structures. Provost Uvin said that the make-up of such committees is often not as diverse, in regard to the constituencies represented within their membership, as what will be desired for the planning process. President Martin noted that the workload of existing committees will likely not allow its members the time necessary to focus on strategic planning as well as their regular charges.

Continuing the conversation, President Martin noted that the Provost is proposing a structure that will offer a good deal of support to the planning committees. Staff from the Office of Institutional Research and the Provost's office will provide assistance to each committee, helping with the collection of data, and the members will be provided with a full array of background readings and reports. The committees will be asked to do the necessary analysis of this information. The committees will also be provided with a set of parameters in the form of a charge and focus, which should make the work less onerous. The members agreed that it will be important to define clearly the role of the committees. It was suggested that providing these groups with a small set of central, visionary, and very specific questions, and making the committees' charges explicit, would enhance the effectiveness of the process. Professor Harms commented that she likes the proposed charge to the committees that they develop options, rather than solutions, noting that having a range of constituencies represented on the committees will likely result in thinking about issues in diverse ways, which will lead to more options than might be generated otherwise.

Continuing, President Martin said that the central questions on which the planning process should focus are clear at this point. She suggested that the Committee's comments indicate that these questions may not be reflected as well as they might be in the groups' charges, as currently written. She suggested that the Provost add more specificity to improve the charges. The Provost agreed to reexamine the charges, with the Committee's comments in mind. Professor Corrales noted the overlap in the charges among some committees and wondered whether a couple of committees could be merged. He expressed concern that the committee structure, as presently articulated, could create conflict. He asked about the ways in which the work of the committees will be integrated. Dean Call said that one of the challenges of the process will be finding ways to facilitate conversation and interaction among the committees. He noted the importance of having the committees interact and that encouraging communication among the groups will make it easier to mesh together their findings in the final stage of the planning process.

Provost Uvin informed the members that plans call for a phase in the planning process during which the ideas and proposals formulated by the committees will be shared with the community, with a request for feedback. The College will make use of an online platform to gather these responses and to organize the resulting data in a variety of ways, enhancing the ways in which the information can be sorted and analyzed. The Committee offered some recommendations about the language, including committee names being proposed as a mechanism for considering issues of diversity and globalism. Professors Corrales and Harms suggested avoiding language that might lead to certain assumptions in these and other areas. Professor McGeoch asked about the timeline for the planning process and when the proposal under discussion will be shared with the Amherst community. President Martin responded that the hope is to have the planning committees established and up and running by late-September, though she acknowledged this is an ambitious goal. The first step of the process was to have a discussion with the Committee of Six as early as possible, which is why this first meeting was

Amended September 17, 2013

scheduled earlier than is typical. The next step will be to consider the Committee's feedback, to finalize the structures and process, and to start inviting colleagues to serve on the committees.

President Martin said that plans call for discussing the details of the planning effort with the Faculty at the first regular Faculty Meeting of the year, which will likely be in October. This will be the first of many occasions to share information about this initiative with the Faculty, and it will still be possible to make revisions to the process at that time, President Martin said. The members then spent some time discussing further nominees who might chair or serve on planning committees. Professor Corrales wondered if, after chairs agree to lead the committees, those colleagues might be important sources of suggestions about colleagues who might join their groups. Professor Miller asked about the relationship between the core committees and the support committees and expressed concern about potential overlap among them, especially in the area of technology. President Martin said that the support committees will not be driving the consideration of issues in a substantive way, but will be providing important information needed by the core committees. The President said that there actually is not much overlap, but that, perhaps the ways in which the committees are being described in the proposal are not communicating the charges of the committees clearly enough. She said that Provost Uvin and she will make revisions, with the goal of eliminating information that might be misleading and describing the committees' work more effectively. For example, one of the core committees is currently called "The Learning Environment of Tomorrow." This group will focus on student life and the relationship between the curricular and the co-curricular, not technology, though perhaps the current title suggests the latter. President Martin said that Provost Uvin will consult with the committee chairs about the visions for their respective committees. All agreed that having effective committee chairs will be critical to the planning effort, and that it would be helpful for the President and the Provost to bring the chairs together for a meeting soon.

Conversation turned to the topic of the Humanities Center. Dean Call noted that the Humanities Planning Committee had, over the summer, completed a report (to be appended via link) and had provided it to President Martin and himself. This document, Dean Call noted, which had been shared with the Committee of Six in preparation for this first meeting of the academic year, will also be provided to the Faculty with the minutes of the Committee's conversation. He asked for the Committee's advice about the most fruitful ways to have a conversation this fall about the humanities center and next steps. The Committee had lengthy discussion about options for moving forward with decision-making about the center, including possibilities for addressing differences of opinion that have arisen within the Faculty and concerns among some colleagues about the process that has led to this moment.

After weighing possibilities, including forwarding the report to the Library Committee and folding the issue of the humanities center into the strategic planning process, the members agreed that the best course would be for President Martin to lead the discussion about this project. It was felt that the President should ultimately make the final decision about whether a center should be created at Amherst—including where it should be located. After consulting with colleagues who have a range of opinions about the center and gaining an understanding of their views; assessing all of the information available to her; gaining clarity about the purpose of having a humanities center at the College; and gauging the level of the Faculty's enthusiasm for this project, President Martin agreed that she will make the final decision. The members suggested that President Martin write to the Faculty to express her thinking about the humanities center and the process for deciding whether to have one at the College, and she concurred that this will be a good plan to follow.

Amended September 17, 2013

Continuing the conversation, the members agreed that, in regard to the proposal that the center be located in the library, which the report concludes is the most viable option, it will be important for Mr. Geffert, Librarian of the College, to convey the ways in which a humanities center fits in with his vision for the library, which he is in the process of articulating more fully. President Martin asked Dean Call, who chairs the Humanities Center Planning Committee, whether he supports the creation of a humanities center, where he feels that it should be located, and what he feels should be the timeline for creating the center. Dean Call said that he is enthusiastic about the creation of the center and that he feels that, based on all the evidence, the best location for the humanities center is within the library. In response to the President's query about the envisioned schedule for a humanities center, Dean Call said that that a renovation schedule that begins in January would be ideal, allowing the center to open in fall 2014. He expressed confidence that there is sufficient space in the library to house the center, and that there would be only a modest impact on the library's collections and the faculty who work in carrels there (all of whom would be accommodated if the center is placed in the library).

Professor Harms commented that, to make an informed decision, it would be helpful to gain a better idea of the effectiveness of humanities centers at peer institutions. The report's appendix includes links to the web sites of such centers, she noted, but the sites are largely aspirational and do not offer information about the impact of these centers. Professor Miller agreed. Professor Corrales, who expressed support for having a humanities center at the College and praised the report, said that he has some concern that, if the center director is charged with making decisions about funding faculty projects, a parallel structure might be created for faculty research initiatives. At present, requests for funding to support faculty research are submitted to the Dean of the Faculty, through a process that is impartial. He expressed concern that the director of the humanities center could be making decisions about funding initiatives, with a particular research objective in mind, perhaps based on an established theme.

Continuing, Dean Call said that it is envisioned that proposals would be vetted by a committee, in much the same way that the Faculty Committee on Research Awards vets proposals for Copeland themes and selects one each year. Professor Schneider wondered if a new committee should be created to review proposals for the humanities center. Professor Miller suggested not adding to the committees that already exist. President Martin commented that she has had a good deal of experience with humanities centers and feels that it is best when a small group, a humanities council, for example, takes responsibility for decisions about what is studied and what is funded, and serves as an advisory body for the center. This structure can help guard against the kind of narrowness that Professor Corrales imagines could occur. The council could be charged with soliciting proposals. Professor Kingston wondered if a director would still be needed if there were such a council. Dean Call said that he has reviewed models for humanities centers at other institutions and that there is always a director as part of them. This individual has the responsibility of bringing colleagues together through the center. Professor McGeoch likened the role of such a director to that of an associate dean, who, in this case, would be charged with stimulating scholarship in the humanities. The Dean agreed, while noting that the position of director would not require the same time commitment as that of an associate dean. President Martin explained that she has heard, through a variety of channels, arguments about why Amherst should have a humanities center. For example, some junior faculty in the humanities and social sciences have pointed out that Amherst's intellectual culture is not as lively as it might be.

Amended September 17, 2013

Others have said that a center would help draw faculty out of their departmental cultures to discuss big ideas. It would be helpful, the President said, if colleagues would bring a strong case to her as to why the center should be established. She would also like to gain a sense of the level of enthusiasm for the center among faculty, and of how many faculty would make use of the center. President Martin commented that she would feel disappointed and irresponsible, if resources (approximately \$2 million) are provided to create a center that is then not used. Professor Schneider suggested that it would be helpful if the President would invite small groups of faculty—those who favor a center and those who do not—to dinner to discuss the humanities center. President Martin agreed that doing so would be informative and said that she will make efforts to learn the answers to the questions she had just outlined. The Provost noted that, with \$2 million, it would be possible to enrich the humanities at Amherst significantly in ways other than by creating a center. What would the “centerness” bring to these efforts, he asked. Professor Harms said that it will be important to answer such questions.

Continuing, Professor Corrales commented that, given the current assault on the humanities on the wider stage, he feels that creating a humanities center at Amherst is a public statement worth making. Professor Schneider noted that, while it is clear that faculty are either for or against the center, many colleagues do not have a sense of how a center would function in practice. He agreed with Professor Harms that it would be helpful to learn about the experiences colleagues at peer institutions have had at their humanities center. Gathering this information may help Amherst predict what might happen here, he noted. President Martin stressed the importance of having a fair-minded, capable director for the center. She noted that, in her experience at Cornell’s humanities center, having a space offers a sense of centrality for the humanities. Dean Call said that plans call for the Dean of the Faculty to appoint the director, who would be a faculty member with a three-year term, after consultation.

Professor Schneider next conveyed his dismay over the level of disruption caused over the summer by the Pratt Field Construction Project. The level of noise on weekends and evenings was unacceptable to those who live near the site, he informed the President. President Martin expressed concern and apologized for the inconvenience. She said that she intends to look into the matter and asked if there is anything that the College could do to help. Professor Schneider thanked President Martin and said that he could not think of anything that could be done after the fact.

The meeting concluded with the Dean noting that, over the summer, Provost Uvin had negotiated a favorable membership rate for an institutional membership in [the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity](#). A number of Amherst faculty have had favorable experiences with this organization, which has an excellent reputation, Dean Call informed the members. All Amherst faculty members are now members. If anyone wishes to “opt out,” they are welcome to do so, an easy process that can be done online. He said that the Provost and he are interested in receiving feedback about the program from colleagues.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended September 16, 2014

The first meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2014-2015 was called to order by President Martin in the president's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, September 8, 2014. Present were Professors Corrales, Courtright, C. Dole, Douglas, Kingston, and Marshall; Dean Epstein; Provost Uvin; and Associate Dean Tobin, recorder.

President Martin and Dean Epstein opened the meeting by welcoming new and returning members of the Committee of Six. The dean reviewed issues of confidentiality and attribution in the committee's minutes, noting that the public minutes should be used as a guide in regard to questions of whether matters discussed by the committee can be shared with others. She informed the members that it is her understanding that very few conversations (with the exception of personnel matters and committee nominations that are under consideration) have not been included in the committee's public minutes. Dean Epstein explained that minutes of discussions of certain sensitive or unresolved matters and plans in their formative stages, about which the president and the dean are seeking the advice of the Committee of Six, have sometimes been kept confidential, she has been told. Generally, conversations about these issues are made public once the matter is in a less tentative state. The committee discussed the circumstances under which it would communicate via email. The members agreed that email will not be used to communicate about personnel or other confidential matters, and that the use of email should be kept to a minimum in general. The members decided that, for reasons of transparency, comments by committee members should be attributed by name in the minutes. It was agreed that the committee's regular meeting time will be 3:30 P.M. on Mondays.

Continuing with her remarks about the ways in which the committee will work, the dean discussed with the members the longstanding policy of appending letters to the minutes when the committee has discussed the matters contained within them. 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 informed the members that Associate 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.

The dean next informed the members that Lisa Rutherford, Amherst's chief policy officer and general counsel, will meet with the Committee of Six on September 15 to provide general legal advice related to the processes for reappointment and tenure, as an attorney does on an annual basis. Ms. Rutherford will also be available to consult with the committee about the proposal that there be a requirement that all Amherst faculty participate in Title IX training provided by the college, a topic that will be on the committee's agenda next week. Dean Epstein said that she anticipates that the committee will discuss at its next meeting whether to bring a resolution before the faculty on this question. The members then briefly discussed the need for a change in membership on a faculty committee.

Turning to a question about the Labor Day meeting of the faculty, President Martin asked the members for their thoughts about the tradition of reading the names of faculty and administrators who are new to the college, as well as the names of colleagues who have just returned from leaves. Professor Marshall noted that he is aware that some new colleagues had offered positive feedback about this aspect of the meeting. Professor Courtright said that she feels it is helpful to begin to put faces to names at this first meeting of a new academic year, but suggested that, in the interest of time, an announcement be made to hold applause until all the names are read. In regard to the administrators, the members felt that having these colleagues

Amended September 16, 2014

introduced is valuable, and it was agreed that the administration should continue to make judgments about which positions should be included on the list of those that are regularly announced. President Martin agreed that the structure of the first faculty meeting seems to serve the community well as an occasion for introducing new members, and that the practice should be continued. Dean Epstein concurred with the committee as well.

President Martin informed the members that she is in the process of constituting a committee that will examine the place of athletics at the college. She noted that this topic was explored in a report titled “The Place of Athletics at Amherst College: A Question of Balance,” which was completed by the Special Committee on the Place of Athletics at Amherst in 2002. Trustee Colin S. Diver ’65 had chaired that committee, and the report is commonly known as “the Diver Report” (see discussion and link to the report in the [Committee of Six minutes of March 31, 2014](#)). President Martin said that the ad hoc committee had recommended that the president constitute an ad hoc committee similar to the Diver Committee within a period of three to five years of the publication of the Diver Report to review the place of athletics at Amherst, and that the president appoint similar committees every three to five years. Last year’s Committee of Six had agreed that there should be a thorough study of athletics at the college. President Martin said that the new committee will have a make-up that is slightly different from that of the previous committee. She informed the members that Shirley M. Tilghman, the former president of Princeton and an Amherst trustee, has agreed to co-chair the committee with an Amherst faculty member. The president asked for the committee’s advice about faculty members who might serve on the committee and offered some suggestions. At the conclusion of the conversation, President Martin thanked the members for their suggestions.

Conversation turned to the strategic plan, a draft of which is nearing completion and will be shared with the Strategic Planning Steering Committee soon, the president said. The draft will also be provided to the Committee of Six and discussed with the members this fall. President Martin asked the members for their views on the possibility of identifying as the college’s primary strategic advantage the combination of academic rigor and accomplishments as a leader in the liberal arts, and a diverse student body that contributes in unique ways to the intellectual life of the college. The members expressed support for portraying the college in this way, noting the importance of recognizing that diversity is not an end in itself, but serves to enrich the educational and social experience Amherst offers. Professor Kingston noted that Amherst still has work to do when it comes to integrating and supporting students from diverse backgrounds. President Martin agreed, commenting that the make-up of Amherst’s student body has changed quickly, and that the college needs to find ways to take full advantage of the benefits that the diversity and difference bring. Professor Douglas commented that alumni often ask him how the college will know when it has reached its goal in regard to diversity and what diversity encompasses here.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Kingston asked about the status of efforts to address childcare needs at the college. President Martin noted that Horizons Workforce Consulting, a division of Bright Horizons, has met with members of the Amherst community on campus, after which the group provided the administration with a Dependent Care and Cost Projection Study. The study includes an assessment of the college’s childcare needs, a comparison with childcare at peer schools, models of childcare, and cost projections. The president and the dean said that the Senior Staff will soon review the report and consider the issue of childcare. The process of considering the report was delayed as a result of issues surrounding sexual misconduct that emerged in 2012, and the need to make changes to

Committee of Six Minutes of Monday, September 8, 2014

3

Amended September 16, 2014

Woodside Children’s Center, President Martin said. Dean Epstein noted that Woodside has an excellent new director, but that the facility is lacking. The dean recently agreed to serve as the chair of the board of the center. President Martin said that she would like to learn more about the need and demand for childcare. This information may be covered in the report, she noted, but

she will need to re-read the document, since she has not reviewed it in some time. Upgrading Woodside would be an expensive undertaking, so trade-offs in terms of moving forward with other priorities must be considered before decisions are made, she noted. The dean and the president said that they will examine the report closely to make sure that the assessment done is adequate. Professor Kingston asked if the faculty would be consulted before decisions about childcare options are made. The faculty will be kept informed and will be consulted, President Martin responded.

Professor Kingston, noting that questions about the division of responsibilities between the dean of faculty and provost had been raised at faculty meetings in April, asked the dean whether her thinking on this subject had evolved in the interim. Dean Epstein said that she and the provost work very well together, that she is pleased with the organizational structure, and that she has not experienced issues surrounding jurisdiction. An initiative on which the provost and she have been working together closely is diversifying the faculty. Provost Uvin, Dean Epstein noted, is the college's chief diversity officer. At the request of the committee, Provost Uvin outlined his primary areas of responsibility. It was noted that this information was shared with the faculty at a faculty meeting last spring (see the [April 15, 2014, faculty meeting minutes](#)). The provost explained that his duties revolve around the coordination of strategic planning and institutional research, advancing and supporting diversity and inclusion, building international programs and partnerships, and strengthening community engagement. It was agreed that it would be helpful for the members to be provided with the reporting structure for the provost's office, which was shared with the faculty at the April faculty meeting, and Associate Dean Tobin agreed to provide this information to the committee. Professor Douglas, who was on leave last year and did not attend the meeting, said that he would welcome this information. Dean Epstein noted that the provost's responsibilities encompass areas that cut across the campus and involve students, faculty, and staff.

Dean Epstein next reviewed with the members a list of possible agenda topics for the committee for the year, some of which represent issues discussed by last year's committee that were not resolved. President Martin noted that the dean and she had added to the Committee of Six agenda a new regular item called Topics of the Day. Issues that may emerge after the committee's agenda is distributed will be discussed under this rubric, it was noted. The members agreed that meeting with Alex Vasquez, dean of students, and Rick Lopez, dean of new students, would be helpful, as the members discuss the topic of first-year advising. Last year's Committee of Six had asked the Office of Student Affairs to consider this issue and to make recommendations to the committee, following the members' review of the [report of the Ad hoc Committee on Advising and the executive summary](#) of the document that was prepared by the committee. The committee and the faculty found the report's recommendations to be problematic, and the ideas have not been implemented. Dean Epstein said that she is interested in having a discussion this spring about teaching evaluations, noting that, while she respects the need for departmental autonomy, she is also concerned that there are issues surrounding equity, since practices around the development of the evaluations vary from one department to the next. She is particularly troubled that some tenure-track faculty members create their own evaluations. Professor Marshall noted that, at one time, it was viewed as troublesome that tenure-track

Committee of Six Minutes of Monday, September 8, 2014 4

Amended September 16, 2014

faculty members were not permitted to develop their own evaluations. Professor Courtright asked if there are plans for the Committee of Six to discuss the question of strengthening the requirement for evaluating the courses of tenured faculty. (At present, tenured faculty members are required to have one course a year evaluated.) Dean Epstein said that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) is currently considering this issue and is likely to bring the question to the Committee of Six. Professor C. Dole asked if the creation of a teaching and learning center is on the horizon, as such a center would enhance support for, and the assessment of, teaching.

Continuing with the discussion of possible topics of conversation this year, Dean Epstein said that she is interested in having a discussion about faculty governance, but that it might be

best to do so next year, when she will be in a better position to assess how current governance structures are working. Related to this topic is the question of reviewing the charges and membership structures of committees. Last year's Committee of Six had suggested that there be a review of the charge of the College Council. The committee had noted that much of the work of the College Council is focused on issues surrounding student life and that some of the business of the council is administrative and routine. Some members of the committee had felt that, since the student affairs unit is being reorganized, professionalized, and enhanced, and because the faculty's time may not be being used most effectively when it comes to some of the business of the College Council, it might make sense to reimagine the charge of the committee and possibly to envision the council as serving in an advisory role to the Office of Student Affairs. There had been a suggestion that the committee be renamed the Committee on Student Affairs. The Committee of Six had noted that the college calendar and the Honor Code currently fall under the charge of the College Council and seem to be the most prominent areas that require faculty oversight. It had been suggested that the CEP would seem to be a more logical choice to have responsibility for the oversight of the college calendar. Any changes to the College Council's charge would require a vote of the faculty, it was noted. The dean said that she would speak with the CEP about the possibility of shifting oversight of the calendar to that committee.

Concluding the conversation about possible agenda items, the dean noted that last year's Committee of Six had suggested that this year's committee consider revisions to the guidelines for external reviews of departments and programs and possible changes to the policies governing who may attend faculty meetings, speak at them, and receive the minutes of these meetings. The committee agreed that it might be helpful for this year's committee to take a fresh look at the question of attendance and voting at faculty meetings, and the committee agreed it would review the *Faculty Handbook* language and information assembled by Professor Harms about this issue last year. Professors Corrales and Kingston noted that the committee had discussed the possibility of having some meetings for faculty only and others for faculty and administrators. Professor Courtright expressed concern that some members of the faculty are not attending faculty meetings, though it is their right and responsibility to do so. Dean Epstein wondered if the time of the faculty meeting might be playing a role in the level of attendance, while commenting that the evening seems to be a good time for many colleagues to come to meetings. Professor Corrales agreed that finding another time would be a challenge, given all of the other activities that are already scheduled in virtually every timeslot. Professor Douglas suggested that a shift in culture surrounding attendance at faculty meetings may need to occur, if the situation is to improve. Concluding the conversation about agenda items, the dean noted that the three-year pilot for course release for Committee of Six members will need to be reviewed this spring, though the process for doing so has not yet been determined.

Professor C. Dole next asked if there are any plans for the college to adopt a new mascot,
Committee of Six Minutes of Monday, September 8, 2014 5

Amended September 16, 2014

noting that this issue had received a lot of attention last year. President Martin informed the members that she had contacted two alumni who are prominent historians of American history to ask them to assess the accuracy of the record of acts that have been attributed to Lord Jeffery Amherst. Both of these historians expressed the view that the record is very clear on Amherst, based on their knowledge of a significant body of research. President Martin said that the college does not have a clear process for taking up the mascot question. It is her belief, and Dean Epstein agreed, that some students were intent on initiating such a process, and the president noted that a number of students and some alumni have expressed the view that the moose should take Lord Jeff's place. President Martin informed the members that the college never formally adopted a mascot, so there is actually no formal decision that would need to be overturned. Interestingly, the Lord Jeff costume appears to have disappeared. Professor C. Dole suggested that it may be time for students to decide whether or not to formally adopt Lord Jeffery Amherst as the college's official mascot since there has never been a formal selection

process. Both Professor Douglas and Professor Courtright expressed the view that students and alumni should lead efforts to initiate a process to select a mascot.

Turning to the question of whether or not to have a faculty meeting on September 16, the members agreed that there was insufficient business to warrant a meeting. It was decided that the following dates should be held for possible faculty meetings during the fall semester: October 7, October 21, November 5, November 19, and December 3. The dean said that she will provide a draft agenda for a possible October 7 meeting for the committee's next meeting. Possible agenda items include annual reports from members of the Senior Staff, strategic planning, and required Title IX training for faculty members. The members agreed that it would be a good idea to have a faculty meeting on October 7.

Discussion turned to the upcoming search for a new director of the Mead Art Museum. Dean Epstein said that she plans to co-chair the search committee with Professor Harms. The full committee membership is not yet finalized, and the dean said that she will inform the members when the committee is fully staffed. Professor Corrales asked about the vision for the Mead moving forward, and whether the college is satisfied with the current model of focusing on curriculum-based programming. Professor Courtright stressed that Ms. Barker has set the museum on a wonderful path, having successfully integrated the collections into the curriculum and made support for teaching a central part of the museum's mission. Professor C. Dole noted that Ms. Barker has made it clear—in comments made as part of the strategic planning process—that she has experienced numerous frustrations, including the Mead's budget, ambiguous institutional position, and its dependence on grant money to fund much of its staff, for example. Dean Epstein pledged to make every effort to attract the best possible candidate for the directorship and to continue to move forward on the trajectory that has been so beneficial to the Amherst community under Ms. Barker's leadership of the Mead. The members then reviewed proposals for the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Summer Stipend and selected two nominees for this year's competition.

Dean Epstein next informed the members that last year's Committee of Six, at the request of committee members and Denise Gagnon, director of fellowship advising, had added a sixth faculty member to the Student Fellowships Committee on a trial basis (which has been continued this fall), in order to relieve some of the workload of the committee. Changing the membership of this standing committee on a permanent basis would require a vote of the faculty, it was noted. Having an additional member has been extremely valuable by all reports, and the dean proposed that the change be made permanent. The committee supported this proposal and

Committee of Six Minutes of Monday, September 8, 2014 6

Amended September 16, 2014

voted six in favor and zero opposed on the substance of the following motion and six in favor and zero opposed to forward it to the faculty.

Motion

The Committee of Six proposes the following changes to current language in the *Faculty Handbook*, section IV., S.,1. t. as indicated in bold caps:

t. The Faculty Committee on Student Fellowships. The Faculty Committee on Student Fellowships is composed of ~~six~~ **SEVEN** members: the dean of financial aid, ~~secretary~~, ex officio; and ~~five~~ **SIX** members of the faculty, one of whom is chair. The faculty members of this committee are recommended to the Board of Trustees by the Committee of Six and serve for two-year terms.

The purpose of the committee is to review applications of students and/or recent graduates who wish to receive graduate and undergraduate fellowships and scholarships and to make recommendations on behalf of the college to the

groups or foundations that award the fellowships and scholarships. Two categories of fellowships and scholarships are principally involved: a) national or international fellowships and scholarships to which the college can nominate a limited or selected number of applicants (Churchill, Fulbright, Goldwater, Marshall, Mitchell, Rhodes, Truman, and Watson are examples). For national fellowships and scholarships, the committee reviews applications, interviews applicants, and writes the letters of recommendation for nominated candidates. b) Amherst College Fellowships, for which the committee reviews applications for fellowships for graduate study, which are awarded by the trustees or faculty of Amherst College as described in detail in the *Amherst College Catalog*.

Conversation turned to the topic of the Humanities Center and the process for selecting its first director. Dean Epstein said that she is receiving responses to her recent invitation for nominations and self-nominations for the position and that she is confident that an excellent candidate will emerge. The members agreed that the director of the Humanities Center should be a visionary thinker and should be a colleague who enjoys the respect of the faculty. The dean said that she will make the selection of the founding director, in consultation with the Committee of Six, the president, and the associate deans in her office. Professor Douglas asked about the length of the term for the director. Dean Epstein responded that there will be a three-year term, though the founding director will begin the position this spring, in order to get the center up and running, and will continue in the role for three full academic years. She noted that plans are in place to establish a faculty advisory board for the center. The board will, in consultation with departments, make a recommendation to the dean of an annual theme and will also make recommendations of future directors. The dean noted that a theme-based Copeland Colloquium will occur only every two years, in order to provide the necessary funding for the center. Professor Corrales expressed the view that having a strong, active advisory board, that meets ideally more than once a semester, will be critical to the success of the center, and that it will be essential that the management of the Humanities Center is as collegial and inclusive as possible. Professor Courtright agreed and stressed that care should be taken that the theme approach does

Committee of Six Minutes of Monday, September 8, 2014

7

Amended September 16, 2014

not dominate the activities of the center, to the exclusion of advancing work that may be outside a given theme. Benefiting as many Amherst faculty as possible—whether they participate in the theme or not—should be the goal, all agreed.

Continuing the discussion, Professor Courtright commented that the program that is imagined for the center should be both muscular and flexible. The other members concurred. President Martin agreed that focusing too heavily on themes could result in neglecting valuable work in the humanities, and that efforts should be made to be as inclusive as possible. Dean Epstein agreed that the center must embrace work beyond the identified theme, noting that five humanities center faculty fellowships will be awarded annually to Amherst faculty members who wish to affiliate themselves with the center. These colleagues need not be working within a given theme. Office space will be available for one or two of these faculty fellows to be housed during their fellowship year in the Humanities Center. The center will also offer funding to support faculty seminars by faculty who are not affiliated with the center, the dean said. In addition, the central space of the humanities center is being designed to serve as an informal gathering place for Amherst faculty members. The hope is that the space will encourage broad use of the center as a venue for intellectual exchange. Professor Corrales asked if the space will be available for use by members of the community more generally, noting that events that draw colleagues to the center will be essential to its success. The dean responded that the space will be available for use, by reservation, by the entire campus. Larger events will continue to be held in the Periodicals Reading Room, she noted. In addition, each week the Humanities Center will host a reception, with refreshments, that will be open to the entire faculty, as well as offering other

events to attract faculty to the center. Professor Marshall sees the center as offering an opportunity for moving beyond a department-centric culture at the college.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Epstein
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 17, 2013

The second meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, September 16, 2013. Present were Professors Corrales, Harms, Kingston, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, Provost Uvin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with a discussion of a personnel matter. Conversation then turned to two troubling incidents that had occurred the previous weekend. The community had been informed via an email from Jim Larimore, Dean of Students, that "on Saturday evening, a student reported to the Amherst College Police that the student had found someone had written some highly offensive comments near the entrance to Chapman dorm. Near the entrance of Chapman, someone had used a pen to draw a swastika and scrawl a vulgar phrase and a racial epithet usually targeted at African-Americans. The student who found this offensive material contacted the police, who responded immediately and are investigating this matter." On Sunday, Mr. Larimore wrote to the community about another disturbing incident, noting the following: "a student found an offensive note posted to the bulletin board outside his dorm room at Waldorf. The note contained a pejorative term often targeted at gay men that is also used as a more general slang put down. The student notified his residential Area Coordinator, who encouraged him to report the incident to the Amherst College Police. The incident was reported to the police and the college is investigating this matter." President Martin informed the members that these deeply upsetting and cowardly acts are being examined thoroughly, with the hope of identifying the perpetrators, which can be a difficult task, she acknowledged. The President informed the members that the students who had discovered the offensive language feel they are being well supported by the College. Support is also being made available to everyone at Amherst, as these acts represent an assault on the entire community.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call discussed with the members a proposal (appended via link) by the Department of Women's and Gender Studies that its name be changed to the Department of Sexuality, Women's, and Gender Studies (SWAGS) to reflect changes in the field of gender over the past thirty years. The Dean noted that last year's Committee of Six had discussed the process for effecting a change in the department's name (see the Committee's minutes of [June 5, 2013](#)) and had decided that consultation with the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) would be all that would be needed to make a decision about this proposal. Dean Call said that the CEP has now considered the department's proposal and has recommended that the decision be left to the department and the administration. Dean Call noted that a member of the CEP had expressed the view that "gender and sexuality studies" might be a more inclusive description of the field than the proposed name. Professors Schneider commented that he feels similarly, while noting that the decision about the department's name should be left to those within the field. Professor Kingston expressed curiosity about the apparent redundancy in the proposed title. President Martin commented that departments across the country that focus on this field have been reconsidering their names and are choosing to retain "women" in their titles, so as not to obscure the specificity of the history of this field. The President said that she is certain that the department has considered the perspective expressed by the CEP member and Professors Schneider and Kingston. Dean Call said that he would be happy to share with the department the views offered by some members of the CEP and the Committee of Six.

The Committee next discussed possible additional meeting times, which would be used, as needed, during the period of tenure discussions. Continuing with his announcements, Dean Call informed the members that Lisa Rutherford, Amherst's Chief Policy Officer and General

Amended October 17, 2013

Counsel, would meet with the Committee of Six on September 30 to provide general legal advice related to the processes for reappointment and tenure, as an attorney does on an annual basis.

Turning to the topic of the new “topping up” policy that the Dean had recently announced, Professor Schneider expressed some concern. (The policy will enable tenure-line faculty members who take a leave of absence to conduct scholarly or creative work under the auspices of an external grant or fellowship, with the approval of the Dean of the Faculty, to receive up to one-half of their salary for the period of their leave, up to one year, to bring the fellowship or grant stipend to the faculty member’s full salary for that time frame.) Professor Schneider commented that, while he appreciates the good intentions of the policy, enabling faculty to take additional leaves could place burdens on their departmental colleagues and the administration of departments. It will be important, he said, for the Dean to look closely at leave plans and patterns within departments before granting approval for leaves to be taken under the new policy. He also wondered about the costs to the College of supporting additional leaves. Dean Call said that he would continue to consider departmental leave plans when making decisions about leave requests, and he informed the members that the new policy should be virtually cost neutral. He would anticipate allocating funds for visitors (for the most part, single-course “borrows”), as needed, to departments when colleagues take advantage of the new program. Professor Schneider noted that increasing the number of visitors might not be optimal for Amherst students. Dean Call reiterated that he anticipates that the number of faculty who will receive fellowships and take advantage of this program will be relatively small, and he noted that the program would be tracked and assessed. Modifications in the program could always be made, Dean Call explained. He said he would be glad to review the description of the new program to make sure that it is clear that leaves under the new policy will require the approval of the Dean, as all faculty leaves do.

Continuing with “Question from Committee Members,” Professor Harms asked, on behalf of a colleague, about the policies governing who may attend Faculty Meetings, speak at them, and receive the minutes of these meetings. The Dean noted that much of this information is included in the *Faculty Handbook*, while some practices have evolved over time. Some colleagues who are not named in the *Faculty Handbook* have been invited to attend as special guests, a procedure described in the handbook, he noted. The Committee agreed that it would be helpful to review the [Faculty Handbook language](#) and to have a discussion about this issue at its next meeting. The members then reviewed a proposal for a National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Summer Stipend, which the Committee enthusiastically endorsed.

The members next discussed some logistics in regard to the Provost’s participation in the Committee’s work this year. Provost Uvin left the meeting during this conversation and returned after its conclusion. Dean Call reminded the members that the Provost had been invited to attend the Committee’s meetings as a guest for this year. Plans call for bringing forward a motion to the Faculty this spring that would describe the Provost’s role in faculty governance, including the Committee of Six. Last year’s Committee had agreed that, for this year, the Provost should not participate in the Committee’s personnel discussions and should not read cases for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, since these processes are well articulated in the *Faculty Handbook*. As a practical matter, the Dean proposed ways in which access to tenure and reappointment dossiers and other personnel materials could be limited to the Committee members, the President, the Dean, and staff members that support the Committee’s work. The members agreed that the steps the Dean described should be implemented. The members agreed that, while the Provost should not approve the Committee’s minutes, he would be welcome to

Amended October 17, 2013

review the minutes and make comments and suggestions. He would also be added to the Committee's list serv, the method by which the Committee conducts some of its administrative work.

Returning to the topic of the practices of the Committee of Six and ways in which the Committee works together, which Dean Call had reviewed briefly at the Committee's August 28 meeting, the Dean discussed these matters in more detail. 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 reviewed issues of Committee of Six confidentiality 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 Committee discussed the circumstances under which it would communicate via email. Committee members agreed that email would not be used to communicate about personnel or other confidential matters, and that the use of email should be kept to a minimum in general. Continuing with the discussion, it was agreed that the Committee's regular meeting time would be 3:30 P.M. on Mondays. The Dean reviewed with the members a list of possible fall agenda topics for the Committee, some of which represent issues discussed by last year's Committee that were not resolved. The Dean next informed the members of the longstanding policy of appending letters to the minutes when the Committee has discussed the matters contained within them. 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 next informed the members that, at the Committee's next meeting, a decision would need to be made about whether to have a Faculty Meeting on October 1. The members agreed that the following dates should be held for possible Faculty Meetings during the Fall semester: October 1, November 5, November 19, and December 3. Dean Call agreed to provide a draft agenda for a possible October 1 meeting for the Committee's next meeting.

Continuing with his announcements, Dean Call informed the members about plans for the Committee to discuss the status of the recommendations of the Special Oversight Committee on Sexual Misconduct, which issued [a report](#) in January of 2013. The Dean said that much progress has been made, and many of the recommendations have been implemented, while some matters remain. The Dean noted that the Committee of Six, and the Faculty as a whole, would be asked to consider two issues, in particular—the handling of “triggering” material in the classroom (i.e., material that may trigger post-traumatic reactions from students who have experienced trauma) and potential modifications to the Faculty's policy on [Consensual Sexual Relationships between Faculty Members and Students](#) (*Faculty Handbook* IV., 3.), which was voted by the Faculty in 1993. He noted that the Sexual Respect Task Force is reviewing the issue of trigger language and plans to make recommendations to the CEP that would also come to the Committee of Six. The CEP has had, and is currently having, discussions about some other SMOG recommendations, Dean Call noted.

Professor Schneider wondered if it would be helpful to have the College's legal counsel at the Committee's meeting, to inform the members about Title IX regulations and the College's compliance with the law. It was agreed that Lisa Rutherford, Amherst's Chief Policy Officer and General Counsel, and Suzanne Coffey, the College's Title IX Coordinator, should be asked to attend the meeting. The members had a brief preliminary discussion about the consensual sexual relationship policy. The members discussed whether coaches and other staff members

Amended October 17, 2013

with instructional responsibilities should fall under the faculty policy. The Committee agreed to discuss further this and other complex issues relating to the consensual relationship policy. Professor Harms suggested that whenever handbook language regarding consensual sexual relationships between faculty and students is brought to the Faculty, it would be helpful to do so within the broader context of all language on sexual harassment in faculty-student interactions. In this vein, Provost Uvin noted that some schools have developed capricious grading policies to address complaints by students that faculty have awarded grades unfairly—e.g., based on their dislike of a student or a disagreement over a student’s articulated opinions—in other words, on some basis other than performance in the course. It was noted that Amherst does not have such a policy and that any questions of this kind are addressed by appeals to the Dean of Students and the Dean of the Faculty. President Martin commented that many students from modest backgrounds might not express their concerns to the College, if they feel that a grade they receive is unfair. Provost Uvin commented that schools that have capricious grading policies set a very high threshold for judging a faculty member’s grading practice as unfair.

Dean Call next asked for the Committee’s thoughts about considering teaching evaluations of experimental courses, now that there are a number of pedagogical experiments under way and more that are anticipated through the new Project in Innovative Curriculum and Teaching (PICT) initiative. He asked the members to consider whether evaluations of experimental courses should be included in the dossiers of candidates for reappointment and tenure, and, if so, whether these evaluations should be treated differently in any way. The Dean summarized current initiatives—the Mellon Research Tutorials, the Global Classroom Project, and the Flipped Classroom Project (also a focus of the PICT). The members noted that, according to the procedures for [reappointment](#) and [tenure](#), “evaluations of teaching are to be requested of all students from every course, including every honors and special topics course taught by an untenured faculty member.” The Committee agreed that, to be faithful to this faculty legislation, teaching evaluations of experimental courses must be considered in the same way that other teaching evaluations are read by the Committee of Six. The members noted that the Committee reads all evaluations in context, and it was recommended that departments and candidates should make efforts to put the evaluations of experimental courses in context, as part of the regular materials (e.g., the departmental recommendation and the candidate’s letter on his or her own behalf) that are submitted as part of personnel cases. Experimentation carries with it a certain risk, Professor Kingston commented, but a failed experiment viewed in that light would not necessarily lead the Committee to adopt a negative view of a candidate’s teaching record, he imagined. Professor Harms noted that the assessment of these pedagogical experiments would be enhanced if all faculty who are teaching them have their classes evaluated—tenured, as well as tenure-track colleagues. The feedback being sought could reveal much about the successes and challenges of a particular genre, for example, the flipped classroom model.

Discussion turned to the [report of the Ad hoc Committee on Advising and the executive summary](#) of the document that was prepared by the committee. The Dean noted that some of the recommendations (e.g., making the evaluation of advising a component of the processes of reappointment, tenure and promotion) would require votes of the Faculty, while others (e.g., creating the position of Associate Dean of Advising in the Dean of the Faculty’s office to take responsibility for advising and advising programming) could be implemented by the administration, should there be sufficient support for them. In terms of the need to make decisions in the near term, the Dean noted that Pat O’Hara, Dean of New Students, has recommended that Orientation advising in its present form be eliminated as soon as possible. If the Ad Hoc Committee’s “hybrid

Amended October 17, 2013

model,” under which there would be a cap on the number of advisees for each faculty member and a single advisor allotted to each student (including double majors), were to be adopted, steps would have to be taken before sophomores declare majors in the spring. To inform their conversation, the Committee discussed feedback gleaned from the twenty-eight departments that had completed an advising questionnaire, which last year’s Committee of Six had shaped with the help of the Office of Institutional Research, and which had been sent to all thirty-four departments and programs. (The survey results include commentary from respondents who are identified or identifiable. For this reason, the responses are not being shared broadly. Survey results are available by request from the Dean of the Faculty.) The Committee was also provided with a letter (to be appended via link) from Professor Sitze to last year’s Committee of Six, in which he had expressed his views about advising and support for all but one of the Ad Hoc Committee’s recommendations.

Professor Harms began the conversation by noting that the responses to the advising questionnaire indicate that there is support among departments for retaining the current advising system, which was seen as serving the needs of Amherst students, and a general reluctance to adopt the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee. Professor Harms expressed the view that many of the Ad Hoc Committee’s recommendations for change seem to be attempts to address the problem of the unevenness of the departments’/faculty members’ advising loads. She noted that there should be ways other than radically overhauling the advising system to remedy the challenges faced by the two or three departments that carry a greater advising burden because they have a large number of majors. The Committee felt that solutions to major advising inequities could best be addressed by the Dean of the Faculty on a department-by-department basis, making use of approaches tailored to departmental needs. Among the suggestions offered by one or more members were asking emeriti and faculty on phased retirement and adjunct faculty to serve as advisors and offering course release to directors of studies, when departments have that model in place. It was noted that, at present, faculty in departments with a large number of majors are not required to do College advising, which offers some relief. The members felt that, in its report, the Ad Hoc Committee sometimes appeared to conflate issues associated with College advising and major advising.

The Committee agreed that the survey results did not indicate support for the Ad Hoc Committee’s recommendation to eliminate major advising in its current form. The members commented that the majority of departments that responded to the questionnaire also did not favor the Ad Hoc Committee’s “hybrid model,” a feature of which would be that double majors would be assigned only one major advisor, who would be drawn from one of their two departments. The majority of departments that do not presently have a “director of studies” model did not support moving to that model, in lieu of a system of allocating major advisees to individual faculty in the department. Turning to the Ad Hoc Committee’s recommendation that academic advising be administered by the Dean of the Faculty’s office, the members noted that there appears not to be a great deal of interest in this idea from departments. There was a desire, instead, to keep this function within the Dean of Students office. Professor McGeoch expressed the view that it could be helpful to have some responsibility for guiding advising fall within the Dean of the Faculty’s office. An Associate Dean might, for example, oversee programming for new advisors and support departments with their major advising. Professor McGeoch said that he is not convinced about the desirability of removing responsibility for assigning College advisors from the Dean of Students office.

Continuing the conversation, the members agreed that the responsibilities of the Dean of New Students are overwhelming, and that the half-time structure for the position no longer

Amended October 17, 2013

seems viable. The Committee, the Dean, and the President noted the importance of maintaining a strong faculty presence in the Dean of Students office. The Dean recommended that consideration be given to how best to maintain and enhance the connections between the Offices of the Dean of the Faculty and the Dean of Students. The Committee agreed on the desirability of doing so. President Martin commented that she sees great value in ensuring the integration of academics and student life; she agrees with others who have voiced the view that dividing advising into academic advising and cocurricular advising would not be consistent with the spirit of a residential liberal arts education, or be in the best interest of Amherst students. The members agreed that keeping Orientation advising in the Dean of Students office would be optimal, and that additional resources should be provided to the Dean of New Students to support advising efforts.

Professor Miller suggested that it would be helpful if the College were to provide more tools to aid faculty with their advising work and to encourage consistency in the way information is presented. She commented that, in recent years, the College has enhanced the ways in which information to inform advising is gathered and disseminated, which has been much appreciated. Professor Schneider said that he sees the value in having a colleague lead conversations about advising, as the Dean of New Students has done in the past. Professor Miller stated that it is her impression that programs designed to encourage conversations about advising (TAP lunches, the January workshop for new faculty) have been helpful, and she hoped this programming would continue to be supported or possibly expanded in the future. President Martin agreed that having discussions about advising can be informative and helpful to this process, which is such an essential part of students' educational experience. She informed the members that, in answer to a question posed by a parent of a new student during an Orientation meeting this year, Dean O'Hara had offered a thoughtful response that she would like to share. The parent had asked how students are helped to choose courses from such a wonderful array at the College. Dean O'Hara responded that advising at Amherst focuses on helping students identify their relative intellectual strengths and weaknesses and to assemble a curriculum that fosters their individual development. Choosing courses is done in this context. President Martin left the meeting at 5:30 P.M. in order to travel on College business.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Kingston suggested that advisors for new students be assigned by July 1, and that colleagues then work with new students over the summer to create a course schedule via email, Skype, or phone. In this way, course selection could be removed from the Orientation advising process. Advisors could then have longer, substantive advising conversations with students about identifying educational aspirations and navigating Amherst's curriculum. Under such a model, these conversations would not have to be confined to the Orientation advising period. Professor Kingston also proposed assigning advisors outside first-year students' declared areas of interest as a means of encouraging open thinking about the educational experience that lies ahead. Professor Kingston commented that advising new students has been among the most rewarding advising experiences he has had at the College.

Based on evidence from the questionnaire and his own experience as an Amherst advisor this year, Provost Uvin expressed the view that the current initial first-year advising system works very well, but that the distribution of advisees seems to be the source of the limitations that have been identified. The logistics of ensuring that there is a sufficient number of faculty available for advising is the basic problem. He suggested that a solution might be to require all faculty to be first-year advisors, perhaps beginning classes one day later in the fall to facilitate this change. Dean Call noted that, even if all faculty eligible to advise new students did so, there would still be a "numbers challenge." This year, around eighty faculty members served as

Amended October 17, 2013

Orientation advisors, a number that has been a consistent over recent years, out of a pool of about 115 colleagues. Professor Kingston argued that all faculty should be required to participate in advising for new students as part of their regular responsibilities. Having only two-thirds of eligible colleagues do so now is a major part of the problem with the current system. Professor Corrales, while agreeing about the importance of advising first-year students, said that he understands that colleagues' research plans may require them to be away from campus during the last week of August.

Professor Corrales suggested that the Dean of Students office be asked to conduct a self-evaluation of Orientation advising. Professor Harms concurred, suggesting that despite the hard work of the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising, she would prefer to have the experts in the Dean of Students Office devise a solution to the problem of initial advising for first-year students. Dean Call said that a number of colleagues in the Dean of Students office have worked on creating systems for Orientation advising, and there would likely be differences of opinion among them about how the process is working. The Committee agreed that the hour-long conversations that advisors have with new students are important and valuable, and the members advocated for sustaining the current system, while noting that ways need to be found to solve associated recruitment challenges. Dean Call wondered whether it might be helpful to return to a system that seemed to work well during Hurricane Katrina, when there was a sudden shortage of advisors because of the emergency, and advising was decoupled from registering for courses. A small cohort of experienced deans and other faculty had advised new students about course selection during shorter meetings, which occurred in a compressed time frame. If this system were used, students' advisors could have more substantive advising conversations with their advisees about learning goals and the Amherst curriculum that would not have to take place during Orientation. Under such a system, each member of the Faculty eligible to do so would be assigned four to five College advisees, equalizing distribution. The Committee agreed that such a system could be workable and could preserve the opportunity for extended advising conversations. Professor Schneider said that he sees the benefit of having one day for advising and another for registration during Orientation. Professor McGeoch urged that any modified approach to advising and registration should, to the greatest extent possible, give each student an equal opportunity to register for limited enrollment classes. Amherst's preregistration system for returning students is excellent in this regard, because no priority is given to students who preregister early. The system used during Orientation seems problematic, with first-year students who meet with their advisors late in the day having much more difficulty enrolling in limited enrollment classes. Professor McGeoch acknowledged the virtue of the current system, that each first-year student is definitely enrolled in four classes by the end of registration day.

Some members commented that a previous system that was in place for a number of years, under which all faculty were required to advise new students on the afternoon of Labor Day, had worked quite well. While noting that all systems have their trade-offs, Professor Harms suggested that, while advising used to take place after a very long Labor Day faculty meeting in the morning, now that the meeting is shorter and takes place in the evening, it might be easier to get advising done on Labor Day. Dean Call wondered if it might be useful to ask advisors if they think that the Labor Day system offers advantages. It would also be helpful to know whether colleagues prefer the system used this year, while acknowledging that recruitment of advisors is a challenge under a volunteer system. Some members felt that the continuity that is required under the current system, which translates into advisors taking on College advisees for two years, may dissuade faculty from volunteering to serve as Orientation advisors. The system that immediately pre-dated the current one might offer advantages in this regard.

Amended October 17, 2013

Professor Miller commented that having more than one advisor during the first two years could actually be beneficial to students and certainly does not seem like a problem to her. Professor Harms noted that no advising system is perfect, and expressed the view that the Dean of Students office should be provided with the support and resources it needs to develop and mount a first-year advising system for Amherst, as long as that system includes a model of faculty-advisors. It is particularly important, with an open curriculum, that students not select courses in a vacuum, she commented. Professor Kingston expressed the view that advisors should not need to approve courses for juniors and seniors. Reducing the bureaucratic aspect of these advising interactions, he feels, might enable a shift of focus toward mentoring and conversation; upperclass students themselves are capable of taking responsibility for making sure their major requirements are met.

As a next step in the consideration of advising at the College, the Committee suggested that the Dean of Students be asked to make recommendations about first-year advising. The Committee asked the Dean to share the members' feedback about advising with Jim Larimore, the Dean of Students, and he said that he would be happy to do so.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 22, 2013

The third meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, September 23, 2013. Present were Professors Corrales, Harms, Kingston, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, Provost Uvin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with President Martin noting how much she had enjoyed the events of the previous weekend, which had been organized as a campus-wide celebration of the successful *Lives of Consequence* fundraising campaign. This effort raised just over \$502 million to support the College's priorities.

Under his announcements, the Dean also noted the success of the campaign celebration and conveyed his admiration for *The Garden of Martyrs*, an opera composed by Professor Sawyer. The opera was performed on September 20 and 22 at the Academy of Music in Northampton and was part of the weekend's program of events. The other members who had attended the opera also expressed their appreciation for Professor Sawyer's accomplishment. President Martin, who had been unable to attend, asked Professor Schneider if the opera would be performed again. He responded that there would likely be two more performances of the production at Fairfield University in Connecticut next fall.

Continuing with his announcements, the Dean informed the members that the Housing Committee has requested to meet with the Committee of Six to discuss the [proposals](#) that it had developed in 2012-2013 to revise the College's housing policy. He explained that last year's Committee of Six had discussed the proposals (see the minutes of May 6, 2013, as well as the minutes of July 28, 2011, January 23, 2012, and September 10, 2012) and had raised some concerns. The members of the Housing Committee have now asked for the opportunity to explain their proposals and how they envision their ideas would be implemented. The Committee asked to be provided with the proposals and the minutes of the Committee of Six's previous discussions. The members agreed that they would review these materials and have a preliminary conversation about the proposals before making a decision about whether to meet with the Housing Committee.

Turning to the topic of the committees that will serve as the underpinning of the upcoming strategic planning effort, Dean Call explained that three of the four colleagues who have agreed to chair one of these committees have requested a course reduction for the Spring semester of 2013-2014. It is anticipated that the work of the committees will be particularly intensive during this period. Dean Call asked for the Committee's thoughts about granting these course releases. While he is sympathetic to these requests, Professor Schneider said that he worries that, without a clear rationale and system in place for release from teaching, the proliferation of such requests would become untenable.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Harms suggested that, if the strategic planning committees were to create a structure of subcommittees, made up of a subset of committee members and through which the work of the committee could be divided and delegated, the chair would not be overly burdened. She asked why it is anticipated that chairs would have more work than their fellow committee members, which seems to be a rationale for the request for a course release. Professor Harms commented that, in order to grant course releases for chairing a strategic planning committee and for other assignments for which a release might be requested, criteria should be established for deciding which roles are more onerous than others and deserving of release time. Choosing just where to draw the line would be a significant challenge, in her view. Provost Uvin said that he does not anticipate that the strategic planning committees

Amended October 22, 2013

will create subcommittees. He expects that the chairs of the committees, who will be asked to serve in that role for at least fifteen months, will attend all meetings of their committees, and that the committees will meet frequently. In addition, the chairs will serve on the steering committee for strategic planning, which is expected to meet weekly. Finally, the chairs will continue working, as members of the steering committee, throughout the fall of next year, in order to finish the final report. Hence, they do have more work than regular committee members.

Professor Miller commented that it seems late in the schedule to be considering offering a release for a course that is scheduled for this spring, in her view. Professor Miller wondered whether colleagues who serve as committee chairs might instead be relieved of some of their other responsibilities through means other than course release to allow them the time needed to focus on strategic planning. For example, colleagues could be offered a research assistant, or their rotation as department chair could be adjusted, if such steps would be helpful. If a colleague who has agreed to serve as chair of a strategic planning committee has a convergence of teaching and research responsibilities this year, it might be preferable to reach out to other colleagues who could potentially serve as chair, Professor Miller said.

The members advised that it would be best not to provide a course release to the chairs of the planning committees. Professors Harms and Miller, agreeing with Professor Schneider, cited the lack of a process for making decisions as a major obstacle to moving forward with release time. If there is a desire to create a policy—and this would represent a significant shift in culture at Amherst—time and care would be needed. Dean Call asked for advice on how to move forward with developing a policy. The members agreed that it would be necessary to develop a set of principles to guide the decision-making process, and that this task would fall to the Committee of Six. Professor Harms said that it would be important to consider the curricular and budgetary implications of offering course releases regularly.

While the Committee of Six is not recommending offering a course release to the chairs of the planning committees, Professor Harms noted that the President could, perhaps, decide that course release is warranted when a faculty member assumes an institutional role that entails a great deal of responsibility. President Martin said that, at present, she would favor awarding releases to chairs of strategic planning committees, based on the principle Professor Harms had suggested, and the fact that these would be one-time releases. In the same vein, Professor Kingston noted that chairing a strategic planning committee could be seen as being outside a faculty member's regular College committee service. Arguably, such service could be "compensated" differently—with a course release. President Martin said that the Committee's advice that the Dean and she work individually with committee chairs to tailor a relief strategy to the individual's needs is most helpful. Not everyone will necessarily need or want course relief, she would imagine.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Kingston asked whether more has been learned about the offensive and disturbing incidents of the weekend of September 14 and 15. The President said that the incidents are still under investigation. The members praised the letters that Jim Larimore had written to the community about these unfortunate events.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Schneider commented on how much he had enjoyed the talks and gatherings that have been organized in previous years to celebrate colleagues who are awarded named professorships. The practice seems to have been phased out. President Martin said that she would be most interested in exploring ways to celebrate faculty achievements. Dean Call agreed. The members then turned briefly to a personnel matter.

Amended October 22, 2013

Conversation turned to the online learning consortium that the College had joined over the summer, which the Dean had mentioned at the Committee's August 28 meeting. The informal group, which consists of Amherst, Carleton, Claremont McKenna, Pomona, Swarthmore, Vassar, and Williams, is now focusing on clarifying its goals and the general principles that will guide its consideration of online learning. Dean Call and Provost Uvin asked the Committee for its response to the goals and principles under consideration, which have been developed to help focus the work and conversations of the group. According to a recent email to the consortium by Steve Poskanzer, President of Carleton, goals under consideration include the following:

- Improving on-campus learning outcomes in residential settings
- Developing teaching tools that our current and future students want and will expect
- Enabling our faculty to devote more time to intensive interaction with students
- Expansion of individual campus curricula (e.g., broader course offerings)
- Enhanced student diversity through online exchanges
- Shared access to greater stores of data about student learning processes and outcomes and the impact of teaching innovations
- Faculty development opportunities

President Poskanzer also provided a draft of a "principles and priorities" document (generated by a faculty governance group on his campus) and suggested that it could be a starting point for clarifying the goals of the consortium, Provost Uvin noted. He shared this document with the members (see below) and asked them for their views of the general principles and whether the full Faculty should be asked to consider this information.

Proposed Principles and Priorities for Future Learning Technology

Liberal arts colleges have traditionally sought out and disseminated exemplary models of undergraduate education, and these models will increasingly involve new technology.

Our most fundamental commitment is to teaching in a residential setting; fulfilling this commitment has always required, and will continue to require, embracing new technologies that allow us to improve student learning. We see this as a way to enhance the close faculty/student interactions that characterize the best of our liberal arts education by focusing attention on high quality face-to-face learning in the classroom, while shifting other activities into a more self-paced and self-directed environment. To do this, faculty and students alike will need to acquire new expertise with an array of technological tools, and our institutions will need to support them along the way. At every step, our institutions will abide by our traditional commitments to robust faculty governance and to academic rigor. New ventures and new pedagogies will not compromise these long-standing values.

Amended October 22, 2013

Goals, ranked by priority:

1. To improve the quality of our teaching and learning by using our time more effectively in and out of the classroom, by enabling students to learn at their full capacity regardless of their high school preparation, and by allowing our faculty to focus their time on the most important interactions with students.
2. To provide our curricula with more flexibility, by helping us offer students courses in areas we might not be able to serve well otherwise and by letting us manage enrollment pressures.
3. To broaden teaching opportunities for our faculty and learning opportunities for our students by collaborating with peer institutions.
4. To promote most effective practices and add to the scholarship of teaching and learning through analysis of data derived from technology-based instruction.
5. To broaden our community by providing our alumni, prospective students, and other constituencies stronger connections to our faculty and the intellectual life of our colleges.

Professor Harms expressed some concern about goal number two. Professor Schneider agreed with Professor Harms and said that he is uncomfortable with the ranking of goals by priority. He also worries more generally about the quality of the thinking that has gone into the document, which strikes him as overly bureaucratic and poorly thought out. Professor McGeoch said that he also finds the preamble to the ranked goals to be troubling. While it mostly makes the indisputable claim that new technology will always affect higher education, the text seems premature in its enthusiasm for shifting some activities “into a more self-paced and self-directed environment.” He noted that Amherst’s experiments in this area are only beginning. Provost Uvin asked whether the Committee felt that these goals and priorities should be shared at a Faculty Meeting. Noting that the College had already joined the consortium, the members agreed that it does not seem necessary to consult with the Faculty on the administration’s participation in an informal group composed of presidents and provosts. The Provost thanked the members for their feedback and said that he would convey to the group Amherst’s lack of support for the ranked list of goals, and that there was significant uneasiness about goal two, in particular. The members agreed that they preferred the language of the shared goals, rather than the goals ranked by priority in the “proposed principles and priorities for future learning technology” section.

Conversation turned to the topic of attendance and voting at Faculty Meetings. The discussion was informed by the [Faculty Handbook language](#) on this topic (IV., R., 1.). Prompted by Professor Harms’s question about the policies governing who may attend Faculty Meetings, speak at them, and receive the minutes of the meetings, which she had asked at the Committee’s meeting of September 16 on behalf of a colleague, the members discussed these issues. It was noted that the handbook does not address the topic of who should receive the minutes of Faculty

Amended October 22, 2013

Meetings. The Dean informed the members that, over time, certain practices have evolved in regard to the minutes. He noted that those who attend with voice and vote are given access to the minutes, but those who attend with voice, but without vote, are not, for example. Those who speak at Faculty Meetings are sent the text of their remarks in the minutes for review. Designated guests, who attend with voice but without vote, are given access to the minutes. Designated guests are individuals who are permitted to attend the meetings by invitation of the President, after consultation with the Committee of Six. Though the list of guests should, perhaps, be reviewed annually, typically if a guest is approved that individual may continue to attend from one year to the next. Professor Schneider said that, while he can see a rationale for having Faculty Meetings attended largely by Faculty, it would be difficult to move away from the current more inclusive model. Excluding colleagues would result in offending many and would not be practical, in his view. Professor Harms agreed that she would like to see the number of administrators who attend Faculty Meetings reduced. The members agreed that the most reasonable principle would be that those who are permitted to attend Faculty Meetings should be given access to the minutes. The one exception would be that students in attendance should not be permitted to receive the minutes.

The members next reviewed a draft agenda for a possible Faculty Meeting on October 1. The members agreed that there was insufficient business to warrant a meeting. The Committee discussed future topics for faculty discussion and Faculty Meeting agenda items, which included a report by the Chief Financial Officer on the financial health of the College and a report by the Dean of Admission and Financial Aid on the entering class, and presentations on faculty governance and the strategic planning process. The Dean noted that he had been contacted by some students who are organizing a TEDx conference at Amherst in November titled “Disruptive Innovation.” The students would like to provide information to the Faculty, and Dean Call suggested that they be permitted to speak with faculty in the lobby after the next Faculty Meeting, if the conference had not yet occurred by then. The members turned briefly to a personnel matter.

Lisa Rutherford, Chief Policy Officer and General Counsel, and Suzanne Coffey, Title IX officer, joined the meeting at 5:30 P.M. to discuss the status of the recommendations of the Special Oversight Committee on Sexual Misconduct (SMOC), which issued [a report](#) in January of 2013, and changes brought about by the implementation of the College’s new [Title IX policy](#). Professor Kingston asked whether the composition of the Hearing Board that considers cases of sexual misconduct has been changed, as recommended, so that Amherst faculty members and students no longer serve on this body. Ms. Coffey responded that the disciplinary process has been changed, based on student feedback, and after consultation with the College Council, the Committee of Six, and the full Faculty, as part of the larger consideration of the College’s new Title IX policy, which was approved in spring 2013. The [composition of the Sexual Misconduct Hearing Board](#), which addresses complaints of sexual misconduct, is now persons drawn from a pool of individuals from the community, including the Five-College Consortium. The Dean of Students or designee serves as the non-voting chairperson and as an advisor to the Hearing Board. Amherst faculty, staff, and students do not serve. All Hearing Board members have experience in, and receive training on an annual basis regarding, the “dynamics of sexual misconduct, the factors relevant to a determination of credibility, the appropriate manner in which to receive and evaluate sensitive information, the manner of deliberation, and the application of the preponderance of the evidence standard, as well as the College’s policies and procedures,” Ms. Coffey said. She noted that a pool of panelists for a

Amended October 22, 2013

Hearing Board was recruited and trained last spring. The new process has already been used for a hearing that was held at the end of last semester. Ms. Rutherford next reported on the progress of the search for a new Title IX Coordinator, a role that Ms. Coffey has been kind enough to take on in addition to her regular responsibilities, on a temporary basis. Three candidates for the position have thus far been brought to campus, and the search is ongoing for an individual with the desired skill set.

Discussion turned to the Faculty's policy on [Consensual Sexual Relationships between Faculty Members and Students](#) (*Faculty Handbook* IV., 3.), which was voted by the Faculty in 1993. Professor Harms suggested that the Committee focus on the faculty policy, as it may be difficult to achieve uniformity across constituencies at the College. Once a faculty policy is set, it could, perhaps, be used as a basis of establishing a College-wide policy. The members discussed whether the current policy should be strengthened to prohibit all sexual relations between faculty members and students and list possible penalties for violating the policy.

Professor Harms, who said that she favors prohibiting all sexual relations between faculty members and students at Amherst, expressed the view that the language of the policy should be changed to put the focus first on the integrity of the educational process, rather than the potential for harassment, as it now stands. She suggested the following revision: "Sexual relations between faculty and students compromise the integrity of the educational process. The objectivity of evaluations that occur in making recommendations or assigning grades, honors, and fellowships are called into question when a faculty member involved in those functions has or has had sexual relations with any student." Professor Miller agreed with Professor Harms that a revised policy emphasizing the importance of the educational mission and stating clearly the potential issues of consensual relationships on the educational process would be an improvement over the existing policy. Professor Miller continued that, while she agrees that sexual relations between faculty members and students are problematic and should be avoided, she wonders whether prohibiting all relationships is necessary. She had been under the impression that strengthening the policy was required to be in compliance with Title IX, and she was somewhat surprised when Ms. Rutherford had informed the Committee that this is not the case. Professor Miller wondered whether it might be best to maintain the current policy of prohibiting sexual relations when a faculty member is in supervisory, evaluative, advisory, or other pedagogical roles with students—i.e., when in roles with clear power differentials—and strongly discouraging sexual relations between faculty and students under other circumstances. Professors Schneider and Harms stressed that, in an open curriculum, faculty potentially play an advisory role in regard to all students. Professor Harms expressed the view that all relationships that involve sexual relations between faculty members and students compromise the educational process. Effectively, they close parts of the curriculum for students. If relations are not prohibited, there is no reason to keep them secret, she noted. That could compromise the objectivity of other faculty with respect to the student, and of other students with respect to the faculty.

Professor Corrales asked if there would be a hearing process and an appeal process if someone violated a policy that prohibits all sexual relations between faculty members and students. Dean Call said that faculty are already subject, and would continue to be under any new policy, to the [disciplinary policy described in the Faculty Handbook](#), which would involve the formation of a hearing board consisting of three faculty selected by the Committee of Six from among the faculty elected to the Committee on Adjudication. Dean Call noted that the Dean of the Faculty engages in an informal negotiation with a colleague as a first step, during which he or she would refer to the relevant policies in the *Faculty Handbook*, when serious violations occur. The matter may be

Amended October 22, 2013

resolved through this process—including but not limited to, a settlement that would require the individual to leave Amherst. Professor Corrales stressed that, whatever policies are developed, it will be important for everyone to know the range of penalties that would be in place for violation of them, depending on the gravity of the offense. Professor Kingston asked whether the Dean can exercise discretion in determining whether or not a violation warrants a formal disciplinary procedure. Dean Call said, yes, this is the case. According to the *Faculty Handbook* (III, I., 2.) if there is a question of suspension, demotion, or dismissal, the Dean of the Faculty first has a discussion and works toward a mutual settlement. There can also be an informal inquiry by the Committee on Adjudication that may, if there is no informal resolution, recommend that a formal proceeding begin.

Professor Corrales stressed the importance of protecting faculty members from false accusations if a policy prohibiting all sexual relations between faculty members and students is adopted. He said that he would worry that one transgression might automatically trigger a disciplinary process for a faculty member, based exclusively on one-party allegations. In his view, a false accuser could estimate that there is very little probability that he/she can be discovered to be lying. Provost Uvin agreed that the issue of false accusations is a difficult one. A faculty member's career could be threatened, even if the complaint is not legitimate. If a faculty member is eventually exonerated in the end, he or she may still have experienced great suffering and loss of reputation in the meantime. The members discussed safeguards against false accusations, which include the Honor Code, and the hearing process. The Provost suggested that clear language could be adopted about false accusations. He noted that Brown University recently adopted the following language (which he accessed online at the meeting):

MALICIOUS, FALSE ACCUSATIONS

A grievant whose allegations are found to be both false and brought with malicious intent will be subject to disciplinary action which may include, but is not limited to, written warning, demotion, transfer, suspension, dismissal, expulsion, or termination.

Provost Uvin suggested, in addition, that clear language could be adopted about confidentiality, by the accuser, the accused, the Dean, and the other people involved, if necessary, in the hearing. Violations of the confidentiality should be punishable as well, in his view. Such a strong confidentiality policy would help protect faculty members from unjustified harm to their reputations. The members discussed the possibility of adopting language such as the following: "False allegations can lead to a hearing and assessment of a range of possible penalties as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*. The College will consider a false allegation as a significant infraction of our Honor Code." Professor Harms expressed the view that the grievance procedure outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* (III.I.2.b.,1.) makes it clear that the first steps in dealing with a complaint are relatively private. A conversation with the Dean is required initially. If a hearing is deemed necessary, the Hearing Board can make the proceedings private (III.I.2.b.,7.). She said that she wonders if there is something that can be learned from (and incorporated into the Hearing Board procedures in the *Faculty Handbook*) from the new student grievance procedures regarding the inherent problems of a "he said-she said" case. Incorporating the use of trained investigators might be helpful.

Amended October 22, 2013

At the conclusion of the conversation, the members asked Ms. Rutherford to do some research on the consensual sexual relations policies at peer institutions, and she agreed to do so. The members decided to continue their discussion of the policy at their next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 25, 2013

The fourth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, September 30, 2013. Present were Professors Corrales, Harms, Kingston, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Provost Uvin was absent.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Martin discussed with the members the agenda for the autumn meetings of the Board of Trustees, which will be held October 11 and 12. The major topics will be the siting of the new science center and dormitories; a presentation by the Dean on the tenure process, which he periodically provides for the Board's information; and approaches to the budget process.

Continuing with her remarks, President Martin informed the members that, as a response to pressure being exerted by some alumni to compel her to issue a public statement condemning views expressed by Professor Arkes in several written pieces, she had recently posted a statement about "free speech and institutional responsibility" via a [blog](#). (President Martin had discussed with the Committee of Six earlier, in confidence, details related to the efforts of the alumni.)

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call discussed a personnel matter with the members. Following that conversation, the Dean informed the members that, at the Committee's request, he had asked Amanda Vann, the College's new Sexual Respect Educator, for an update about the Sexual Respect Task Force (SRTF)'s conversations about how best to prepare Amherst students in advance of instances when triggering language or material may be used in class. Ms. Vann had informed him that the SRTF is starting to meet later in the semester than the group had hoped. The delay is the result of the SRTF's decision to wait until the Association of Amherst Students had appointed student members to the task force before gathering, which the members had agreed would be important. The first meeting of the SRTF is set for October 11, Dean Call said. Following that meeting, Ms. Vann anticipates meeting with a faculty subcommittee, and it is her hope to have recommendations drafted on triggering language a few weeks later. The understanding is that, after the full SRTF approves the language, it will be forwarded to the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), which will make recommendations and forward them to the Committee of Six. The Dean said that the full Faculty may also be asked to vote on the language, depending on how it will be used. It is the SRTF's hope to provide the CEP with its recommendations by the end of October. The Dean noted that the CEP has taken up some related matters this term. The committee has had a preliminary discussion about the possibility of having gender and sexuality keywords for Amherst courses. Last year's CEP had begun a discussion about developing a required half-credit course on sexual respect, which students would take on a pass/fail basis, and had been enthusiastic about the prospect of doing so. This year's committee just began its discussion about requiring such a course, Dean Call noted.

Conversation turned to the request by the Housing Committee to meet with the Committee of Six to discuss the [proposals](#) that it had developed in 2012-2013 to revise the College's housing policy. The committee is interested in having the conversation, in advance of faculty hiring, this spring, Dean Call explained. The Dean asked the members if they would be amenable to meeting with the Housing Committee and if there is anything, in particular, that they would like to discuss. Professor Harms asked the Dean if the committee had been assessing the rental pool of housing and the second mortgage policy as part of its regular charge, or whether the committee's consideration of these issues had been prompted by an increased demand for rental housing during the current intensive period of faculty hiring. The Dean said that there is a concern about an increase in the demand for rental housing from the College, and that last year was only the

Amended October 25, 2013

unable to meet all of the requests for rental housing from those who were eligible to receive it. Professor Harms commented that while, in her view, it is within the role of the Committee of Six to advocate, generally, for benefits that aid faculty recruitment and retention, she is uncomfortable with the idea of the Faculty trying to determine its own benefits. Professor Harms sees the need and the problem identified by the Housing Committee, but she is unsure what the Housing Committee is asking of the Committee of Six. Professor Miller concurred. The Dean noted that, while ultimately decisions about benefits, including housing, are within the purview of the Board of Trustees, it is important to gain a sense of the Faculty's views about this and other benefits. Such views are shared with the Board and inform the Trustees' decision making.

Continuing with the discussion, Professor Harms asked the Dean what lies at the heart of the problem that the Housing Committee is seeking to address. Is it too expensive for faculty to rent housing in Amherst on the open market? The Dean noted that the rental market in Amherst is primarily student-centered, and many faculty find it difficult to find suitable housing on the open market. Professor Harms suggested that, if it is too expensive or undesirable for faculty to live in Amherst, perhaps the solution is to increase all faculty salaries, to avoid offering (another) benefit that is distributed unequally—that is, only to a subset of faculty—those who are eligible to rent College housing but have decided not to do so. She noted that, if there is no direct benefit to the College (in the form of having faculty live near campus, for example) as a result of offering a housing subsidy, and the purpose of it is to provide what amounts to additional income to be used for housing or another purpose, the College might as well be raising the salaries of everyone by \$400.00 per month, for example. Dean Call noted that, during conversations within the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR), multiple arguments have been offered for the benefit to the College of having faculty live close to campus—including enabling faculty to be more involved with life on campus. Advantages of having the College own property surrounding the campus include being able to have some control over the character of the surrounding neighborhood. Dean Call noted that changes in lifestyle among faculty have now become part of the conversation. Many faculty members and their partners now prefer to live outside of the immediate Amherst area. Dean Call noted in the context of such changing needs, that, traditionally, an important purpose of the College's housing program has been to encourage faculty to live close to the College. He commented that it is a very helpful recruitment tool, when hiring new faculty, to be able to offer affordable, accessible rentals. Professor Schneider noted that last year's Committee had had a conversation about the Housing Committee's proposals, which had been seen as under-theorized and ineffective in regard to the questions at hand. He said that these questions still remain, and that the Committee of Six is, in his view, the body to lead conversations about them. For this reason, he feels it would be helpful to meet with the Housing Committee.

The discussion continued, with Professor McGeoch commenting that he sees the question of whether a housing subsidy should be offered if faculty choose to live outside a thirty-mile radius of the College as a significant point of disagreement. It would be valuable to have an exchange of ideas on these and other matters, he feels. President Martin suggested that, during such a conversation, it would be helpful to consider the fundamental question of what we want a College housing program to be doing. The discussion concluded with the Dean noting that the College's rental program would need to be augmented for a finite number of years—perhaps five or six—to address the bulge in need that is the result of the current period of intensive faculty hiring. A review of the rental program has revealed just how many units short the College will be during this period. It is estimated that current rental holdings can meet demand for housing after the next five

Amended October 25, 2013

or six years. Professor Kingston noted that he understands from meetings of the strategic planning effort's Facilities Working Group, of which he is a member, that there is the possibility that the Merrill apartments may at some point be replaced by or converted into student housing. Dean Call said that, under current plans for siting the science center, and the most recent calculations of student housing needs, it is believed that demolishing the Merrill apartments will not be necessary in the near term. Professor Kingston next noted that because of the points system, if the rental housing stock is insufficient to meet demand, visiting faculty will be excluded from the program before tenure-line faculty. He asked whether, if the purpose of the policy is to strengthen our community by inducing faculty to live near the College, then from the College's perspective it may be less important for visiting faculty to live/rent near the College than it is for tenure-line faculty to do so. Professor Schneider noted that the promise of nearby and reasonably priced rental housing has been an essential element in his department's success in recruiting senior colleagues for visiting positions at Amherst. The President noted that it will be important to have a discussion that focuses on the fundamental purpose, and related complexities, of Amherst's housing system. To inform such a discussion, Professor Harms asked who at the College has responsibility for defining the purpose that should guide the housing system at Amherst. It was agreed that the Committee should meet with the Housing Committee, and that the central question of the purpose of the housing policy should be part of the conversation.

At 4:35 P.M., the Committee was joined by Lisa Rutherford, Chief Policy Officer and General Counsel, who offered general legal advice related to the tenure process and answered questions posed by the Committee.

Conversation returned briefly to the Faculty's policy on [Consensual Sexual Relationships between Faculty Members and Students](#) (*Faculty Handbook* IV., 3.), which was voted by the Faculty in 1993. Ms. Rutherford commented that her research on the related policies of peer institutions, which she had provided to the members in advance of the meeting, had revealed that a very small number of the institutions surveyed prohibit consensual relationships between faculty members and students. Most institutions take an approach similar to Amherst's, strongly discouraging such relationships and/or requiring a transfer of teacher/student responsibility if such a relationship occurs. Ms. Rutherford commented that schools use various terms to describe the activity prohibited by a consensual relationship policy. Examples include amorous, romantic, and sexual. She noted the importance of the terms that are used and of defining them precisely. Some schools, she noted, define a consensual relationship as a dating, romantic, sexual or marriage relationship. A number of schools have policies that state the consequences of violating their policies. Such consequences include being subject to disciplinary action by the College, up to and including termination of employment; disciplinary action up to and including termination of employment should such a relationship be found to undermine the trust, respect, and fairness that are central to the success of the institution's educational mission and/or to constitute a conflict of interest and to violate professional ethics, even if consensual; being personally liable to formal action; and being subject to sanctions commensurate with the severity of the offense. One institution, it was pointed out, has a sexual harassment policy that references false accusations, noting the following: "a grievant whose allegations are found to be both false and brought with malicious intent will be subject to disciplinary action which may include, but is not limited to, written warning, demotion, transfer, suspension, dismissal, expulsion, or termination." The Committee thanked Ms. Rutherford for gathering this helpful information.

Amended October 25, 2013

Professor Harms reiterated her view that being in a consensual sexual relationship with a faculty member effectively closes parts of the curriculum to a student, can compromise him or her in courses within the department in which the faculty member teaches, and can compromise the teacher/student relationship across the College. Professor Schneider, who agreed, noted that, in practice, having the language of “highly discourages” is effectively the same as prohibiting relations of this kind between faculty members and students. If such a relationship becomes known, the Dean would get involved. Professor Harms said that “prohibit” is much clearer than other words, and that the College should strive for clarity in this policy. Professor Kingston noted that the current policy does not require that the Dean become involved if a relationship becomes known. Professor McGeoch said that he would prefer having a clear prohibition. Professor Corrales said he is torn about this language and noted that he remains concerned that a prohibition, with an automatic penalty, might encourage silence out of fear of punishment, and other unhelpful behavior. The situation might be helped by having the flexibility to talk about such matters and to work toward the most desirable outcome for all involved. It was noted that having a policy of prohibition would not require that any penalties for violating the policy be automatic. Automatic penalties for a violation of the policy might be counterproductive, noted the members, who agreed that it might be best to have a range of sanctions that could be employed in a way that would be commensurate with the severity of the offense. Professor Miller said that she favors prohibiting consensual sexual relations in cases where faculty hold supervisory, evaluative, or advisory positions in relation to the student, and strongly discouraging them in other circumstances.

The members discussed the scenario of a faculty member having multiple relationships with students—in other words, a serial abuser. Concern was raised that, if this behavior is not prohibited under Amherst policy, such a person could not be stopped. The members wondered whether there should be a requirement that faculty members who have consensual sexual relations with a student notify the Dean of the Faculty, noting that such a policy might be challenging to enforce.

It was agreed that, based on the Committee’s feedback, Ms. Rutherford should draft a number of policy options for the Committee’s consideration. The members requested she provide language for the following: a policy that prohibits all consensual sexual relations between faculty members and students; one that prohibits some of these relationships, but strongly discourages others; statements about false accusations and penalties for violating the policy; and a requirement for reporting consensual sexual relationships between faculty members and students. The members agreed to discuss these drafts at a future meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 25, 2013

The fifth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, October 7, 2013. Present were Professors Corrales, Harms, Kingston, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Provost Uvin attended for the first half hour of the meeting and was not present during the discussion of personnel matters.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Martin informed the members that she and the Senior Staff are preparing for the autumn meetings of the Board of Trustees, which are set for October 11-12. She will report back to the members about the meetings at the Committee's October 21 meeting.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call discussed possible dates for the Committee's meeting with the Housing Committee. He informed the members that he is encouraged about the Five Colleges' prospects for receiving a \$1 million grant from the Mellon Foundation to support blended learning initiatives in the humanities. The funds would supplement the Amherst funding that is being made available through the Project in Innovative Curriculum and Teaching (PICT). Dean Call noted that the Mellon Foundation Board is set to vote on the grant in December.

In response to the question posed at an earlier meeting by Professor Kingston about the status of a report on childcare at the College, which had been undertaken by Bright Horizons and promised last year, the Dean offered an update on the current status of this effort. Dean Call explained that Horizons Workforce Consulting, a division of Bright Horizons, had met with members of the Amherst community on campus last year, after which the group had provided the administration with a Dependent Care and Cost Projection Study. The study included an assessment of the College's childcare needs, a comparison with childcare at peer schools, models of childcare, and cost projections. Plans had called for the group to make a presentation about the report on campus soon after it was submitted in the fall of 2012, but the troubling events of last year surrounding sexual misconduct had led the College to cancel meetings with the group. Attention is now focusing on this issue once again, Dean Call informed the Committee. Horizons Workforce Consulting will be meeting with a small group of senior administrators in early October to present the report. It is expected that the group will lay out options for childcare and their cost. The next step would be for these Amherst colleagues to make a recommendation to the Senior Staff.

The Dean next informed the members that a need has arisen for the Committee to make some committee nominations. He explained that two colleagues who have agreed to serve on strategic planning committees have requested to be relieved of their current committee assignments. Professor Miller commented that some colleagues who have agreed to serve on committees for the strategic planning effort have told her that they are unclear about the nature of the work that they will be asked to do. Provost Uvin said that he would be providing information to all of the committees soon, once they are fully staffed.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Miller noted that the ongoing shutdown of the federal government could potentially have a negative impact on colleagues who receive current research funding in installments (for example, through the National Science Foundation or National Institutes of Health), and in the current application cycle for funding. She said that colleagues in the sciences have expressed some anxiety that the College is investing so much of its resources in bricks and mortar, especially in the context of challenges to obtaining external research funding, worrying that insufficient support may be available for research as a result. The President and the Dean offered assurance that the College's commitment to

Amended October 25, 2013

supporting the Faculty's research remains one of its highest priorities and thanked Professor Miller for bringing this matter to their attention. Discussion turned to personnel matters.

Dean Call next informed the members of his plans to step down as Dean of the Faculty on June 30, 2014, and told the Committee that he would soon be writing to the Faculty and staff to share this news. He commented that it has been his great privilege and joy to serve as Dean. He shared his plans to return to the Department of Mathematics in 2014-2015, and, in 2015-2016, to take one of the sabbatic leaves that he has held in abeyance during his tenure as Dean. The President, the Committee, and the Provost thanked the Dean for his extraordinary service to the Faculty and the College. President Martin said that she is delighted that Dean Call has agreed to serve as Senior Advisor to the President during the next academic year.

Dean Call left the meeting so the members and the President could discuss the search process for the next Dean of the Faculty. Conversation revolved around the advantages and disadvantages of a national versus a solely internal search and the history surrounding decanal transitions at the College. The President said that she would be open to either an internal or a national search, depending on the preference of the Faculty. The majority of members expressed a strong preference for an internal search, with the option of turning to a national search, if necessary. Professor Corrales said that he senses a certain unease among the Faculty during this period, with so many new colleagues joining the ranks of the administration from outside. For this reason, it would seem prudent to have the next Dean come from the Faculty, bringing strong ties to the College and Amherst experience to the position. Professor Harms stressed the importance of developing a clear definition of the division of responsibilities between the Dean and the Provost, something that is being worked out over time and with experience. In her opinion, a Dean who is familiar with the administrative structure of the College would be best positioned to negotiate a new structure with the Provost. It was agreed that responsibilities of the Dean of the Faculty have multiplied over time, and that moving some of the work to the Provost would strengthen the administration of the College. It was noted that consideration should also be given to changing the ways in which the Dean's office is administered—including, perhaps, delegating more responsibility to the Associate Deans, as a way of reducing the burden on the Dean and increasing efficiency. This would be up to the new Dean to decide, the Committee and the President agreed, but should be discussed. The possibility of appointing a current faculty member to be the Dean for a term of, say, five years, was also discussed. It was agreed that, since the learning curve for the position is steep, such an approach would not be desirable. The President and the members discussed the process for searching for the Dean. President Martin said that she would seek nominations from the Faculty and would solicit views about the scope of the search, what the College needs in its next Dean and the qualities that she or he should have, and the challenges the Dean might face in the years ahead. The President asked the Committee to consider whether a search committee should be appointed or whether the Committee of Six might act in this role. Some members said that they would be willing to have the Committee of Six serve in an advisory role to the President for the search. If there is a search committee appointed, they said that they would prefer that it be composed of faculty members only.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 31, 2013

The sixth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, October 21, 2013. Present were Professors Corrales, Harms, Kingston, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Provost Uvin attended for the first half hour of the meeting and was not present during the discussion of personnel matters.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Martin offered a brief report about the autumn meetings of the Board of Trustees. She noted that the Board had devoted most of its meetings to a discussion of plans for the new science center and related projects, and associated financial matters. The Trustees also discussed the process for setting the fiscal 2015 budget and considered a request by the Green Amherst Project, an Amherst student group, that the College not make investments in the coal industry in the future. The President said that, since she had sent [the Board's statement about the plans that had been approved](#) to the Amherst community earlier, she would not spend time describing the plans further for the Committee. She welcomed the members' questions about any of these matters. Turning to the topic of the Humanities Center, President Martin informed the Committee that members of her staff are currently scheduling for her a series of conversations about the center with members of the Faculty. In regard to the decanal transition, President Martin commented that the response to her email to the Faculty asking for nominations and suggestions had received a response that was good, but not yet sufficient, with a range of opinion about what the format of the search should be and possible candidates for the position. The President had just sent a second email as a reminder, she said, and expressed hope that she would hear from more colleagues about this important matter.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call reminded the members that the Committee would be meeting with the Housing Committee on October 28. The Committee discussed nominations to committees, before turning to a personnel matter.

Dean Call reported to the members that he had discussed the possibility of a course release with the chairs of the four core strategic planning committees. Three faculty members had decided on other options to provide relief from some of their other responsibilities during the time that they would be serving on the planning committee. One chair had opted for a course release. At the request of some colleagues, the Dean next discussed with the members the possibility of having a Memorial Minute for Bekki Lee, who had a twenty-three-year career at the College in the Dean of Students Office, before moving to Scripps College, where she was the Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students at the time of her sudden death on October 12. Dean Call noted that plans are under way for a Memorial Service for Ms. Lee to be held at Amherst in late-February. The members expressed their sorrow at the loss of Ms. Lee and discussed whether a Memorial Minute should be read at a Faculty Meeting. It was agreed that the Dean should research the precedent for memorializing administrative colleagues in this way. He said that he would do so and report back to the Committee.

The members next reviewed a draft Faculty Meeting agenda for a possible November 5 meeting. It was agreed that the Committee should not determine whether to have a Faculty Meeting on that date until the members had met with the Housing Committee and had had further conversation about possible policies regarding consensual sexual relations that might be brought to the Faculty for discussion and a vote. Both of these discussions would occur at the members' October 28 meeting. The Committee, the President, and the Dean agreed that, over the course of the year, it would be desirable to include on the agenda a report by the Chief Financial Officer on the financial health of the College, a report by the Dean of Admission and

Amended October 31, 2013

Financial Aid on the entering class, and presentations on faculty governance and the strategic planning process. Professor Schneider expressed concern that, if a decision is made not to have a Faculty Meeting on November 5, courses would have to be listed as “pending faculty approval” during the preregistration process. In his view, doing so would diminish the legitimacy of the participatory role that the Faculty has decided to play in the administrative oversight of the course approval process. Dean Call noted that proposals for new courses that might be listed as “pending faculty approval” would have been vetted by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and that, in the past, the approval of the course proposals by the full Faculty has, at times, not taken place by the time of preregistration. At those times, there had been an email vote or the courses had been approved at a Faculty Meeting after preregistration.

Conversation continued about possible ways to structure an upcoming Faculty Meeting. Provost Uvin wondered if preliminary discussions of issues, without calling for a vote, ever occur at Amherst Faculty Meetings. The Dean said that the Faculty does have such conversations at its meetings, typically in a committee-of-the-whole format. Provost Uvin noted that, at the Fletcher School at Tufts, making use of a personal response system (PRS) to take straw votes on issues, to gauge opinion in real time, had been informative and efficient. Professor Miller thought that this would be an interesting idea to try. Professor McGeoch, who has served as the Faculty’s parliamentarian in the past, noted that straw votes typically occur in a committee-of-the-whole format. The members agreed to consider the agenda and schedule for the next Faculty Meeting at their next meeting. Discussion turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended November 22, 2013

The seventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, October 28, 2013. Present were Professors Corrales (via Skype), Kingston, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Harms and Provost Uvin were absent.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Martin informed the members that she is in the process of inviting a small group of scholars who are experts in American colonial history to conduct research on Lord Jeffery Amherst and to offer an outside perspective on him as a historical figure. As the conversation about the College's mascot moves forward, this group's views and findings will be most valuable, President Martin noted. The members agreed that having these colleagues weigh in would be helpful.

Turning to the search for the next Dean of the Faculty, President Martin informed the members that, based on feedback that she has received from faculty members, it is clear that there should be an internal search for the next Dean of the Faculty. The President noted that a national search would be launched if strong internal candidates who are interested in the position of Dean do not emerge. President Martin informed the members that she has asked Professor Servos to serve as chair of a committee that will seek input from the Faculty about the nature of the position, the structure of the Office of the Dean, and the list of possible candidates. She asked for the members' suggestions about faculty who might join Professor Servos in this important work. The members then turned briefly to a personnel matter.

In preparation for the members' discussion about precedents regarding Memorial Minutes, the Dean had provided the Committee with confidential minutes of the Committee of Six that had addressed the question of whether administrative colleagues should be memorialized in this way. The members noted that, within the past five years, the Committee of Six had agreed that having Memorial Minutes for some non-faculty members of the Amherst community and not for others was problematic and potentially divisive. Rather than trying to develop criteria for deciding for whom a Memorial Minute would be appropriate, the Committee of Six had decided that these tributes should be limited to members of the Amherst Faculty. The current Committee of Six agreed with the rationale and the final decision. The Committee noted that the College should and does honor deceased members of the community in many ways other than through the creation of Memorial Minutes.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Corrales shared concerns on behalf of himself and colleagues surrounding the new "Grab-N-Go" program, which is located in Schwemm's Coffee House in the Keefe Campus Center. While recognizing the benefits of the program, he noted that a problematic consequence of locating the "Grab-N-Go" in Schwemm's has been the loss of an important venue on campus for conversations over an informal breakfast or lunch. Professor McGeoch agreed and said that he too has felt the loss of the old Schwemm's. While it was agreed that the "Grab-N-Go" is meeting an important need for the community, particularly for students who, at times, had been missing meals because they did not have enough time to dine at Valentine, some members wondered whether the program could be moved to another location. Schwemm's past operations could then be reinstated. President Martin asked the Dean to share the members' concerns with Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate

Amended November 22, 2013

Treasurer for Campus Services, and to report back to the Committee. Dean Call said that he would be happy to do so. Professor Kingston wondered whether this issue could perhaps be considered by the Facilities Working Group as part of the Strategic Planning effort.

Under “Announcements from the Dean,” Dean Call said that there seems to be a sense that some colleagues wish to have a Faculty Meeting on November 5, since there has not been a meeting since Labor Day. The members reviewed a draft agenda and decided that it would be informative to have Kevin Weinman, Chief Financial Officer, and Tom Parker, Dean of Admission and Financial Aid, offer reports. (It was learned later that Dean Parker would be out of town on November 5 so his report was postponed.) Professor McGeoch argued for having a meeting on November 5, noting that he agreed with the view expressed by Professor Schneider previously that the Faculty should gather to vote on proposals for new courses before pre-registration, lest faculty approval of courses become a hollow gesture. The members then voted five in favor and zero opposed to forward the Faculty Meeting agenda to the Faculty.

Before meeting with the members of the Housing Committee, the Committee of Six clarified the purpose of the conversation. The members noted that, while final decisions about the housing program are within the purview of the administration and the Board of Trustees, it would be helpful to have a sense of the Faculty’s views about this program, and how this benefit should be shaped and prioritized in relation to other identified needs. Professor Schneider noted, that, after reviewing the Committee’s minutes of previous discussions about the Housing Committee’s [proposals](#), it appears to him that the only point of significant disagreement between the Committee of Six and the Housing Committee is whether the housing program should provide incentives for faculty to live close to campus.

At 4:00 P.M., the Committee was joined by Professors Barbezat, Hanneke, and Redding, representing the Housing Committee. Professor Barbezat thanked the Committee of Six for agreeing to meet with the Housing Committee. Professor Barbezat explained that the committee had been charged with recommending a revised housing policy. The committee’s work has been informed by the efforts of K. Backus and Associates (KBA), a real estate consulting firm that was engaged to assist with the process of gathering data and to offer recommendations. Professor Barbezat noted that the areas that the Housing Committee had been asked to address included the allocation of College-owned rental units, including the amount of time this process takes; the question of rental subsidies and who should receive them; support for purchasing homes in the open market; and purchasing plans for Amherst-owned homes. Professor Barbezat commented that, while some of the changes proposed by the committee were put into effect last year, others were not. The committee would like to see any changes to the housing policy implemented as soon as possible, in order to accommodate the next cohort of new faculty.

Continuing, Professor Barbezat pointed out that it is in Amherst’s interest to own property surrounding the campus as a means of creating a physical buffer zone around the “site plan” of the College. Given that Amherst has and should retain these houses, it makes sense, he noted, to consider how best to use them in the long run. In considering the housing program, the committee feels that it is important to consider equity within and across cohorts, and factors that may be producing asymmetries. The committee stressed the importance of developing a policy that can be revised easily, as needs change. Professor Redding explained that last spring four colleagues who were eligible for College housing were turned away because of a unit shortfall. The Housing Committee commented that the problem of not having sufficient rental units to accommodate all of the Amherst faculty and administrators who qualify for rental housing is expected to worsen, as the number of new hires increases over the next few years. Research suggests that, once the surge of new hires winds down after five or six years, and these faculty

Amended November 22, 2013

members complete their tenure track, there will no longer be a shortage of College rental housing. The committee proposed that the subsidy be offered only during the period in which there is a greater demand for rental housing and be discontinued once the need is reduced. KBA has determined that the peak of the housing shortage will be in 2019 and that housing will return to a state of equilibrium by 2023. The Housing Committee noted that the construction of the new dorms and science center may exacerbate the College housing shortage, if the site of the Merrill apartments is used.

Professor Barbezat stressed the importance of being able to provide high quality rental housing near campus as part of recruitment efforts to hire the best possible candidates for faculty positions. The Housing Committee noted that KBA has determined that the differential between a subsidized two-bedroom College rental and the open market in Amherst is \$480.00 per month. After consultation with the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR), the committee is recommending that all those eligible for rental housing receive a subsidy of \$400.00 per month, and that there be no distance limit imposed for renting non-College-owned units. The committee noted that the Dean authorized a subsidy of \$300.00 a month to the four colleagues who were turned away from College housing this year. The Committee of Six, the President, and the Dean argued that a subsidy should be offered only to those who are actively turned away from the housing program, not those who choose not to participate. Professor Hanneke argued for allocating the subsidy to all faculty members who are eligible for rental housing, in order to support everyone. While some faculty may wish to rent housing to be near campus, others may find it necessary to live further away to accommodate their needs, such as the desire to be equidistant from the College and their spouse or partner's workplace, for example. These faculty should receive the same housing benefit as colleagues for whom living close to campus is preferable, the Housing Committee argued. Some members of the Committee, President Martin, and the Dean noted that giving a subsidy to everyone would amount to an income benefit. Most members, the President, and the Dean expressed the view that there is a benefit to having faculty live near campus and that the housing program should provide incentives for faculty to do so.

The Housing Committee expressed concern that some colleagues who are eligible for College housing are effectively turned away at present, because rental units are allocated so slowly and thus so late in the academic year. The committee argued that the long waiting period for College housing makes it challenging for new hires to participate in the housing program. New colleagues may have to make a decision not to make use of College housing, as a result. A major part of the problem, the committee noted, is the amount of time it takes Human Resources to determine individuals' eligibility for housing and to assign points to them, which is the underpinning of the housing system. Some of those hired in early spring are now waiting until mid- to late-June to hear about housing. The Housing Committee noted that, in addition to the administrative problems that have occurred in regard to defining eligibility through the ranking process, some faculty who are already in rental housing are unwilling to make a decision about whether they will stay in their units, a situation that makes it difficult to know which units will be available. Professor Hanneke explained that some improvements have been made and praised the work of the rental housing office, which now posts photographs and floor plans of available units. Colleagues now have three days to make a decision about their housing choice after seeing units (either online or in person). Nevertheless, beginning the process of allocating housing late in the spring is problematic, and it would be better for everyone if the process occurred earlier. President Martin agreed and said that she will review this matter and seek to make improvements.

Amended November 22, 2013

President Martin asked about the ranking system. Professor Hanneke explained that untenured faculty, visiting faculty, junior lecturers, and coaches who have not received senior contract status are eligible for College rental housing. Tenure-line faculty members are given priority under the system. Rental housing is assigned on the basis of a point system that is based on the number of years of service, number of children, and rank when appointed to Amherst. Professor McGeoch expressed surprise that the assignment of points was seen as such a complicated process. The Housing Committee and the Committee of Six agreed that the process by which points are assigned and the ways in which the housing policy is administered should be more transparent, and that the policy should be communicated more broadly.

Returning to the question of awarding a housing subsidy, Professor Kingston argued that one of the main purposes of the housing program is to provide an incentive for faculty to be in close proximity to the campus to make it easier for them to participate in the life of the College. Professor Barbezat expressed the view that this should not necessarily be one of the goals of the housing program. One of the program's primary goals, he said, should be to serve as a recruitment tool for new faculty, in addition, of course, to providing high quality housing to all eligible members of the Amherst community. Professor Redding expressed the view that, if a \$400.00 housing subsidy is provided to everyone, and doing so results in an exodus from College housing, the subsidy could be recalibrated or eliminated. Most faculty prefer to live near campus—and more than 80 percent do at present—so she doesn't envision that the subsidy will drive a large number of faculty away. Professor Kingston commented that it would likely be difficult to withdraw the stipend once it had been provided. The Housing Committee noted that providing the subsidy would also be an incentive for the administration to provide high quality housing for faculty because colleagues would be able to use the subsidy to opt out of the College system if they found College units to be unsatisfactory. Some members and the Dean noted that the housing provided is already of high quality.

The Housing Committee next raised the issue of changing the current policy for home purchase subsidy options. The options are now available to tenure-line faculty, junior and senior contract coaches, and certain administrators who are first-time purchasers of a house while employed by Amherst College. Professor Barbezat noted that the Housing Committee had previously suggested that eligibility should be extended to those who are purchasing a home and had not yet used a College home purchasing benefit. Members of the Housing Committee believe this change should be implemented. One of the other conditions, at present, is that the house be located within a thirty-mile radius of the center of Amherst. Professor Barbezat suggested that the thirty-mile radius restriction be reconsidered for home purchases. While some members of the Committee of Six expressed support for extending the home purchasing benefit to anyone who is eligible and had not previously used a College home purchasing benefit, most expressed the view that the thirty-mile radius is in the best interest of the College. Dean Call noted that the rental program helps faculty to decide where they wish to live and the purchase program provides support to help them to live in that area permanently. Providing incentives to live close to campus both for rentals and purchases is beneficial to the College.

The members of the Committee of Six, the President, and the Dean agreed that a desirable policy would be that those eligible to participate in the College housing program should be informed about their housing by June 1 or, if they will not receive a unit, should be informed by June 1 that they will be provided with a housing subsidy by the College. Professor Miller noted that many science faculty begin working with students in their labs in early- to mid-June. The Dean noted that, since tenure-track searches are typically completed in early spring, the first calculations for awarding housing could be done much earlier for this cohort. Professor Corrales

Amended November 22, 2013

expressed the view that a flat subsidy does not help with equity issues, as it would not be of equal value to everyone, depending on their resources. He wondered if the amount of the subsidy could be adjusted based on faculty members' financial need. Professor Redding commented that most tenure-track faculty members are in the same income range, and that it would be a difficult matter to assess need. The other members of the Committee of Six and the Housing Committee agreed that tying the amount of the stipend to individual financial situations would not be appropriate or workable.

As a final argument for allocating housing stipends to all those eligible to live in College housing who are turned away, not just to those who rent within a thirty-mile radius of campus, Professor Barbezat noted that neighborhoods in Amherst have changed in recent years. For those who are turned away from College housing, it can be very difficult to find suitable housing in Amherst. The open market is dominated largely by students, who have changed the face of many neighborhoods. The Committee thanked the Housing Committee, which left the meeting at 5:00 P.M.

The Committee continued its discussion of the housing policy briefly. President Martin said that steps would be taken to improve the administrative oversight of the housing program, including the process of allocating College housing, which is occurring later than it should. Professor Schneider questioned whether the home purchase options should be extended to senior administrators appointed from outside the College, since they may not have the same level of need as faculty who are making the transition from renting College housing to making a purchase. Professor Miller expressed the view that developing greater clarity about the intent of the housing policy should be the next step. She wondered which body should be responsible for doing so and whether it would be appropriate for the CPR to have a conversation about this matter. Dean Call noted that two different CPRs have discussed many of the issues raised and that there has been a difference of opinion expressed about the thirty-mile radius question, for example. Professor Schneider said that he feels that a residential college should not provide incentives for faculty to live outside of the local area.

Conversation returned briefly to the Faculty's policy on Consensual Sexual Relationships between Faculty Members and Students ([*Faculty Handbook IV., 3.*](#)). The members thanked Ms. Rutherford, who had joined the meeting after the departure of the Housing Committee, for drafting three potential policy options, as the members had requested. She provided a policy for each of the following: prohibiting consensual romantic and/or sexual relations between faculty members and students in cases of direct supervisory contact; discouraging consensual romantic and/or sexual relations between faculty members and students, but allowing these relationships if they are disclosed to the Dean; and prohibiting these relationships completely. The Committee first considered whether there is a need to replace the current policy. Professor McGeoch suggested that perhaps the College's values in regard to these issues could be expressed more clearly and eloquently if the current policy is amended. It was noted that the current policy strongly discourages consensual relationships between faculty and students and requires faculty to remove themselves from supervisory roles with students that they have had (or are having) relationships with; however, it does not require reporting of such relationships to the Dean of the Faculty. Professor Schneider commented that the most important thing is to have a process in place to address these relationships when it becomes known that they are taking place, and to make sure there is sufficient flexibility in the policy to allow for a range of solutions, depending on the circumstances and needs. There are many reasons why the College might discourage or prohibit these relationships, but moving into the realm of specifics might not be the best approach, he noted. Professor Corrales suggested that, if it were decided to bring this matter to

Amended November 22, 2013

the floor of the faculty for discussion, then two draft policies ought to be presented: the one that calls for an absolute prohibition and the one that does not call for a prohibition but requires disclosure to the Dean. Professor Corrales also agreed with other members' caution that having a structured conversation on the floor of the Faculty about this sensitive matter might prove unproductive. Since Amherst's current policy resembles that of most peer schools, and because there is no pressing requirement or need to change it at this time, the Committee decided that more time and thought should be given to this issue.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended November 22, 2013

The eighth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, November 4, 2013. Present were Professors Corrales, Kingston, Harms, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, Provost Uvin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Martin discussed a personnel matter with the Committee. Conversation then turned to the "Grab-N-Go" program. Following up on the concerns expressed by some members, Dean Call reported back on what he had learned from Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services, about the possibility of restoring Schwemm's to its original service configuration and moving the "Grab-N-Go" to another location. Mr. Brassord noted that students appreciate the convenience of the new program; he reported that approximately six hundred students are served each day at the "Grab-N-Go", which has revitalized Keefe Campus Center. Many students "grab" a meal but don't "go." Many tend to linger in Keefe, which has had a positive impact on the social dynamic there, Mr. Brassord commented. Students would see moving the program to another location as a significant loss, in his view.

Continuing with his summary of Mr. Brassord's comments, Dean Call said that utilization of Schwemm's for breakfast and lunch was quite low before the implementation of the "Grab-N-Go". Charlie Thompson, Director of Dining Services, estimates that no more than twenty to thirty faculty/staff had breakfast at Schwemm's on any given day. Interestingly, many faculty and staff now use "Grab-N-Go" as a convenient à la carte alternative, Mr. Brassord noted. Using Keefe for both "Grab-N-Go" and Schwemm's counter service is not possible, given the volume of traffic. Mr. Brassord said that expanded breakfast menu offerings have been added at the Frost Café, which is now open earlier (beginning at 9:00 A.M.) to address concerns expressed about the curtailed hours. Menu offerings have been expanded during the lunch period at Frost Café to include sandwiches, salads, yogurt, and side dishes, in response to feedback given last year by a couple of faculty members. Lunch activity at Frost remains slow, however. Continuing, Dean Call said that Mr. Brassord reports that locating the "Grab-N-Go" in Keefe has enabled him to efficiently redeploy Schwemm's staffing to cover this program. If the "Grab-N-Go" were to be moved to another location and counter service were to be reinstated at Schwemm's, it would become necessary to hire three new FTEs at an estimated cost of more than \$130,000 per year. Locating the "Grab-N-Go" in another location would require significant capital investment in counters, coolers, etc. That cost would be well over \$100,000. Mr. Brassord said that it would not be possible to move the program to Valentine, which would have no space to house it. Producing the volume of food offered through "Grab-N-Go" requires a major preparation operation, he noted. If the "Grab-N-Go" were not in Keefe, the food would have to be prepared in Valentine during the third shift, which would require hiring a full-time runner and keeping the Valentine kitchen open twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week.

Amended November 22, 2013

President Martin said that the evidence is clear that the “Grab-N-Go” program is filling an important need, and that it would take a significant investment to move the program. Professor McGeoch reiterated his view that the changes that have taken place in Schwemm’s have resulted in a significant loss. Professor Schneider asked why the Frost Café cannot serve the same purpose as the “old Schwemm’s.” Professor McGeoch responded that, even if the café is expanded, it would not be a substitute for a full snack bar. Professor Corrales expressed the view that the crowding and long lines that have resulted from the “Grab-N-Go” have compromised the essence of the campus center. He wondered if the organization of the program could be improved, perhaps by having additional staff and additional lines. Professor Harms agreed, suggesting that the way that the space is being used in Keefe is far from ideal. Dean Call said that he would be happy to share this feedback with Mr. Brassord.

President Martin next noted conversations that have been taking place among students about the possibility of creating a Mountain Day tradition at Amherst. Consideration is being given to launching the tradition this spring. The Committee shared its views about the prospect of having a Mountain Day, the ideal timing for it, and adjustments that would need to be made to the academic calendar and in planning by faculty in their courses. The Dean noted that this year there is a five-day reading period, three more days than had been typical for many years in the spring semester, in part because the term now ends on a Wednesday. He proposed that, if Mountain Day occurs on a Thursday, another Thursday class day could be added to the semester. Dean Call said that he has been consulting with the Registrar about making changes to the calendar to allow for a Mountain Day this year and in future years. Another option for this year would be to condense the exam schedule to make up for the lost day of class. Professor Schneider said that, in the past, colleagues at Mount Holyoke and Smith, particularly science faculty, have shared with him their frustrations about Mountain Day, including the disruption that it causes with their labs. Professor Miller agreed, stating that labs often build on one another, such that a Mountain Day could be disruptive if it affects the lab schedule. She suggested learning more about how other schools that have Mountain Days address this concern. Professor Harms expressed serious concerns about the impact that Mountain Day would have on many courses, noting in particular that course sections would be out of sync for the remainder of the semester following the loss of a day on which lab or discussion sections are held. The Dean suggested that Mountain Day should occur as late into the semester as possible, perhaps in April, to minimize the disruption. The members wondered about the motivation for having a Mountain Day. President Martin said that students have expressed the desire to have more traditions at the College. They have not yet decided what kind of Mountain Day experience that they would want—some would like to focus on hiking, others would prefer a day of community service, and

Amended November 22, 2013

still others have argued for an educational experience resembling last year's Day of Dialogue. They feel that it is important that the day be a surprise, as this would be part of the fun. Professor Harms questioned how well the element of surprise could be maintained if Mountain Day always occurred on a Thursday in late April.

Under "Questions from Committee members," Professor Schneider asked how and when it is possible for a faculty member to co-teach a Mellon Tutorial with a staff member, for example a librarian or a member of the Academic Technology Services (ATS) staff. The Dean said that the process has been to include the information about the co-teaching arrangement in the course proposal for the tutorial. This type of arrangement has been successful in the past, he noted. Professor Schneider asked if the Mellon Tutorials are being evaluated. Dean Call said that there is an assessment component to the grant, and that the program is going so well that the Mellon Foundation has funded a second grant (for three years), a year earlier than expected. It was noted that a faculty member can teach the class as an overload and receive an honorarium, or can teach his or her regular load, in which case the department receives the honorarium in order to hire someone to teach a class for the department.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Corrales asked if members of the search committee for the new Dean of the Faculty can be nominated for the position. President Martin said this is entirely possible, and that service on the committee does not preclude an individual from being a candidate for the position. If a member of the committee should become a candidate, he or she would need to withdraw from the committee. That person might or might not be replaced on the committee, depending on the phase of the search at the moment, President Martin commented.

Provost Uvin raised the topic of the process and structures that could be used for revamping Orientation and the role of the Orientation Committee. As background for the conversation, he informed the members that, last May, several changes to Orientation were made in response to the report of the Special Oversight Committee on Sexual Misconduct (SMOC). These changes focused on sexual misconduct and improved facilitator training. The response from students was less than enthusiastic. Provost Uvin noted that Pat O'Hara, Dean of New Students, has expressed the view that Orientation should be reconceived from the ground up. She also said that organizing this massive effort should not be the responsibility of the Dean of New Students, who has many other responsibilities and whose time and expertise can be put to better use.

The Provost informed members that he has created a small working group to consider the goals of Orientation and ways in which this program can be improved. He asked for the Committee's views on how the working group should share its ideas with the Faculty Orientation Committee, which Dean O'Hara chairs, and seek feedback from this committee. He noted that

Amended November 22, 2013

Dean O'Hara has announced plans to step down as the Dean of New Students at the end of this academic year. Since she will not be involved in next year's Orientation planning, Dean O'Hara has offered to give up her role as chair, if that would be preferable. The Faculty Orientation Committee has been reduced in size, the Provost noted, and now consists of seven members of the Amherst community. Dean Call expressed the view that there may not be a need at this time to change the structure of the Faculty Orientation Committee. Typically, the outgoing Dean of New Students would plan the Orientation, passing the baton to the new dean at the end of the academic year. The new dean would run the program that fall.

Continuing the discussion, Dean Call said that he could imagine that the Provost's working group could take on the task of rethinking Orientation, while having Dean O'Hara and the Faculty Orientation Committee available for comment when needed. Professor Harms expressed the view that, while it is important that there be faculty oversight of Orientation to ensure that there is substantive educational content in the program, faculty should not do the work of running Orientation. Dean O'Hara, perhaps, could continue in an oversight role this year, Professor Harms suggested. President Martin noted that Orientation, under the present structure, is apparently based to some degree on the history of participation by different groups and could be more cohesive. The President suggested that staff who have expertise in event planning and student life could plan and run Orientation, inspired by faculty members' vision of the program. In that way, much of the burden on the Dean of New Students could be removed. Professor McGeoch suggested that the Faculty Orientation Committee could go on hiatus for the most part, while the working group reimagines Orientation, perhaps acting as a sounding board for the smaller group's ideas as it proceeds with its charge. Perhaps, one recommendation might be to change the make-up of the Orientation Committee going forward. Professor McGeoch suggested that Professor O'Hara remain as the chair, with the understanding that the committee would not be responsible for planning next year's Orientation. Dean Call said that, perhaps, the Committee of Six could consider the make-up of the Faculty Orientation Committee in the spring. If changes are suggested, a motion could be brought to the Faculty, perhaps at the same time that a motion to revise the membership of several major committees to include the Provost is brought forward. Professor Corrales noted that an ad hoc committee was charged several years ago with considering issues relating to the First-Year Seminar Program, but had not been charged with running that program—a task that had been left to the First-Year Seminar Program. He wondered if this is a model that could be replicated by the bodies that will consider Orientation. Professor Harms noted that, in this case, the group that is reimagining Orientation should be the same group that runs it. President Martin noted that Jim Larimore, Dean of Students, is currently in the process of reimagining the staffing structure of the Dean of Students office and that, while this effort is under way, it would be helpful to have Pat Allen, Director of Conferences and Special Events, assist with the events planning work surrounding Orientation. Professor Kingston commented

Amended November 22, 2013

that, during his time on the Orientation Committee, he had felt that faculty members' time was not being used effectively, as the focus was primarily on organizational details, but that greater faculty involvement in developing an overarching vision for the program would be valuable, as such a vision was lacking.

The Committee next considered [a proposal](#) from the Department of Physics, forwarded by the Committee on Educational Policy, to rename the Department of Physics the Department of Physics and Astronomy. The members noted that, since the proposal would result in the elimination of the Department of Astronomy, the change actually represents a merging of two departments, rather than simply a change of departmental titles. The Dean informed the members that the intention would be that the requirements for the two majors would remain the same. The members noted that an open-rank search is currently under way for an astronomer and discussed the ways in which the merger might affect that individual and future requests for resources in this field, as well as the relationship between Amherst's astronomy major and the Five-College Department of Astronomy. The Dean commented that the Amherst hire would also be part of the Five-College department. Professor Harms said that Amherst would be poorly served by not having the teaching of astronomy appear explicitly in our catalog. She expressed the view that having "astronomy" in the title of a department, rather than just offering the major within a Department of Physics, is essential for attracting young scientists to Amherst. Noting that the Five-College Astronomy Department is central to the major at Amherst, Professor Harms asked what steps had been taken to coordinate this change with the Five-College Program. The Dean noted that a member of the Five-College Astronomy Department is working with the physics department on the search committee for the new astronomer. Professor McGeoch noted that housing the astronomer in the physics department would be beneficial to the new astronomer, particularly if the person is in a tenure-track position. This structure will enable the astronomer to have departmental colleagues at the College, not just within the Five-College Astronomy Department. Professor Harms said that she would like to have seen the rationale for the change in title articulated in the proposal. The Dean said that the argument for the change of name was made more fully in the physics department's FTE request for the astronomy position. Professor Corrales noted that having "astronomy" in the title of the department means that the physics department might feel more compelled to offer courses in astronomy and that the

Amended November 22, 2013

astronomer would not end up only offering courses in physics. Professor Miller suggested that it would be important to discuss, more generally, the process by which new majors are incorporated into existing departmental structures. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Committee of Six Minutes of Monday, November 11, 2013

44

Amended November 22, 2013

The ninth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, November 11, 2013. Present were Professors Corrales, Kingston, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Provost Uvin was absent. 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 November 22, 2013

The tenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, November 18, 2013. Present were Professors Corrales, Kingston, Harms, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Provost Uvin was absent.

The members discussed whether to have a Faculty Meeting on December 3. Dean Call explained that the Strategic Planning Steering Committee feels that it is important for the chairs of the four core committees (The Committee on the Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning, chaired by Professor Bishop; The Committee on the Integration of Curricular and Co-Curricular Learning, chaired by Professor Frank; The Committee on Diversity and Community, chaired by Professor Cobham-Sander; and The Committee on Internationalization of Liberal Arts Education, chaired by Professor Basu) to report briefly to the Faculty at this early stage, and that there be an opportunity to discuss the strategic-planning process going forward. Reviewing the draft Faculty Meeting Agenda, the Committee discussed whether there was sufficient business to warrant a meeting, given that there were no items on the agenda that would require a vote of the Faculty. After further discussion, including consideration of whether to include the proposal to change the name of the Department of Physics to the Department of Physics and Astronomy on the agenda (it was decided that doing so would be premature), the members agreed to honor the wishes of the steering committee that there be a conversation with the Faculty about strategic planning as soon as possible. The Dean informed the members that Professor Frank has requested that Ali Rohde '16, Jayson Paul '16, and Sarah Barr, Director of Academic Engagement Programs for the Center for Community Engagement, who are serving on her committee, be invited to the Faculty Meeting on December 3, if it is decided that there will be one. The Committee agreed that an invitation should be extended to these members of the community. The members then voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the agenda for a December 3 Faculty Meeting to the Faculty. The members decided that the proposal from the physics department should be brought before the Faculty early in the spring, once additional information has been solicited and provided.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Martin noted that a number of media outlets have reported that two Amherst students have filed complaints with the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights, alleging that the College mishandled the students' complaints of sexual assault several years ago and allowed hostile sexual environments, in violation of Title IX. President Martin said that she has not received any notification that such complaints have been filed or that an investigation is under way, though it is entirely possible that she could receive notification in the future. The President commented on the improvements that the College has made in the prior year to the process for addressing

Amended November 22, 2013

incidents of sexual assault and misconduct and answered the Committee's questions about the ramifications of a federal investigation, in the event that one should occur. The remainder of the meeting was spent on personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended January 9, 2014

The eleventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, December 2, 2013. Present were Professors Corrales, Kingston, Harms, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Provost Uvin was absent. 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 January 9, 2014

The twelfth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:00 P.M. on Friday, December 6, 2013. Present were Professors Corrales, Kingston, Harms, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Provost Uvin was absent. The meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended January 9, 2014

The thirteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, December 9, 2013. Present were Professors Corrales, Kingston, Harms, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Provost Uvin was absent.

The Committee, the President, and the Dean discussed a number of disturbing incidents that had occurred over the preceding weekend, which continue to be under investigation. President Martin explained that a menorah on Valentine Quad had been vandalized and a dangerous situation of overcrowding in Crossett Dormitory and in at least one other social dorm, involving Amherst students and those from other campuses, had occurred. Suites were vandalized, and altercations of various kinds had taken place. Amherst College police, with support from the police and fire departments of the town of Amherst, had responded, as had the fire department. There have also been reports of troubling interactions between police officers and students, which are also being investigated. President Martin expressed her deep disappointment and her concern about students' reckless behavior, including intoxication. The members of the Committee also found these incidents, and the behavior of some students, to be deeply troubling. On a positive note, Professor Schneider commented that students had told him that the alternative party to "Crossett Christmas," which had been held in the gym, seemed to be successful. President Martin said that she had also been told that the event had been helpful. The President, the Dean, and the Committee agreed that the College should explore ways of ensuring that there are consequences to students' actions and that students take responsibility for their behavior.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Schneider asked, on behalf of a group of colleagues, about an article that had appeared in the *Boston Globe* on November 17, 2013, about pay packages provided to college presidents after leaving their positions. The piece had referenced a \$1.4 million payment to President Marx made by Amherst in 2011. President Martin explained, as did the article, that most of this amount represents deferred compensation (a standard practice in which a portion of a president's salary is set aside for him or her during the period of the presidency and paid upon the individual's departure from the position). Also included in the compensation was payment for an untaken sabbatic leave. Professor Schneider said that, while he understands that it is important to compensate a leader fairly and that it might be necessary to follow market practices, some faculty feel that the payment made to President Marx is inconsistent with the College's values. He asked that President Martin share this view with the Board of Trustees, and she said that she would be happy to do so. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended February 14, 2014

The fourteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, February 3, 2014. Present were Professors Corrales, Kingston, Harms, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, Provost Uvin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Martin informed the Committee that James Larimore, the College's Dean of Students, has told her of his plans to step down from his position immediately. Dean Larimore will remain at Amherst through the end of the academic year, serving as an advisor to her, the President said. Continuing, President Martin informed the members that Dean Larimore would be sending an announcement of this news to the community later in the day, and that she would then send a communication to faculty, students, and staff about this change in leadership in student affairs, and plans moving forward. President Martin praised Mr. Larimore's contributions during his time as Dean of Students.

Continuing, President Martin discussed the opportunities and serious challenges now facing the College within the area of student life. She noted that last year two outside consultants had been brought to Amherst to review student services, including but not limited to the relationship of the Counseling Center to the Office of the Dean of Students. Concurrently, Gina Maisto Smith had conducted an extensive review of the way sexual assault had been handled on campus. The findings and recommendations of all of these consultants were consistent. President Martin explained that there was a shared sense that the Dean of Students office needed to be reconfigured to become more effective in meeting the needs of Amherst students. Dean Larimore came to a similar conclusion, based on his experience here. President Martin noted that, while Dean Larimore has begun this important work, much remains to be done. She stressed that the needs are pressing, and that challenges on a number of fronts are serious. Among other things, they are creating barriers among students, and to the overall sense of community at the College. She feels strongly that action is needed now. For this reason, President Martin said that a lengthy search and/or short interim staffing would not be viable solutions to establishing new directions in student affairs.

President Martin informed the members that she has asked Suzanne Coffey to assume the role of Chief Student Affairs Officer for a two-year period, leaving her position as Director of Athletics to assume this new assignment. This change will take place immediately. President Martin informed the members that Don Faulstick, Associate Director of Athletics, has agreed to assume the position of Interim Director of Athletics. Dean Call praised Mr. Faulstick's experience and skills as an administrator and expressed the view that he has earned the respect of his colleagues in Athletics. President Martin agreed, noting that she has confidence that Mr. Faulstick will be effective, and that he will continue Ms. Coffey's excellent work. Professor Miller expressed the view that student life would benefit if the leadership programs that Ms. Coffey has put in place in Athletics were extended to the student body as a whole. The President and other members of the Committee agreed.

Continuing with the discussion, President Martin said that Ms. Coffey will be charged with making the organizational, personnel, and management changes that have been recommended by the outside consultants. The members of the Senior Staff, who work collaboratively, will continue to contribute their expertise and experience to aid this work, President Martin said. The strategic-planning process will also continue to focus on addressing issues of student life. President Martin offered her highest praise for Ms. Coffey's abilities as an administrator, commenting on her depth of experience in many areas of student life and noting Ms. Coffey's integrity. In addition to the many contributions that she has made within her department, Ms. Coffey was extremely effective in her role as Title IX Coordinator, over the

Amended February 14, 2014

course of eighteen months, bringing the College into compliance with Title IX. President Martin noted that the policies and procedures that have been put in place with Ms. Coffey's leadership are now a model for other schools.

Professor Harms expressed her admiration for Ms. Coffey and her confidence in her abilities, while posing the question of whether the role that Ms. Coffey has played as Director of Athletics might lead some on campus to call Ms. Coffey's objectivity into question in relation to her ability to evaluate the role of athletics in the social life of the College. Professor Harms suggested that the administration prepare to speak to such concerns, if raised. President Martin said she has had direct discussions with Ms. Coffey about the importance of objectivity and ability to focus on the needs of the student body as a whole. She noted that the impact of athletics teams on student social life was part of the discussion and added that Ms. Coffey has the trust of the Athletics department and the student-athletes, which should help her in implementing changes that come to seem desirable. Professor Corrales asked if the President is envisioning an overhaul in regard to the place of athletics at Amherst. President Martin said that it is her expectation that Ms. Coffey's role will encompass an examination of the role of athletics in the social life at Amherst as part of her broader work. It was noted that none of the strategic planning committees has been charged with the specific task of examining athletics, but its role in social life is part of ongoing conversations in a variety of contexts. Provost Uvin commented that a change related to athletics will be made to Orientation beginning this fall. All first-year athletes will now be required to attend all of the programming.

Continuing the conversation about the new appointment, Professor McGeoch asked if the President expects that the model of having a faculty member serve as the Dean of New Students will continue. President Martin responded that many colleagues and consultants feel that the class dean model may be unsustainable, including Dean Larimore, but that it is important that a faculty member continue to be a part of the academic support offered through the Dean of Students Office. One idea is to have a staff member in the Dean of Students Office who would be responsible for triage, reviewing students' needs and directing them to the appropriate person to help them.

Discussion continued with the President noting that some Amherst faculty members have expressed concern over the leading role being played by the Five Colleges in the Northeast Regional Library Print Management Project, which is being funded by the Mellon Foundation. The focus of the project is to explore how libraries in the Northeast might collaborate to manage their print collections. Some Amherst faculty have indicated concern the Faculty has not been invited to engage sufficiently in the discussion of managing and housing print collections. Neal Abraham, Executive Director of Five Colleges, has responded to this concern by emphasizing that no action will be taken by the collective, or as a result of the work on this project, that would compel any individual library to manage its collections in a particular way. He has explained that collaborative projects will be launched only if particular libraries, after consultation on their campuses, decide to participate in a particular endeavor. Mr. Abraham has noted that, while Five Colleges, Inc. is managing the grant that is funding the exploration of possible models, none of the five campus libraries (or librarians) has made any commitments to participate in any of the models being explored in the Northeast Regional project. Decisions to participate will be left to individual libraries, in consultation with their campus constituencies. Mr. Abraham has indicated that the project will be discussed at meetings of the Five-College deans, librarians, and presidents/chancellor. Dean Call reiterated that this project has not played a role in Amherst's collection policy, and it would not do so without extensive consultation with the Faculty and the Faculty Library Committee, in particular. While some of the Five-College institutions (most

Amended February 14, 2014

prominently UMass and Smith) need a central repository to store materials, Amherst's needs are being met by the current repository and the College is not involved financially in creating a central repository. The Dean indicated that Mr. Abraham and Mr. Geffert, Librarian of the College, plan to respond to the Amherst faculty members who have raised concern over this issue. Professor Schneider noted that, in the past, decisions made at the Five-College level would have had a profound effect on the Amherst library had Amherst faculty not spoken up, so it is a good idea to be informed and vigilant.

Continuing with her announcements, President Martin offered highlights of the winter meetings of the Board of Trustees, which had been held January 24 and 25. She noted that a preliminary view of the budget had been given, and that there had been a presentation about how Amherst manages its endowment, commenting that the Trustees favor a conservative approach to the endowment spend rate. The Trustees had also focused on student life issues, including the topic of off-campus fraternities. The Board continues to consider change in the organization and effectiveness of student affairs to be pressing matters. President Martin said that the Instruction Committee of the Board had had a robust conversation about the concept of the "research college," which had been informed by a discussion with Professor Bishop, chair of the Strategic Planning Committee on the Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning, and Professor Sitze, a member of the committee. President Martin noted that the Trustees had also had pizza with students and had enjoyed their conversations.

The Board had expressed excitement and support for the proposal to establish a humanities center at Amherst, agreeing that the center could be an important resource for faculty and students that would stimulate intellectual exchange on campus. President Martin informed the members that she has decided to move forward with the center, with some revisions to the original proposal that will be made to address concerns that were expressed to her during conversations with faculty last semester. The President noted that some faculty had told her of their fear that the College would be investing in an initiative from which relatively few Amherst faculty would benefit directly, during a time when significant numbers of faculty feel the need for a greater sense of intellectual community across departments. Another concern that had been expressed was that funding for the center's postdoctoral fellows would leave the Dean without sufficient resources to support postdoctoral fellowships, which currently provide much-needed teaching in some departments. Some faculty had also told President Martin that they felt that a theme-based program could prove to be of more of a benefit to the visitors (postdoctoral visitors and senior scholars) who would be affiliated with the center than to regular members of the Faculty. To address these concerns, President Martin said that funds have been added to the budget to insure that the present program of postdoctoral fellowships for humanities departments will be continued. In addition, all postdoctoral humanities center fellows will be jointly appointed between the humanities center and an academic department. There will also be a program of humanities center faculty fellowships for Amherst College faculty members who wish to affiliate themselves with the center. Office space will be available for one or two of these faculty fellows to be housed during their fellowship year in the humanities center. In addition, the central space of the humanities center will be designed to serve as an informal gathering place for Amherst faculty members to encourage broad use of the center as a venue for intellectual exchange. President Martin also noted that some faculty members had expressed concern about the name, "humanities center." The President said that the decision about the name of the center would be left to the Faculty.

Continuing with the conversation about the meetings of the Trustees, Dean Call noted that the Board had expressed support for a set of options that the College will now offer to assist

Amended February 14, 2014

eligible members of Amherst's Faculty and administration with the purchase of a nearby home. The new options will replace a second-mortgage program that has been in place for some time, which was no longer serving the needs of many colleagues, as the Committee had discussed. The new program was informed by a proposal brought to the President by the Faculty Housing Committee, and after consultation with the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR), as well as the Committee of Six. The new set of options went into effect February 1, 2014. Dean Call informed the Committee that the Board had voted to renew the Enhanced Faculty Phased Retirement Option for faculty age sixty-five and over, which had been in effect from 2008 to 2012, pending the anticipated award of a grant from the Mellon Foundation. That grant would provide support for this program.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," the Dean discussed with the members nominees to serve on the Committee on Discipline, and it was agreed that the Dean should invite two colleagues to serve, replacing faculty who are leaving the committee. Dean Call informed the members of a request that he had received from Denise Gagnon, Director of Fellowship Advising, that another faculty member be added as a sixth member of the Student Fellowships Committee, in order to relieve some of the workload of the committee. Dean Call noted that changing the membership of this standing committee on a permanent basis would require a vote of the Faculty, but that the Committee could consider doing so on a trial basis this spring. If the addition of a member is found to be of value, a motion to make the change permanent could be brought before the Faculty for a vote this spring. Dean Call said that Ms. Gagnon has told him that adding another member would enable committee members to divide into two groups of three members (possibly by disciplines or fields of interest), which would allow each of them to read fewer applications and interview and write for fewer applicants. The number of students applying for national fellowships has been steadily increasing, the Dean noted. In the spring, he has been informed, the committee is kept very busy reading and rating Amherst College fellowship applications, a task that must be completed by early-April. By late-February, Ms. Gagnon has already started promoting and advising juniors and alumni about the next cycle of national fellowship competitions with early fall deadlines (the Marshall and Rhodes preliminary applications will be due on August 29 this year). Professor Schneider praised Ms. Gagnon for her excellent work and success in helping Amherst students garner fellowship awards. He endorsed adding another faculty member to the committee and devoting more resources to support and expand Ms. Gagnon's work. Professor Schneider said that he has served on the committee in the past and had found the experience to be interesting and rewarding. It was agreed that a member should be added to the Student Fellowships Committee this spring as a pilot, with the proviso that a permanent change to the membership of the committee would require a vote of the Faculty.

Continuing his remarks, Dean Call noted that he has received a request to invite Justin Smith, the College's new Associate General Counsel, to attend Faculty Meetings as a guest. The members agreed that doing so would be helpful to his work. The members anticipate a broader discussion this spring of the issue of attendance and voting at Faculty Meetings. The Dean then noted possible Faculty Meeting dates for the spring semester. They are February 18, March 4, April 1, April 15, May 6, and the morning of Thursday, May 22.

Discussion returned to the proposal from the Department of Physics, endorsed by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), to merge the Department of Physics and the Department of Astronomy to create a Department of Physics and Astronomy. After first reviewing this proposal in the fall, the Committee had asked for more information about the

Amended February 14, 2014

rationale for the proposal and the anticipated relationship between the Amherst department and the Five-College department. In an effort to offer greater clarity, the physics department provided the members with the FTE request for a position in Astronomy that they had submitted to the CEP (the position was later allocated, and a search is currently under way) and a [letter from Suzan Edwards](#), L. Clarke Seelye Professor of Astronomy at Smith College and Chair of the Five College Department of Astronomy. The letter outlines the current relationship between the Amherst department and the Five-College department, which is envisioned to continue in the same form under the new structure. Professor Harms said that, while she supports the merger, she feels that it is important to share with the Faculty a fulsome proposal, much of the substance of which could be drawn from the FTE request. Included should be an articulation of the department's intention for the Astronomy major going forward. Would the major continue to rely on the Five-College department? Dean Call agreed to ask the department to create such a document that could be provided to the Faculty in advance of the Faculty Meeting in which the proposal would be discussed. The members then voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the following motion to the Faculty, and six in favor and zero opposed on the substance of the motion. (The [final proposal](#) and a [letter of endorsement from the Committee on Educational Policy](#) are provided with these minutes.)

Motion

That the Department of Physics and the Department of Astronomy combine to form the Department of Physics and Astronomy. They will retain their separate majors within the combined department.

The Committee next discussed the [Department of Mathematics proposal](#), which has been [endorsed by the CEP](#), that the Department of Mathematics be authorized to change its name to the Department of Mathematics and Statistics and to establish a major in Statistics in the renamed department. As a matter of context, Professor Corrales wondered about the separation of Mathematics and Computer Science, and the possibility that Statistics might want to be a department unto itself now or in the future. Professor McGeoch explained that Mathematics and Computer Science were combined at a time when the Computer Science curriculum could not yet stand on its own, since it was a small department with three untenured faculty members. The statisticians have a similar composition at present, with only one tenured professor, Professor Horton, and two untenured faculty members, Professors Liao and Wagaman. Professor McGeoch noted that, by the time of the amicable separation of Mathematics and Computer Science in 2008, there was no overlap in requirements for the two majors, the two parts of the department had managed their curricula independently for over a decade, and there was little holding the entities together. Professor McGeoch said that he sees the logic of Statistics and Mathematics being joined, and could also envision the possibility of two separate departments in the future. There is greater overlap in the fields and in the majors than there was between Mathematics and Computer Science, he noted. Professor Harms agreed that both Mathematics and Statistics would benefit under the proposed structure.

Continuing, Professor Corrales wondered whether there might be awkwardness in the tenure review process at the departmental level under the proposed structure, since pure mathematicians would be evaluating the statisticians' scholarly work, which would be far afield from their own. Dean Call said that the mathematicians would be involved in the assessment of statisticians' tenure cases whether or not Statistics is combined with Mathematics, simply

Amended February 14, 2014

because there is only one tenured colleague in Statistics at present, which would necessitate the formation of ad hoc committees that would inevitably include mathematicians. He noted that the mathematicians would be inclined to defer to the outside reviewers and Professor Horton in their assessments of the tenure-track statisticians' cases, because the disciplines are so different. Dean Call noted that the current tenure-track statisticians have been mentored within the Mathematics department for their entire careers at the College. Professor Miller said that she supports the proposal and expressed admiration for the way in which the proposed curriculum has been structured to address overlap in the Mathematics major and the Statistics major. It would be a challenge to double major, as doing so would require seventeen courses.

In response to questions about staffing the major, the Dean noted that, with the impending hiring of a lecturer in statistics who would teach five or six courses per year, it would be possible for the department to offer annually at least fifteen courses in statistics. Professor Harms wondered if mounting a Statistics major would be difficult because of the loss of courses due to sabbaticals. The Dean said that, with supplemental visitors, at times, there would be sufficient staffing to mount needed courses, even when some colleagues were on leave. Dean Call noted that the ability to teach the needed introductory courses, with the addition of the lecturer, will provide a needed relief valve. On principle, the President expressed concern about creating any new majors at the College before the necessary resources, particularly FTEs, are in place. Allocating FTEs to meet the needs of newly created majors and/or departments can result in an approach that can contribute to a narrow, rather than a broader, way of conceiving and considering the curriculum, she said. It is inevitable that new entities that come into being without the necessary resources will want to grow. The Committee suggested making use of Five-College statistics courses and integrating statistics courses outside the Mathematics (and Statistics) department to augment the offerings that might count toward the major. Professor Schneider expressed the hope that the major would remain true to the liberal arts and not be structured as a pre-professional degree. In this vein, Professor Corrales expressed concern that students with weak backgrounds in statistics might be intimidated by the prospect of taking a course in statistics, if they saw an introductory course as a gateway to a major. Dean Call said that introductory statistics ("service") courses will remain accessible to all students, as they are now, and that the greatest demand will be for statistics courses for non-majors. The Committee discussed the growing interest in statistics to inform research and teaching in the social sciences. Dean Call said that he could envision the College hiring a quantitative social scientist, which would enhance offerings in quantitative methods that are in demand across fields.

The members then voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the following motion to the Faculty, and six in favor and zero opposed on the substance of the motion.

Motion

That the Department of Mathematics be authorized to change its name to the Department of Mathematics and Statistics and to establish a major in Statistics in the renamed department.

The Committee next reviewed a draft Faculty Meeting Agenda for a possible meeting of the Faculty on February 18. The members voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward it to the Faculty.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," President Martin was asked about her attendance at a White House summit on January 16 that had been devoted to exploring ways to improve access and success for low-income students. President Martin said that the discussion

Amended February 14, 2014

had been interesting, and that she had been impressed with the commitment of the college and university presidents who had attended to doing more in this realm. She noted that Valerie Jarrett, Senior Advisor to President Obama, had informed the group that finding ways to address the problem of sexual assaults taking place on campuses was a top priority for President Obama and that enforcement would become more rigorous.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended February 28, 2014

The fifteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, February 17, 2014. Present were Professors Corrales (via speaker phone), Kingston, Harms, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, Provost Uvin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Martin shared impressions of a conference at the University of Virginia at which she had been asked to speak the previous week. The intensive two-day gathering had focused on the topic of sexual misconduct on college campuses, which is on the rise nationally, and the increasing attention and vigilance being devoted to this issue. The President explained that she had been among six presidents and more than two hundred student affairs professionals, legal experts, and student leaders from across the country who had come together for a set of informative conversations. Leading experts in education, prevention, and adjudication in the area of sexual misconduct and the care of survivors had participated, offering their knowledge and perspectives on topics ranging from approaches to changing campus culture; institutions' obligations under federal civil-rights law to investigate and resolve reports of sexual misconduct; the impact of greater attention by the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) to these issues; and the role that may be played by President Obama's recently formed White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, which is charged with addressing the issue of sexual assault on college campuses. President Martin commented that Catherine Lhamon '93, the assistant secretary of education who heads the department's OCR, had spoken about her office's stepped-up efforts to ensure that institutions of higher learning abide by federal law in their handling of campus sexual assaults, including investigatory practices and potential penalties for being out of compliance. It was made clear that the stakes are very high, and that possible penalties include the loss of federal funding, President Martin commented. The President noted that national activist groups have petitioned President Obama's task force to agree to demands that would hold colleges and universities more accountable, parts of which would be difficult to meet. President Martin said that she had just been invited to speak with the task force and plans to offer her thoughts about what more can be done to prevent sexual assault and respond to it when it occurs, and the complexities surrounding the issues.

Continuing, President Martin reported that the topics discussed at the conference are relevant and timely for Amherst. She informed the members that, in response to a complaint filed last fall by a former Amherst student, the OCR has opened an inquiry into the College's policies, procedures, and practices under Title IX. As part of that inquiry, the OCR recently requested all documents related to the College's nondiscrimination policies, sexual harassment and sexual assault complaint policies and procedures, and all incidents of sexual harassment and sexual assault reported to the College in the last three years. President Martin praised the work of Lisa Rutherford, Chief Policy Officer and General Counsel, and a team of staff members that she has assembled, who are now engaged in an intensive and challenging process of assembling the documents, which number in the thousands, which are needed to respond to this request. The group has been working sixteen-hour days and has a great deal more to do. President Martin said that it is her hope that the extensive work that the College has done over the past two years to develop and put in place policies and procedures to bring Amherst into compliance with Title IX, and to respond thoroughly, appropriately, and swiftly to incidents of sexual misconduct that have

Amended February 28, 2014

occurred, will be recognized by the OCR as positive, significant steps. The President noted that the leadership of Suzanne Coffey, who had taken on the role of Title IX Officer for eighteen months to spearhead these efforts, had been essential to the College's ability to design and implement new practices and to demonstrate its commitment to addressing the issue of sexual misconduct, including compliance with Title IX.

Professor Harms noted that, in the past, the College has been told that most of the incidents of sexual misconduct that take place on college campuses are "he said/she said" cases that are difficult to prosecute because of the nature of the evidence that is typically available and circumstances that are often a factor. President Martin said that, under Title IX, the College is required to investigate when an incident of sexual misconduct is brought to its attention. She noted that, when undertaken by trained investigators, such an investigation can often reveal a pattern of evidence that will indicate where responsibility lies, even in "he said/she said" cases. President Martin explained that the standard for proving allegations under Title IX is a "preponderance of the evidence," i.e., that the accusation is more likely to be true than not true. A higher standard of proof is used in criminal cases, where guilt must be proven "beyond a reasonable doubt." The standard of "clear and convincing evidence," which is used for some civil and criminal cases, is also a higher level of burden of proof than the one used under Title IX.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call discussed several committee nominations with the members. The Dean next reviewed with the members the faculty committees on which the Dean of Students serves ex officio. They are the following: the College Council, the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid, the Committee on Discipline, and the Committee on Education and Athletics. It was noted that Suzanne Coffey, as Chief Student Affairs Officer, will sit on these committees, for the time being.

Conversation turned to the change in leadership in the Dean of Students office and the possibilities for reimagining and restructuring this area of the College, as well as the urgency of doing so. Professor Kingston asked President Martin why she had chosen to create the title/position of Chief Student Affairs Officer, rather than retaining the title of Dean of Students. The President responded that the new position will be largely administrative and managerial, and it will focus on examining, redefining, and reorganizing the structure and operations of the Dean of Students Office. The new title reflects the responsibilities of the job. Ms. Coffey has the administrative experience, ability, and fortitude to bring much-needed changes to the area of student affairs, at a time of pressing need, President Martin added. The serious and urgent nature of these needs, and concern for the well-being of Amherst students, prompted President Martin's decision to appoint Ms. Coffey to this new role immediately after Dean of Students Jim Larimore decided to step down from his position, she said. The President said that some students have suggested to her that, with the establishment of the Chief of Student Affairs position, it would be desirable to redefine the role of the Dean of Students so that it focuses most prominently on issues of academic and personal support for students, and to move quickly to hire a new dean. President Martin said that she is open to the possibility of filling this position soon, which could complement and support the work of the Chief Student Affairs Officer, in her view.

Continuing with the discussion, Professor Harms asked the President if she anticipates that the Chief Student Affairs Officer position will be permanent, or if it represents an interim

Amended February 28, 2014

structure for the next two years. President Martin said that it is too early to know what the most viable structure for student affairs at Amherst should be. The President, the Dean, and the members discussed the potential challenges of finding outstanding student affairs professionals who would want to come to Amherst to work in student affairs, given recent circumstances. Some members agreed that, if a search is launched for a new iteration of the Dean of Students position, it will be important to narrow the focus of the job and to define and convey the responsibilities clearly. President Martin noted that the search firm of Isaacson, Miller has indicated a willingness to assist with a search for a Dean of Students at no cost. Professor Corrales suggested that the process of reimagining the Dean of Students position, and student affairs more broadly, would benefit from consultation with the College Council and/or some other body. President Martin agreed and informed the members that she would be meeting with the College Council on Wednesday for this purpose. She noted that the College has engaged a higher education consulting firm, Keeling and Associates, to offer advice on ways to restructure the Dean of Students Office and best practices, and that the firm has been very helpful. Richard Keeling, who heads the group, has co-authored (with Dr. Richard Hersh) *We're Losing Our Minds: Rethinking American Higher Education* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), which the President found to be an interesting book. President Martin noted that Dr. Keeling supports the idea of having a more narrowly defined Dean of Students position, in addition to the Chief Student Affairs position. He, like other consultants engaged by the College to assess student affairs at Amherst, has characterized the student affairs area at Amherst as “antiquated and underperforming.”

Dean Call shared with the members a concern brought to his attention by an Amherst student, who is troubled by the ways in which some faculty members word messages that inform students about whether classes will be held when the College is closed because of snowstorms. Some faculty convey to students messages to the effect of the following: “you should be able to handle the snow” or “as a member of a residential community, it’s not an undue burden to expect attendance in class today,” the student noted. The student commented that Amherst has a significant population of physically disabled students, some of whom openly identify and present themselves as such, and some of whom do not. The student expressed the view that some of the emails that have been sent by faculty have alienated these students, for whom trekking through the snow is often an undue burden or even impossibility. While noting that the student raises important points and that the Faculty should be made aware of these concerns through the Committee of Six minutes and in the Dean’s remarks at the next Faculty Meeting, the Committee agreed that faculty members, in general, are sensitive to these issues and would make accommodations for any student who informs them that he or she cannot safely travel to class during bad weather. Faculty could be encouraged to send messages that are succinct and informational, such as “class will be held today.” Professor McGeoch suggested that faculty let students know that the Campus Police can assist students who need help getting to class during bad weather. Professor Schneider noted, more generally, that accessibility is a problem in regard to many campus buildings independent of weather.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Schneider, referencing concerns raised previously about aspects of the athletic culture at Amherst, said that he hopes it will be

Amended February 28, 2014

possible to have productive and nuanced conversations about athletics, without making students or members of the athletics department feel under attack. Dean Call said that he believes that such conversations would be welcome. President Martin agreed with the Committee's view that conversations about student life issues, including but not limited to those that relate to athletics, should be folded into the strategic planning process. The President commented that, regrettably, some criticisms of athletics and athletes made last year in the context of discussions about factors contributing to sexual misconduct were demoralizing to some Amherst students. It will be important to discuss the place of athletics at the College as part of the broader topic of student life at Amherst. The degree to which certain kinds of behavior practiced by student-athletes may be contributing to the fragmentation of the student body is one issue that needs to be discussed, she said, while noting that this is a concern that applies to some other clubs and student organizations, as noted in the report of the Special Oversight Committee on Sexual Misconduct (SMOC). Professor Kingston informed the Committee that some student-athletes have told him that they feel trapped in a culture that imposes many constraints, including on their ability to form social connections outside the community of student-athletes. It can be difficult for students who have these feelings to be candid about them with other athletes and with coaches.

The Committee agreed that having discussions about stereotyping and other biased attitudes toward athletes would be beneficial. Provost Uvin said that he will work to create opportunities for such conversations within the strategic planning process. Professor Schneider suggested that it would be helpful to discuss how to create a climate of community on campus. Provost Uvin commented that this issue is on the agendas of a number of the strategic planning committees. Professor Schneider noted that he has heard from students that having First-Year Seminar groups connect with one another through activities beyond the classroom has been one successful way of building social bonds based on shared intellectual experience. President Martin, commenting that it is easy to become stuck rhetorically when discussing this issue, wondered whether the word "community" conveys fully the complexities of the topic at hand. She noted that others who have considered this issue have suggested that institutions recognize the value of these smaller networks and nodes around which students gravitate, which play a valuable role for them in college, and should work to find ways to ensure that the networks frequently intersect and are dynamic enough to shift over time. Professor Schneider commented that the student dinners and festivals that President Martin has launched have been positive first-steps in giving students a sense of belonging. Professor Harms expressed the view that it would be helpful to convey to students that they share common ownership in Amherst, no matter what their affiliation group or background, by virtue of the fact that they take four classes each semester and are engaged in that intellectual endeavor. Professor Corrales commented that it will be essential that the role of athletics be examined as part of the rethinking of student life and in discussions about community. He suggested that creating a big brother/big sister program, in which athletes pair up with non-athletes, might help students form affiliations beyond their established social circles. Dean Call noted that some groups on campus have a program of this sort within their groups, and that the idea of extending such a program to cut across groups is intriguing. Provost Uvin commented that a number of student groups have been developing mentoring initiatives. The Committee next turned briefly to a personnel matter.

Amended February 28, 2014

Discussion turned to the current procedures that govern attendance and voting at faculty meetings and matters related to faculty governance more broadly. Professor Schneider said that, before considering this issue, it would be important to have a shared sense of the purpose and goals of Faculty Meetings and the philosophy that guides them. Dean Call noted that one approach to considering this issue could be to update the position titles in the *Faculty Handbook* language about [attendance and voting at Faculty Meetings](#), as they are out of date, then review the current structure and practice to judge whether it is effective. The Committee reviewed detailed information about current rules and practices in regard to which members of the College community are entitled to attend faculty meetings, who may vote, and who receives minutes of the meetings of the Faculty and the Committee of Six. Professor Harms noted that there seems to be little rationale and logic guiding the current system. She expressed the view that, since there is a great deal of transition occurring in the administration, it appears to be a particularly timely moment to consider making changes about who should be attending and voting at Faculty meetings. The other members agreed. The Committee discussed advantages and disadvantages of having so many staff members attend Faculty Meetings, including whether the purpose of doing so is largely to keep staff informed. For the most part, the Committee agreed that the purpose of attending the meetings should be largely to contribute to decision-making, through participation in debate and voting. This view would argue for limiting the number of staff who attend to, perhaps, administrators who report directly to the President or the Dean of the Faculty. The Committee agreed that most staff members could be kept informed through the minutes of the Faculty Meetings, rather than through attendance. Professor Miller commented that, at present, if staff members are present to inform the Faculty about issues about which the staff member has expertise, it often seems difficult for the person to do so effectively “on the spot.” A better approach might be to ask staff members to research particular topics as they arise and to invite staff colleagues to attend particular Faculty Meetings to report back on their answers to questions that have been posed and/or requests for information. Provost Uvin expressed the view that many staff members may find it helpful to listen to debate at Faculty Meetings and may feel that it is empowering to attend the meetings. Deciding to exclude those who may now attend is a sensitive matter, he noted. The Committee agreed. Some members expressed the view that the time of many staff members is being wasted at Faculty Meetings, and that staff may feel obligated to attend if they are eligible to do so.

Continuing the conversation, President Martin suggested identifying the problem that the Committee is trying to solve. Are there too many people attending the meetings? Are too few faculty members participating in governance or in discussions at Faculty Meetings? Is there a widespread idea that the meetings need to change? Professor Schneider expressed the view that the College would be better served if more faculty were more involved in Faculty Meetings. Most members agreed that having so many people at the meetings contributes to the feeling that the room is overcrowded, and it was noted that it can be difficult, at times, to find a seat. At a more substantive but related level, the Committee felt that conversations feel diluted with so many staff members present, and that the meetings might be more cohesive moments for the Faculty if the majority of those attending are faculty members. It was noted that a major purpose of Faculty Meetings is debate and decision-making about issues that are within the purview of the Faculty and/or discussion about questions about which the Faculty may be asked to play an

Amended February 28, 2014

advisory role. President Martin observed that it seems paradoxical at times, as a matter of governance, that there seems to be a culture at Amherst in which it is expected that Faculty Meetings be held infrequently; that meetings should not be held unless there is business that requires a vote; that meetings should not be held only for the purpose of providing information or having discussions; and that there seems to be no tradition of having executive sessions of Faculty Meetings with faculty members only, which could be a way for the administration to discuss sensitive matters that should not be shared more broadly within the community.

President Martin expressed some concern about the role of committees when it comes to consultation. While recognizing that the Committee of Six, for example, is not a representative body, there are circumstances and issues that require the Committee's counsel and times when it is not feasible to consult with the entire Faculty about an administrative decision. Professor Miller commented that, from the faculty side, the committees can also prove frustrating. Members devote a great deal of time and effort to the work of the committees, with little action taken as a result. The members agreed that it would be helpful to have a discussion with the Faculty about how the Faculty participates in decision-making and what the Faculty's time should be used for in Faculty Meetings. Professors Kingston and Schneider suggested that, given the large numbers of relatively new faculty, it would be informative to have a presentation on the structure of faculty governance, including the purpose of Faculty Meetings and the role of the major faculty committees. Returning to the topic of committees, Professor McGeoch commented that faculty committees might benefit from having fewer administrators present on a regular basis. As a former chair of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), he expressed the view that it would be helpful to the CEP not to have the Dean present at every meeting, as the presence of the Dean, at times, can constrain conversation. He would favor a structure in which the Dean would be invited to attend CEP meetings, as needed, with the idea that he or she could be a regular guest. The Committee discussed the possible role of the Provost on major committees, including the idea that it might be appropriate to have the Provost serve on the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) and did not come to a conclusion about the Dean continuing to attend CPR meetings. Dean Call said that the Dean's oversight role in regard to the academic budget should be considered when thinking about that question.

In conclusion, the members discussed possibilities for different formats for Faculty Meetings, with and without staff present, to discuss important issues. Open meetings for faculty do not draw large attendance, it was noted, and discussions draw more faculty if they are conducted as part of Faculty Meetings. It was agreed that there seems to be nothing precluding having executive sessions of Faculty Meetings for faculty only, as was done on one occasion to discuss Title IX issues with Gina Smith, the attorney who was engaged to work with the College on these matters. Professor Harms suggested that the Committee develop a proposal about attendance and voting at Faculty Meetings and bring it to the Faculty for discussion. In order to have a candid discussion, it would be best if staff did not attend the meeting in which a case might be made that Faculty Meetings would, perhaps, be more efficient and effective if fewer staff members or a more rational and equitable slate of staff members attended. The members agreed to take a comprehensive look at the issue of attendance and voting at Faculty Meetings, rather than adopting an approach to the question that would involve "tinkering around the edges." Professors Harms and McGeoch agreed to develop a proposal for change that would be

Amended February 28, 2014

based on a rationale and to bring this proposal to the Committee of Six for discussion first. The Committee could then decide whether to bring a proposal to the Faculty. Professor Harms requested that the Committee be provided with an organizational chart of the College to inform the proposal, and the Dean agreed to provide these charts. If a decision is made that Faculty Meetings should be attended largely by faculty, the members felt that it might be a good idea to have a meeting open to the entire community at the beginning and end of each academic year, perhaps, and to have other “College meetings,” when there are issues that require community discussion.

In the brief time remaining, the members began a discussion of mentoring tenure-track faculty members. Professor Schneider asked Dean Call why this issue is being raised now. The Dean said that issues surrounding mentoring emerge periodically, and that, with so many new tenure-track colleagues and significant ongoing faculty hiring, it seems like a good moment for discussion of this topic. Professor Harms wondered if the results of the COACHE (The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education) survey of faculty job satisfaction might be prompting the conversation. Professor Harms asked the Dean if the Committee could be provided with the full report of the survey results, as having this document could be helpful to the mentoring discussion. The Dean agreed to provide the members with this document, which does include some feedback about the College’s mentoring practices.

Continuing, the members discussed the mentoring programs put in place by some Amherst departments, varying departmental approaches to annual conversations with tenure-track colleagues, and whether there should be some standardization in the teaching evaluations used by departments—for example, the question of whether there should be some core questions that are included on all teaching evaluations. Professor Schneider was not in favor of standardizing or formalizing mentoring programs, arguing that individual departments should decide for themselves how they wish to mentor their tenure-track faculty. Professor Harms said that she is leery of departmental mentoring programs in which tenure-track faculty are mentored by the same colleagues who will ultimately evaluate them for tenure. She feels that there are approaches such as team-teaching that can be very helpful mentoring tools, but don’t necessarily have to be labeled as such. It was agreed that it could be useful to departments and tenure-line faculty for the Dean’s office to share information more broadly about the mentoring programs that have been developed by departments, while not imposing them. Professor Miller commented on the challenges presented by the frequent rotation of department chairs, in regard to ensuring consistency across tenure-track colleagues in departmental mentorship practices. She suggested that there might be structural improvements that could be made that would be helpful to ensuring continuity in this regard. Dean Call informed the members that he has helped to set up mentoring relationships for tenure-line faculty outside their departments and also outside the College. President Martin commented that, in her experience, mentoring works well under a team approach and with mentors outside as well as inside the department of the individual. Professor Kingston expressed the view that departments could benefit from learning more about the mentoring programs developed by other departments. He noted that candidates for positions in his department often ask about College/departmental mentoring practices. President Martin noted that mentoring has taken on increasing importance across fields, and that many institutions

Amended February 28, 2014

have highly developed mentoring programs, about which job candidates are often aware and value.

In regard to teaching evaluations, it was noted that the same evaluation form should be used for all tenure-track colleagues within the same department. While this is supposed to be the case, it is not a consistent practice. Professor Harms noted that the practice in her department is that all members of the department, both tenured and untenured, use the same teaching evaluation forms. Professor McGeoch suggested that it would also be helpful to the Committee of Six if departmental teaching evaluation forms were consistent from year to year. The Committee noted that some departments ask untenured faculty members to develop their own evaluation forms. Professor Harms commented that the feedback that tenure-track colleagues might want to gain from teaching evaluations is not necessarily the same feedback that is useful to the Committee of Six in its reviews of personnel cases. For example, a colleague might want to learn what students feel would be helpful to improve a particular course. Faculty members should, perhaps, be encouraged to use mid-semester evaluations for this purpose, Professor McGeoch noted. Continuing, Professor Harms noted that the Committee of Six is less interested in how successful a particular class is than how successful a colleague's teaching trajectory is in an overall sense. The members agreed to continue the mentoring discussion at a future meeting, after reviewing the results of the COACHE survey.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended February 28, 2014

The sixteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, February 24, 2014. Present were Professors Corrales (via Skype), Kingston, Harms, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, Provost Uvin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Martin informed the members that she would be leaving the next day to travel to Washington and that she would be meeting on Wednesday with the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, which is charged with addressing the issue of sexual assault on college campuses. She will report back about the meeting upon her return, she said. She was told that she was one of three presidents to be asked to meet with the task force.

Continuing with her remarks, President Martin reminded members of the [recommendation of the Special Oversight Committee on Sexual Misconduct \(SMOC\)](#), which asked that "The Board of Trustees should comprehensively visit the issue of whether underground fraternities should be permitted to influence the social life of Amherst students." The Board was asked to clarify the status of underground fraternities. She informed the members that the Board of Trustees is continuing to discuss the issue of underground "secret" fraternities at Amherst, and that she expects that there will be more conversation about this topic on campus during the coming months, as the Board approaches a decision. The issue under consideration is whether to ban all Amherst students from membership in fraternities. President Martin noted that the Board had voted to ban fraternities at the College in 1984, with the intention that they would no longer be a part of the Amherst experience, but fraternities have continued to exist "underground," off campus, and still have a significant impact on student life at the College, including on-campus social events. Some members wondered why students have been able to be members of fraternities with impunity, and if other schools that have banned fraternities have also explicitly banned membership in them. President Martin said that Williams banned fraternities and membership and imposes sanctions on any students who are found to be members of fraternities. The Trustees are considering whether to take a similar approach at Amherst. Professor Harms asked if students who came to Amherst with the expectation that they would be able to be a member of an off-campus fraternity would be grandfathered, if membership in fraternities is not allowed. President Martin said that this issue would be considered, but that she imagines that an argument could be made that Amherst banned fraternities decades ago and that, though individuals have found ways around the ban, the spirit of the vote was that membership in fraternities would end at the time of the vote. Professor Schneider stressed the need to think through such practical and logistical questions before any final decision about banning membership in fraternities is made. Professor Corrales questioned why the Trustees and others are devoting so much attention to the issue of fraternities when it appears that membership in them is very small. President Martin said the number of Amherst students who are members of fraternities is not known, but that the number is probably not large. The Board was asked explicitly to consider the issue. The problem is that, under present circumstances, the College is responsible for the students who are members of fraternities and has been made aware of their role in the organization of activities that affect other students, on and off campus, but Amherst does not have the authority it has with other student groups to educate, set expectations, or respond to problems that arise. This state of affairs leaves the

Amended February 28, 2014

College quite vulnerable. Dean Call noted that, while the number of fraternity members may be relatively small at Amherst, fraternities have a significant impact on student social life. President Martin noted that this is a Board issue, and that the Trustees have asked for consultation to take place with the College Council and other bodies on campus.

The members next discussed an [email titled "Orientation Committee-Faculty Governance"](#) that Professor Reyes, a member of the Orientation Committee, had sent to the other members of the Orientation Committee, copying the members of the Committee of Six, to convey concerns about governance in regard to the planning and implementation of Orientation. In her note, Professor Reyes had expressed the view that Provost Uvin has been directing the meetings of the Orientation Committee, a practice that she has concluded is inconsistent with [the membership and charge of the committee, as noted in the Faculty Handbook](#). Professor Reyes had noted that, by charging Provost Uvin with leading a small working group that has focused on reimagining Orientation, President Martin has violated faculty governance by "transfer[ing] authority over Orientation to this ad-hoc committee [working group]." In her email, Professor Reyes concludes by noting the following: "It is thus necessary that the Orientation Committee discontinue the practice of allowing a nonmember to direct our work. To be in compliance with College policy, the Orientation Committee must return to the functioning and composition envisioned for it by the Faculty, from whom we have received our charge and from whom our authority derives. Until such time as the Faculty chooses to change the Committee's charge or alter its composition, we must act in accordance with written policy."

Dean Call commented that the Orientation Committee has, in his experience, served as an organizational committee that has played an advisory role when it comes to implementing Orientation. Implementation has been left to the Dean of New Students and staff in the Dean of Students Office. Provost Uvin noted that he had been sharing all of the Orientation working group's recommendations with the Orientation Committee. In addition, the working group has garnered feedback from past Deans of New Students, past Deans of the Faculty, and other constituencies. The Orientation Committee, he noted, had offered helpful feedback, all of which he had agreed should be implemented, though one issue has arisen. Provost Uvin's group has suggested that first-year student-athletes be required to attend all Orientation events, with the exception that the first-year athletes be permitted to train during a two-and-a-half-day period of Orientation when other students participate in trips and related programming (First-Year Outdoor Orientation Trips, a.k.a., FOOT, Community Engagement Orientation Trip, a.k.a., CEOT, etc.). It was noted that this was a change from previous years when first-year athletes were required to attend only the events designated as mandatory for all first-year students. Professor Reyes and some of the student members of the committee hold the view that student-athletes should participate in the entire Orientation program and should not be excused from any programming, including the two-and-a-half days during which various programs take place. Taking this approach would mean that first-year athletes would be unable to prepare with teammates for the upcoming season for nine days. Professor Miller wondered if it was unfair to deprive incoming student-athletes of the opportunity for pre-season preparation with their teams, which is standard practice at other schools, with whom Amherst teams compete. The Committee agreed that it might be preferable to have more conversation before making such a radical departure from past

Amended February 28, 2014

practice. Dean Call noted that the last major changes to Orientation, which resulted in having a common start date for all students (prior to the change, athletes and members of affinity groups had participated in pre-Orientation activities), had taken place in 1997 and had taken three years to be fully implemented.

The members next reviewed the Committee's minutes (distributed by the Dean) of the members' previous conversation about this issue, which had taken place in November. As noted in the minutes of November 4, 2013, Provost Uvin had, at that meeting, raised the topic of the process and structures that could be used for revamping Orientation and the role of the Orientation Committee. As background for that conversation, he had informed the members that, last May, several changes to Orientation had been made in response to the report of the SMOC. These changes focused on sexual misconduct and improved facilitator training. In the November 4 Committee of Six discussion, Provost Uvin had noted that Pat O'Hara, Dean of New Students, has expressed the view that Orientation should be reconceived from the ground up and has suggested that organizing this massive effort should not be the responsibility of the Dean of New Students, who has many other responsibilities and whose time and expertise can be put to better use.

Continuing with the review of the substance of the previous Committee of Six conversation about Orientation, it was noted that the Committee had been informed that Dean O'Hara would be stepping down from her role as the Dean of New Students at the end of this academic year. The Dean noted that the outgoing Dean of New Students plans the Orientation, turning over this task to the new dean at the end of the academic year. The new dean then runs the program that fall.

At the November meeting, the Provost had informed the Committee of Six that he had created a small working group to consider the goals of Orientation and ways in which this program can be improved. He had asked for the Committee's views on how the working group should share its ideas with the Faculty Orientation Committee, which Dean O'Hara chairs, and seek feedback from that committee. Dean Call had said that he could imagine that the Provost's working group could take on the task of rethinking Orientation, while having Dean O'Hara and the Faculty Orientation Committee available for comment and advice. Professor Harms had commented at the time, and reiterated this view during the current conversation, that, while it is important that there be faculty oversight of Orientation to ensure that there is substantive educational content in the program, faculty should not do the work of running Orientation. Dean O'Hara, perhaps, could continue in an oversight role this year, Professor Harms had suggested. President Martin noted that she had commented in November, and continues to believe, that staff who have expertise in event planning and student life could plan and run Orientation, inspired by faculty members' vision of the program. In that way, much of the burden on the Dean of New Students could be removed. She noted that it is critical that the College design and implement a successful Orientation program, and that doing so is yet another goal that must be met within the area of student life.

Continuing its review of the November conversation, it was noted that Professor McGeoch had suggested that the Faculty Orientation Committee could go on hiatus for the most part, while the working group reimagines Orientation, perhaps acting as a sounding board for the smaller group's ideas as it proceeds with its charge. Perhaps, one recommendation might be to

Amended February 28, 2014

change the make-up of the Orientation Committee going forward, the Committee had agreed, with the idea of discussing this concept and possibly bringing a motion to the Faculty in the spring. Professor McGeoch had suggested that Professor O'Hara remain as the chair, with the understanding that the committee would not be responsible for planning and implementing next year's Orientation. Professor Kingston had commented in November, and reiterated during the current conversation, that faculty time would be better spent on developing an overarching vision for the orientation program, rather than planning the organizational details.

The members concurred that the review of their previous conversation had been most helpful. The members agreed strongly that, given the present circumstances in which we do not yet have a Dean of New Students for next year, and given the need to reimagine Orientation more generally as one part of a larger set of pressing changes within student life, it is important that the Provost continue his work on Orientation. The Orientation working group, having served its function in generating ideas and recommendations that were then shared with the Orientation Committee, no longer exists, it was noted. The Committee unanimously decided to endorse its previous decision, asking that the Provost plan and implement Orientation in 2014, and that he continue to meet with the orientation committee to avail himself of its wisdom and guidance. The members asked the Dean to communicate the Committee's decision to the members of the Orientation Committee, and he agreed to do so.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," the Committee, as a response to some issues raised at the February 18 Faculty Meeting, discussed briefly views about the role of the Committee of Six. The faculty members of the Committee agreed that they do not see the Committee as representatives of the Faculty and commented that they prefer playing a proactive, rather than a reactive role, in regard to their relationship with the administration. They have not found their relationship to the administration to be problematic, they agreed. The members also noted that they feel that there is nothing preventing the President from having executive sessions of Faculty Meetings, with only faculty members present. Professor Schneider shared with the President concerns that have been conveyed to him by two colleagues, about the appointment of Ms. Coffey to the position of Chief Student Affairs Officer. President Martin said that she has heard and understands the concerns that have been raised. She expressed her confidence in Ms. Coffey's ability to carry out her responsibilities and noted that Ms. Coffey has, in her brief time in her new role, already had a positive impact. The President reiterated the importance of developing and implementing improved systems in the area of student affairs. Professor Schneider asked if the Dean of Students office is currently understaffed. President Martin noted that, moving forward, it will be important to have student affairs colleagues with the expertise that is needed for the very important jobs that they do and the necessary resources and systems in place for them to be successful.

Continuing the discussion, Professor Schneider noted that some faculty have conveyed to him that they feel that there has been a weakening of the connection between the intellectual/academic life of the College and student life. Professor Miller agreed and suggested that President Martin's articulation of trade-offs within institutions (at the last Faculty Meeting) might be contributing to this anxiety, given the current and intense focus on student affairs functions. Professor Harms suggested that a possible interim solution to this concern, which could be implemented very quickly, might be to appoint a faculty member to serve as the Dean

Amended February 28, 2014

of Students for a period of time. Such a colleague would understand the academic enterprise and the Amherst culture and serve as an academic presence in the Dean of Students office, and as a liaison to the Faculty. A tenured faculty member would also be in the unique position of being able to speak truth to power, with no fear of repercussions, Professor Harms explained. Professors Miller and McGeoch expressed some skepticism about asking a faculty member to serve as Dean of Students because of the magnitude of the job and its growing complexities in regard to compliance and other issues. President Martin said that she would consider the proposal to have a faculty member serve as Dean of Students, in its newly conceived role of the position, while noting that it takes special experience and expertise and training beyond academic advising to support students who may be experiencing emotional, medical, and academic challenges. President Martin reiterated her view that addressing issues in student affairs will allow more, rather than less attention to be focused college-wide on research and education. Professor Harms said that she continues to be concerned about finding a qualified student life professional who would be willing to come to Amherst at this time. In her view, it would be possible to train a faculty member to serve as the Dean of Students and that doing so could be an immediate solution to the need to fill this position as soon as possible.

Professor Corrales expressed the view that it is necessary to build more bridges between the Dean of Students Office and the academic side of the College. He suggested creating a faculty advisory committee to the Chief Student Affairs Officer and the Dean of Students for this purpose that could function in much the same way the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCFA) does with the Office of Admission. Dean Call said that he sees potential in this idea. Provost Uvin wondered if it might be helpful to draw two class deans from the Faculty and to give each of them a reduced course load of one course a year. These deans could share responsibility for academic advising within the office and bring an academic perspective to their work with staff colleagues in the office. President Martin thanked the members for their thoughts and said that she would consider their suggestions. Professor Schneider asked if it might be possible to provide the Faculty with copies, redacted if necessary, of the outside consultants' reports on the dean of students office. President Martin said that she will review consultants' reports about the Dean of Students office and will see if portions of these documents that do not include confidential information can be shared with the Faculty. It might also be helpful to have Richard Keeling of Keeling and Associates, meet with the Faculty, to discuss his assessment of the student affairs at Amherst. The members said that they would welcome having a conversation with Dr. Keeling.

The members next reviewed a draft agenda for a possible March 4 Faculty Meeting and agreed that it would be helpful to have written materials to prompt the discussion at the meeting that would be led by Professors Frank and Cobham-Sander, as chairs of the Strategic Planning Committee on the Integration of Curricular and Co-Curricular Learning and the Committee on Diversity and Community, respectively. The Dean agreed to request these materials on the Committee's behalf. The members then voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the agenda to the Faculty. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

Amended February 28, 2014

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended March 14, 2014

The seventeenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, March 3, 2014. Present were Professors Kingston, Harms, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, Provost Uvin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Corrales was absent.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Martin offered a report about her meeting with the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, which had been held on February 26, 2014. Vice President Joe Biden had led the meeting, which had also been attended by Bea Hanson, Principal Deputy Director of the Department of Justice Office on Violence Against Women; Catherine Lhamon '93, Assistant Secretary of Education, Office of Civil Rights (OCR); Kathleen Sibelius, Secretary of Health and Human Services; Tina Tchen, Executive Director of the White House Council on Women and Girls, and six other college and university presidents. President Martin reported that, at the meeting, emphasis had been placed on the Obama administration's expectations that colleges and universities work assiduously to prevent sexual assault on their campuses and provide support for survivors. To help guide the government's development of new requirements for institutions of higher learning surrounding sexual misconduct, the college and university presidents stressed the need for clear standards that offer sufficient flexibility to be pragmatic and effective. President Martin noted that Ms. Lhamon has invited her, along with two other presidents, to meet with her in the coming weeks.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call noted that, as the Committee had requested, he had reached out to Professor O'Hara, in her role as Dean of New Students and chair of the Orientation Committee, and to Professor Reyes, who had raised questions about the Provost's role in the planning of Orientation and Provost Uvin's participation at meetings of the Orientation Committee. Dean Call informed the members that he had had a helpful conversation with Dean O'Hara. In regard to considering the make-up of the Orientation Committee, Dean O'Hara had suggested that, if a proposal is made to change the membership of the committee, consideration be given to adding Amanda Vann, the College's new Sexual Respect Educator, to the committee. The Dean said that Professor Reyes had chosen not to meet with him and had requested a written summary of the Committee's conversation about this issue. In response, Dean Call said that he had sent Professor Reyes and the other members of the Orientation Committee the Committee of Six minutes of this discussion over the weekend. The Dean informed the members that Professor Reyes had requested that the members of the Orientation Committee who do not otherwise attend Faculty Meetings be invited to the March 4 Faculty Meeting, but had later decided to withdraw that request for this meeting, as Dean O'Hara would be unable to attend. Professor Reyes said that she might ask that the invitation be extended for a future meeting. Professor Reyes had asked the Dean to inform the Committee of Six of these plans and to ask that the members "understand that, in the meantime, it seems likely that the Orientation Committee will continue to operate as outlined in writing."

Noting the upcoming transition to a new Dean of New Students and the challenges that the College is facing in the area of students affairs, as well as past practices regarding the role of

Amended March 14, 2014

administrators and staff in planning and running Orientation, the Committee reaffirmed its recommendations regarding planning mechanisms for this year's Orientation. The members agreed that, in a good faith effort to organize and implement the best Orientation possible under challenging circumstances this year, having Provost Uvin work with the Orientation Committee and other colleagues to reimagine and run Orientation seems to be the best plan. It was noted that the Orientation Committee and Provost Uvin are now close to having the program set for the next Orientation. While there was a need to move expeditiously this year to plan Orientation, going forward, the Committee agreed it would be helpful for everyone to gain greater clarity about the process for planning Orientation and the role of the Orientation Committee and others involved with planning and implementing Orientation. Among the issues that the Committee of Six and the Faculty may wish to consider is the make-up of the Committee, as noted earlier. Provost Uvin informed the members that he would be leaving the Committee of Six meeting early in order to attend a meeting of the Orientation Committee.

Conversation turned to the Faculty Meeting that would be held the next day. Dean Call said that he had received requests from Professor Frank, Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee on the Integration of Curricular and Co-Curricular Learning, and Professor Cobham-Sander, Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee on Diversity and Community, that the members of their committees who do not otherwise attend Faculty Meetings be invited to attend the March 4 meeting, during which the chairs would offer reports. The members agreed that these colleagues should be invited to attend.

Professor Harms next posed some questions that had been prompted by her review of the proposals for new courses on which the Faculty would be asked to vote at the March 4 Faculty Meeting. She asked to be brought up to date about the oversight role being played by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) in regard to the following issues. Professor Harms inquired, as a matter of the allocation of College resources, whether questions are raised about proposals to co-teach very small, limited-enrollment courses. Another question revolved around proposals to teach seminars that would meet for fewer than 150 minutes a week. Professor Harms also asked whether the CEP encourages departments to discuss course proposals that might be duplicative within their curricula. The Dean responded that the CEP routinely monitors these and other questions that arise and brings matters to the attention of individual faculty and departments. In the case of the first question, the Dean said that it can be important to consider the balance of courses that the faculty involved might be teaching, and that colleagues often provide relevant information when a proposal raises questions by the CEP. For example, some faculty might co-teach such a course as an overload, or might also be teaching a course with a very large enrollment in the same semester. The Dean noted that the CEP contacts all faculty members who propose to teach seminars that would meet for fewer than 150 minutes a week, suggesting that the seminar meet for at least 150 minutes. Most faculty consent to this request, or indicate that the course includes required time commitments in excess of class time. In terms

Amended March 14, 2014

of proposals that may fit within and/or support the curricula of more than one department or may seem to duplicate courses in multiple departments, the CEP may bring this to the attention of departments and ask if they would consider cross-listing a course. That decision is then left up to the departments. The Committee agreed that it is appropriate and helpful that the CEP is being vigilant about these and other issues. Professor Harms thanked the Dean for this helpful information. Professor Schneider asked if the CEP feels that it needs the buttressing and support of the Committee of Six when issues related to course proposals arise. Dean Call said that he believes that the CEP process works well. A former CEP chair, Professor McGeoch commented that, in his experience, when questions are brought to departments and/or individual colleagues about course proposals, requests are generally met and/or a compromise is reached.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Miller raised some questions about the electronic format and organization in which departments should submit electronic personnel dossiers to the Committee of Six. The Committee agreed to have a discussion about the standard electronic formats that would be most helpful to the members’ review process. The Dean’s office would continue to be tasked with reviewing the electronic and hard-copy materials and ensuring consistency of format and organization across cases. Assistant Dean Tobin suggested that it would be helpful if department chairs attend the meetings that the Dean’s office hosts each year for academic department coordinators who will be assembling personnel cases, in order to ensure that communication about the materials needed, and the format in which they must be submitted, is clear. The members agreed that having chairs attend this meeting would be helpful. The Dean’s office will continue to organize separate meetings annually for cohorts of candidates for reappointment and tenure and for their chairs.

The Committee then had a brief discussion of the results of the COACHE (Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education) survey of faculty job satisfaction, raising questions about the methodology of the instrument and the resulting data, while agreeing that the survey results are useful as a means of highlighting some important questions. The College can now explore through other mechanisms, such as strategic planning and Teaching and Advising Program (TAP) lunch discussions, for example, issues that had been raised. Dean Call noted that the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) had recently asked to review some sections of the report of the survey results, which the Dean had provided to them. Prompted by the survey responses, the CPR now plans to discuss the nature of faculty work and work/life issues. Professor Schneider noted that many of the other institutions participating in the COACHE survey did not seem appropriate to be considered as Amherst’s peers, and added that a number of the results did not ring true. Professor Kingston suggested that the small sample size of the survey and the ways in which the questions were framed probably played a role in generating results that seemed inconsistent across questions, at times, and/or did not seem to ring true. Other members concurred. The members agreed that the survey results seem to point to three issues around which faculty have concerns: committee service, the clarity of tenure procedures and the related issue of mentoring of tenure-track faculty, and issues relating to work/life balance

Amended March 14, 2014

and family, such as spousal hiring and childcare. The Committee noted that it would appear that some of these issues would be easier to address than others, while noting that the survey results often do not reveal the complexities and/or subtleties of a problem. Professor Miller offered the example of committee service. She wondered whether the negative responses surrounding committee service stem from an intrinsic dislike of committee work, or whether faculty may feel that the time that they invest in committee work does not have an impact. Provost Uvin left the meeting to attend a meeting of the Orientation Committee.

Dean Call next informed the members that Associate Dean Cheney and he had met on February 21 with nine recently tenured members of the Faculty about these colleagues' impressions of the reappointment and tenure experience at Amherst. The feedback from these faculty members had been interesting, the Dean said. For the most part, the newly tenured professors had found that the procedures for reappointment and tenure are clear and had noted that they were satisfied with the speed of tenure deliberations. Concerns were raised by some colleagues about the frequency and usefulness of the annual conversations with their departments. The faculty members had found that the feedback given at the time of reappointment, through the redacted departmental recommendation and the Dean's reading of the minutes of the Committee of Six's conversation about their cases, to be helpful. The sum and substance of the Committee of Six's discussions of their tenure cases was also viewed as valuable. Some of the newly tenured professors said that they did not understand the purpose behind the Committee of Six's practice of asking tenured members of a candidate's department to meet with the Committee about some candidates' tenure cases. Some colleagues were also unsure of the purpose of the individual colleague letters that are sent in confidence directly to the Committee of Six as part of the tenure dossier.

Continuing his report about the meeting with the recently tenured professors, the Dean said that some of those who attended the meeting were concerned that the Committee of Six is not structured to ensure that its members represent the major divisions. Those at the meeting expressed the view that the process of evaluating teaching suffers from the inconsistency of methods employed to solicit the evaluations and from the fact that the teaching of tenured faculty members is not evaluated by students very often. Dean Call said that some concern had been raised about the frequency and usefulness of candidates' annual conversations with their department chair(s), and about the Committee of Six's relatively recent practice of asking departments to solicit additional outside reviewer letters, when the members feel that they would be aided in their work by having more information from experts in a candidate's field. The Committee noted that letters from outside reviewers can vary greatly in quality, which is why additional letters are sometimes needed. The Committee felt that, perhaps, this procedure could be made more explicit and transparent by including the process as a formal part of the tenure procedures. Doing so would require a vote of the Faculty, it was noted. Some newly tenured professors had said that their annual conversations had not occurred with the intended frequency, and that departmental advice, perhaps because of the rotation of the chair, could be inconsistent, at times. The members agreed that the annual conversation process would be improved if the

Amended March 14, 2014

tenured members of the department(s) met prior to the conversation with the untenured faculty member to discuss the colleague's record of teaching, research, and service. Rather than having only the chair present at the conversation, the members felt that it would be desirable to have at least one other tenured member of the department participate in the discussion with the untenured colleague. In addition, to ensure that annual conversations occur yearly for each tenured faculty member, the Committee suggested that chairs be asked to notify the Dean in writing, each year, that the annual conversation has taken place. The members agreed to develop a proposal that would standardize departmental practices surrounding the annual conversation. To this end, the Committee decided to review the [Faculty Handbook language about annual conversations](#) at its next meeting. At the conclusion of the conversation, Professor Kingston, referencing the COACHE survey, noted that, in response to a question posed on page forty, which asks responders to describe the "one thing your institution can do to improve the workplace for faculty," no assistant or associate professors had identified concerns about tenure, promotion, or mentoring as their top priority. Based on the survey results, he said that he is not convinced that there is a crisis in these areas, and he expressed the view that improving childcare facilities should be a priority. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended March 28, 2014

The eighteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, March 10, 2014. Present were Professors Corrales, Kingston, Harms, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, Provost Uvin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call asked for the Committee's advice about how best to move forward with a [proposal](#) from the Registrar and Librarian to collect, archive, and distribute student theses in electronic formats, which has been [endorsed by the Committee on Educational Policy \(CEP\)](#). Dean Call noted that the CEP had discussed this proposal at length. Professor Schneider suggested that the proposal be brought before the Faculty, which would allow for thinking through details and contributing to the formulation of the proposal, and providing a forum for questions or concerns. Professors Miller and Harms agreed that taking this approach would be best and raised concerns about making unpublished data within theses, which are often part of the faculty advisor's research, broadly accessible via the Internet. Another problem would arise if student thesis writers misinterpret data, which is then disseminated. Dean Call noted that, under the proposal, the faculty advisor and the student would sign off on making the proposal available electronically, and that they could opt out of posting the thesis if they wished. Professor Miller said that she could foresee having to opt out of the policy for every thesis, and that other scientists would likely do so as well to avoid distributing their data electronically prior to publication and/or including the material in a grant proposal. The need to opt out constantly would be onerous, in Professor Miller's view, and she said that she would prefer a policy that did not have opting in as its default. Professor Kingston noted that the proposal would require faculty members to provide a rationale for opting out of the policy, which raises questions surrounding who will evaluate the decision to opt out and the possibility that a faculty member's decision to do so might be questioned. Professor Kingston said that he finds the requirement that a rationale be provided to be inconsistent with the spirit of open access, which is to give authors full control over the dissemination of their work. Dean Call said that it is his understanding that rationales would not be evaluated; they would be accepted. Professor Schneider raised the point that the policy could force faculty members into awkward situations with students, having to inform them that problematic aspects of the thesis would necessitate an opt-out approach to prevent less-than-optimal work from being shared widely. At present, faculty members might inform students of shortcomings in more nuanced ways that would not be possible if a decision about distributing the thesis electronically were to be required. Professor Schneider suggested that, if the policy is approved, it might be helpful to consult with faculty in the Department of Music to determine which electronic formats would be best for audio files, which can be very large. Professor Schneider reiterated his view that the proposal should be brought to the Faculty for a vote, as the policy relates to teaching. Other members agreed, deciding that the first step would be for the Dean to share the minutes of the Committee of Six's conversation with the CEP, which might choose to revise the proposal in light of the concerns expressed. The Dean said that he would communicate the Committee's views to the CEP and share the minutes of the Committee of Six's conversation with the committee.

Conversation turned to [questions posed by Professor Wagaman](#) about Amherst students' participation in, and time commitment for athletics. These questions were prompted by the discussion about athletics at the Faculty Meeting of March 4, during which concerns had been expressed by a number of faculty members. Dean Call informed the members that he is aware

Amended March 28, 1014

that the Committee on Education and Athletics is gathering information for the Faculty that relates to Professor Wagaman's questions. He suggested that her email be forwarded to that committee in the hope that the "baseline information" sought might be part of the committee's work. Professor Harms commented that Professor Wagaman's questions are good ones. Professor Miller agreed, adding that, in addition to the official data requested by Professor Wagaman, she would also favor asking student-athletes directly about time commitments to athletics. President Martin concurred, noting that, in addition to learning more about student-athletes at Amherst, it will be important to collect relevant data from peer institutions. The Committee asked President Martin if the topic of athletics comes up during her conversations with other college presidents. She responded that the issue is discussed at least twice a year at meetings of the New England Small College Athletic Conference (NESCAC) presidents, and on other occasions. The President informed the members that she has asked Tom Parker, Dean of Admission and Financial Aid, to gather data surrounding athletics and admission practices. She noted that the academic qualifications of student-athletes admitted to the College have been improving over the last decade. Having teams with winning records is a big draw for these academically talented student-athletes, it was noted.

Professor Kingston commented that, while statistical data will aid any consideration of athletics, it will be equally important to take qualitative approaches to exploring this issue. The other members agreed. President Martin noted that the discussion at the Faculty Meeting about athletics indicates that there is a strong interest in having further conversation about this topic. She informed the members that she had recently become aware of a report, completed by the Special Committee on the Place of Athletics at Amherst in 2002 and titled "The Place of Athletics at Amherst College: A Question of Balance." Trustee Colin S. Diver '65 had chaired the committee, and the report is commonly known as "the Diver Report." President Martin noted that the ad hoc committee had recommended that the President constitute an ad hoc committee similar to the Diver committee within a period of three to five years of the publication of the Diver Report to review the place of athletics at Amherst, and that the President appoint similar committees every three to five years. President Martin commented that she would welcome a thorough study of this issue and said that appointing an ad hoc committee, with a similar make-up, would be an approach that she would favor. The Committee expressed an interest in reading the Diver Report, and the President said that she would be pleased to provide it to the members.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Harms said that she would like to see the College take a leadership role in taking steps to limit the potential of repeated head injuries among student-athletes, including leading efforts to eliminate "headers" as part of soccer games. President Martin said that she would be willing to raise this issue with the NESCAC presidents, but does not believe that it will have traction. Professor Miller said that it would be helpful, in the context of problems that arise for faculty in regard to athletics, to consider structural approaches that might be put in place that support placing academics first at Amherst. For example, there could be a requirement that athletes cannot participate on an athletic team unless they maintain a minimum grade-point average. Another suggestion might be to expect that athletes attend a certain number of practices, rather than all of the practices that are scheduled. Several members of the Committee noted that athletes participating in games to which they must travel sometimes request to miss classes well in advance of the scheduled game. President Martin agreed that departures for games should be scheduled so that the amount of class time that student-athletes miss is kept to a minimum. Provost Uvin left the meeting at 4:00 P.M.

Amended March 28, 1014

Conversation returned to the possibility of creating a committee to undertake a study of the place of athletics at Amherst. Issues considered included the possibility of charging the Committee on Education and Athletics with this project, constituting a special committee, or making use of both structures. Noting the make-up of the Diver Committee, Professor Corrales expressed some concern about having trustees serve on a special committee, arguing that trustees might have a special interest in the outcome of the study of athletics at the College. Noting the Board of Trustees' fiduciary responsibility, President Martin said that she feels that it would be helpful to bring trustees into the discussion and commented that there are precedents for trustees serving on special College committees, including the committee that explored this issue most recently. Professor Miller said that, in addition to charging a committee to examine this issue, and to inform its work, it would be helpful to have a full discussion about athletics at a future Faculty Meeting. Professor Kingston suggested that it would be helpful to have more information about the role of athletics in admissions. Dean Call commented that the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) could be charged with providing data on this area. Professor Schneider said that he favors charging the Committee on Education and Athletics with studying the place of athletics, as doing so seems to be the most efficient approach. The Dean said that he would be happy to review the history of the Committee on Education and Athletics with the members, noting that in 2003, the Faculty had voted changes to the committee's name, membership structure, and charge to strengthen its ability to address issues surrounding the intersection of academics, social life, admissions, and athletics at the College. The Committee, the President, and the Dean agreed that the time seems ripe for a discussion about athletics and that they would continue to discuss possible structures for exploring this topic. President Martin commented that she would favor the appointment, ultimately, of a special committee similar to the Diver Committee, the work of which could be informed by research done by the Committee on Education and Athletics.

At the conclusion of the discussion about athletics, which had arisen as a result of the conversation that had occurred at the March 4 Faculty Meeting, the members briefly reflected on that meeting. It was agreed that the committee-of-the-whole structure had led to a fruitful conversation about the initial work of the Strategic Planning Committee on the Integration of Curricular and Co-Curricular Learning and the Strategic Planning Committee on Diversity and Community. The members felt that it would be informative to have the other two planning committees (The Committee on the Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning and the Committee on the Internationalization of Liberal Arts Education) report in the same format at Faculty Meetings on April 1 and April 15.

Dean Call next asked the members for their advice on how best to structure a search committee for the newly envisioned Dean of Students position. The committee will be aided in its work by the search firm of Isaacson, Miller, which will do a good deal of the groundwork and which is already helping to develop a pool of possible candidates, President Martin noted. Professor Harms said that, when she had chaired the search committee for the traditional Dean of Students position, she had read all of the applications that had been submitted, not just those that had been forwarded by the search firm. She recommended that the search committee chair

Amended March 28, 1014

follow this procedure again to ensure transparency within the process. The Dean explained that the Association of Amherst Students (AAS) had recommended the following in regard to student representatives: one senator, two at-large students selected by the AAS, one additional student chosen by Chief Student Affairs Officer Suzanne Coffey and the President of the AAS. After consultation with the Senior Staff, Ms. Coffey is recommending that there be four students, four faculty members, and one staff member. The Dean said that it is imagined that Ms. Coffey will chair the committee. Professor Schneider commented that a ten-member committee seems unwieldy. Professor Miller agreed. Since the position will largely focus on academic support, Dean Call suggested, and the Committee agreed, that having Ms. Coffey co-chair the committee with a faculty member would be appropriate. President Martin agreed. She noted that she had been thinking about the suggestion put forward at a previous Committee of Six meeting that a faculty member potentially serve as the Dean of Students. After consulting with colleagues at other institutions, she had come to the conclusion that, given the current legal and regulatory environment governing student affairs and the complex issues within the area of student mental health, for example, turning to a faculty member to assume this role does not seem viable. In her view, the College needs a Dean of Students with expertise and experience in the area of student affairs. After more discussion, the Committee of Six recommended that the search committee for the new Dean of Students consist of three faculty members, three students, a staff member, and Ms. Coffey. It was further recommended that one of the faculty members be asked to serve as co-chair of the search committee with Ms. Coffey. While this structure would allow for a committee of a more manageable size, in the members' view, the Committee stressed the importance of offering students opportunities for providing feedback on candidates for the position who come to campus. For example, the AAS could organize a committee of students that would meet with candidates and/or attend job talks and then offer feedback, as some departments do with faculty searches. The Committee next offered suggestions of faculty members who might serve as the co-chair, and as members, of the committee.

The members next reviewed a draft Faculty Meeting agenda for a possible meeting on April 1. To address concerns that have emerged over time surrounding the mentoring of tenure-track faculty members, the Committee developed the following two motions and voted six in favor and zero opposed on content and six in favor and zero opposed to forward the motions to the Faculty.

Motion

To enhance the effectiveness of mentoring tenure-track faculty members, the Committee of Six proposes the following revision to the Faculty Handbook, as indicated in bold caps, to sections [III., D., 2](#) and [III., E., 4.,\(8\)](#), regarding annual conversations for tenure-track faculty members with the chair(s) of their department(s), effective immediately:

2. Annual Conversation with the Chair

The Chair, **WITH AT LEAST ONE OTHER TENURED MEMBER OF THE DEPARTMENT ALSO PRESENT AND PARTICIPATING**, shall have at least one formal conversation per year with **EACH OF** the department's untenured faculty member(s) to discuss in detail performance and progress in teaching and research, **OR CREATIVE WORK** and evidence thereof. As to teaching, this evidence should include all semester-end evaluations by students with signatures removed, the testimony of colleagues who have observed the untenured faculty member's teaching, and such course materials as the untenured faculty

Amended March 28, 2014

member sees fit to submit for discussion (Voted by the Faculty, November 1998). **PRIOR TO THE ANNUAL CONVERSATION, THE CHAIR SHALL PROVIDE MATERIALS DOCUMENTING THE UNTENURED FACULTY**

MEMBER'S TEACHING AND RESEARCH OR CREATIVE WORK TO THE TENURED MEMBERS OF THE DEPARTMENT AND CONSULT WITH THEM TO REACH A SHARED UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT SHOULD BE CONVEYED IN THE ANNUAL CONVERSATION.

ANNUAL CONVERSATIONS ARE HELD EACH YEAR UNTIL THE TIME OF THE FACULTY MEMBER'S TENURE REVIEW. A sum and substance letter about the conversation should be given to the untenured faculty member and be placed in the records of the department. (Voted by the Faculty, May 1995). **ON AN ANNUAL BASIS, THE CHAIR MUST NOTIFY THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY THAT THE ANNUAL CONVERSATION HAS TAKEN PLACE WITH EACH OF THE DEPARTMENT'S UNTENURED FACULTY MEMBERS AND THAT THE SUM AND SUBSTANCE LETTER HAS BEEN GIVEN TO EACH CANDIDATE.**

4. Procedures Followed in Tenure Decisions

(8) The departmental evaluation of teaching effectiveness should draw upon a representative range of teaching activities in addition to evidence described in (5). Evaluation should derive from, but need not be limited to, conversations about courses with some members of the department; attendance by some members of the department at a number of class meetings at mutually agreed upon times; assessment, by the candidate with at least one senior member of the department, of the accomplishments of at least one of the candidate's courses at the end of a semester. Evaluations of teaching effectiveness may also be included in the letters described in (2) and (7). (Voted by the Faculty, March 1999). **ANNUAL CONVERSATIONS WITH THE CHAIR ARE HELD EACH YEAR UNTIL THE TIME OF THE FACULTY MEMBER'S TENURE REVIEW. PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL CONVERSATIONS CAN BE FOUND IN SECTION [III., D., 2.](#)**

Motion

To enhance the effectiveness of mentoring tenure-track faculty members, the Committee of Six proposes the following revision to the Faculty Handbook, as indicated in bold caps, to sections [III., D., 4.](#), and [III., E., 4.,\(8\)](#):

4. Reappointment Procedures

In preparation for recommendations concerning reappointment, the department will

Amended March 28, 2014

gather evidence concerning teaching effectiveness, scholarly or creative growth, and other contributions to the life of the College. (Voted by the Faculty, October 2004). Evaluations of teaching are to be requested of all students from every course, including every honors and special topics course taught by an untenured faculty member. These evaluations are to be signed and are normally to be solicited in essay format in all classes in the final week of each semester on a form to be devised by the instructor in collaboration with the department. After the submission of grades they will be made available to the instructor without the names of the respondents. In addition, all departments will be required to have solicited from all students confidential letters of evaluation at the time of reappointment review (Voted by the Faculty, October 1998). All student evaluations of teaching collected for purposes of reappointment are to be submitted to the Committee of Six with the department's recommendation. (Voted by the Faculty, May 1995)

The departmental evaluation of teaching effectiveness should draw upon a representative range of teaching activities in addition to evidence described above. Evaluation should derive from, but need not be limited to, conversations about courses with some members of the department; attendance by some members of the department at a number of class meetings at mutually agreed upon times; and assessment, by the candidate with at least one senior member of the department, of the accomplishments of at least one of the candidate's courses at the end of a semester. (Voted by the Faculty, May 1999). **EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS SHOULD ALSO BE INFORMED BY THE DISCUSSIONS OF THE TENURED MEMBERS OF THE DEPARTMENT, THE SUBSTANCE OF WHICH IS CONVEYED DURING ANNUAL CONVERSATIONS.**

4. Procedures Followed in Tenure Decisions

(8) The departmental evaluation of teaching effectiveness should draw upon a representative range of teaching activities in addition to evidence described in (5). Evaluation should derive from, but need not be limited to, conversations about courses with some members of the department; attendance by some members of the department at a number of class meetings at mutually agreed upon times; assessment, by the candidate with at least one senior member of the department, of the accomplishments of at least one of the candidate's courses at the end of a semester. Evaluations of teaching effectiveness may also be included in the letters described in (2) and (7). (Voted by the Faculty, March 1999). **EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS SHOULD ALSO BE INFORMED BY THE DISCUSSIONS OF THE TENURED MEMBERS OF THE DEPARTMENT, THE SUBSTANCE OF WHICH IS CONVEYED DURING ANNUAL CONVERSATIONS.** Annual conversations with the chair are held each year until the time of the faculty member's tenure review. Procedures for annual conversations can be found in section [III., D., 2.](#)

Amended March 28, 1014

The members then voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the Faculty Meeting agenda to the Faculty. The Committee requested that the Dean ask Provost Uvin to confer with the two strategic planning committees that have not yet reported to determine which would report at the April 1 Faculty Meeting and which would report at a Faculty Meeting to be held on April 15. It was agreed that the two committees should also be asked to provide information to inform the discussions in advance of the Faculty Meetings, which would be shared with the Faculty. Dean Call said that he would be happy to do so.

The Committee briefly discussed its recent recommendations regarding the Orientation Committee in light of concerns that have been shared with some members. It was noted that some colleagues have put forward the view that the Committee of Six may have exceeded its authority by supporting the proposal that the Provost work with the Orientation Committee to plan this fall's Orientation and that he coordinate its implementation. The members said that they continue to believe that, given the current situation in student affairs and the upcoming transition in the Dean of New Students position, they had given sound and appropriate advice. The Orientation Committee's role is an advisory one to the administration, which has a decision-making role, the Committee agreed. An alternative approach could have been to ask the members of the Orientation Committee to implement Orientation, which did not seem viable. Provost Uvin's status on the Orientation Committee, as a member or guest, should be less important than getting the job done, in the view of most. Professor Schneider said that much as he agrees with the Committee of Six's decision in this case, he can understand how the process that had been used to insert the Provost into the planning and implementation of Orientation could be seen as problematic from a governance perspective, and the desire to turn to the *Faculty Handbook* for guidance—particularly in a time of uncertainty. Other members noted that, in situations such as the one under discussion, common sense should prevail over a literal interpretation of *Faculty Handbook* language and added that changes in practice can occur that are not reflected in the handbook until the handbook is amended. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 11, 2014

The nineteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, March 31, 2014. Present were Professors Corrales, Kingston, Harms, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, Provost Uvin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with President Martin reviewing with the members the schedule for this week's meetings of the Board of Trustees, which will include the Board's annual executive session with the Committee of Six and discussion with the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). The President explained that the trustees will meet with two members of the Strategic Planning Committee on the Integration of Curricular and Co-Curricular Learning and with consultant Richard Keeling for a discussion about the area of student affairs. Professor Cobham-Sander, chair of the Strategic Planning Committee on Diversity and Community, will give a preview of the work of her committee to members of the Board and the administration. President Martin commented that the Board will be discussing the College budget, noting that emphasis is being placed on tying the budget process more closely to the priorities of the College, and to having systems in place to ensure that budgets are right-sized so individual units can avoid overruns.

Professor Schneider asked what has prompted a re-examination of the budget process, since it has seemed to him that the budget has always been balanced, at least according to the reports that have been provided to departments and to the Faculty. President Martin said that unit-level budgets have not always reflected spending. Some areas of the budget have been generously funded, resulting in under-spending at times, while other areas have been under-budgeted, with over-spending often occurring. As a result, a reconciliation process has been used at the end of the budget cycles to balance the budget. A distributed reserve of approximately \$4 million, which formerly served as a cushion that was used to reconcile the budget, has now been depleted, President Martin informed the members. The amount that the College pays on its debt, which amounts to a considerable expense, has now been folded into the operating budget, for purposes of transparency and tracking. These expenses have been kept separate from the budget in the past. The new approach will be to seek to project actual expenses across the College and to fund units accordingly, President Martin noted.

Continuing the discussion about the budget, President Martin noted that, in addition to improving the ways in which the College can plan for and make informed decisions about spending, another reason for adopting the new approach is to seek to help address Amherst's rising dependence on its endowment to support the operating budget. While the "draw" (the percentage of the endowment that is used to support spending) on the endowment remains at an acceptable range (below 5 percent), the draw will need to increase next year to 4.7 percent to support the budget. The trustees are concerned that, with the endowment now providing more than 50 percent of the funding to support College operations, projecting expenses and monitoring spending closely have become more important than ever before. Volatility in the economic climate has an effect on endowment returns, which can cause anxiety. Since the College is relying on funding from the endowment more and more, the trustees are having in-depth discussions about the most appropriate approach—one that reduces the risk of negative returns, while taking advantage of investments that might result in higher returns. The fact is that the College collects less net tuition (the amount of tuition paid minus the amount of financial aid provided by the College) than its peers. Professor Schneider asked whether, given this set of circumstances, Amherst can afford to

Amended April 11, 2014

have a “no-loan” policy. President Martin said that the College is fortunate to be in a financial position that makes it possible to have this policy, at present. If the financial environment worsens for any reason, there are a number of “levers” that would make it possible for the College to maintain its financial equilibrium. adjustments to such policies as need-blind admission for international students and no loans as part of aid packages would reduce expenses in a crisis, but no doubt the College would choose other options first. Professor Corrales asked what areas pose the most significant problems when it comes to spending at a higher rate than has been budgeted. President Martin commented that casual labor and overtime, particularly within Dining Services and the physical plant, are the areas in which spending most often exceeds budgeted amounts. Professor McGeoch asked if the excess expenses associated with casual workers extends to student workers. President Martin said that this problem does not extend to student workers, as far as she understands. Some of the programs that have been developed recently to address student life issues have resulted in unbudgeted expenses. Examples include the Grab-and-Go program and extending the hours that Valentine is open.

Turning briefly to another student life issue, the place of athletics at the College, President Martin asked the members if they had been able to read the report of the Special Committee on the Place of Athletics at Amherst (2002), otherwise known as the Diver Committee, which she had provided to the Committee, at the members’ request. Several members said that they had read the document, while others had not yet had time. Everyone who had read the report had been impressed with it. President Martin commented that it will be informative to learn the results of the data-gathering exercise that is currently being undertaken by the Committee on Education and Athletics. In addition, she feels that appointing an ad hoc committee, much like the one that produced the [“Diver Report,”](#) will be an important means of exploring this issue fully. President Martin applauded the Diver Committee’s excellent work and said that she favors following the committee’s recommendation that the President constitute an ad hoc committee similar to the Diver committee to review the place of athletics at Amherst every three to five years. A standing committee, burdened with a regular charge, would not have the time needed to take on this project, in her view. President Martin said that it is her intention to create an ad hoc committee to study the place of athletics at Amherst. Professor Kingston indicated his support for this plan, while suggesting that the Diver Committee had so effectively presented the pertinent issues, which remain much the same, that it would likely not be necessary to recreate much of that committee’s work. Professor McGeoch agreed, while noting the need to reassess the major issues based on new data that would become available. Professor Schneider asked if most numbers remain the same in regard to the number of “athletic admits” that are permitted and the size of athletics teams. President Martin commented that she believes that not much has changed in this regard since the Diver Committee completed its work in 2002, but agreed that she would double check these figures.

Continuing with the discussion of athletics, President Martin noted that she had recently attended a session of the Amherst Leads program, at the invitation of the group, and had offered remarks. At the event, a number of students had shared that their professors had made remarks, sometimes in an off-handed way, during classes about student-athletes. The students had found some comments to be disparaging and hurtful. Discussion at the event had focused on the stigma that some students feel is associated with being a student-athlete at the College. Professor Kingston wondered whether some faculty members may have made statements out of a sense of frustration, commenting that the regular absences of student-athletes from Friday classes for purposes of participating in competitions, for example, can

Amended April 11, 2014

have a significant impact. Professor Schneider expressed frustration that Friday afternoon cannot be used for academic purposes because of athletic competitions. While recognizing the reason for frustration, President Martin suggested that it is important that faculty members take care in the ways in which they discuss their views about athletics in their classes, so as not to make student-athletes feel stigmatized.

Under “Announcements from the Dean,” Dean Call noted that the Lecture Committee nominated Edward Melillo, Assistant Professor of History and Environmental Studies, to deliver this year’s Max and Etta Lazerowitz Lecture on April 8. His talk is titled “Out of the Blue: Nantucket and The Pacific World.” The Lazerowitz Lecturer, a member of the Amherst Faculty below the rank of full professor, is appointed annually, he noted. The Dean next discussed a personnel issue with the members. Following that conversation, the Dean informed the members that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) would be considering the feedback that the Committee of Six had offered on the proposal to collect, archive, and distribute student theses in electronic form. The Committee then turned to personnel matters.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Kingston asked the President if it would be possible for her to share with the Committee redacted versions of recent reports about student affairs that have been prepared by consultants. He expressed the view that doing so would be helpful as a means of preparing for the Committee’s meetings with the Board and consultant Dr. Richard Keeling. Noting that some portions of the reports are confidential, President Martin responded that she would review the reports to determine if she could meet Professor Kingston’s request and said that she intends to share the findings of Keeling Associates with the Faculty. The President noted that two of the three consultants’ reports of last year had focused largely on the Counseling Center and its relations with the Office of the Dean of Students, while consultants are now studying the whole domain of student affairs at the College.

The members next discussed the progress of the search for a Dean of New Students to succeed Dean O’Hara. President Martin and Dean Call said that there are two excellent candidates for the position and said that it is their hope to make a decision about the position within the next week. President Martin noted that the search for a new director of the Counseling Center is making good progress and said that it is her understanding that two candidates for the position will be brought to campus within the next two weeks. The Dean then shared a preliminary list of members of the search committee for the Dean of Students. After some further conversation about the make-up of the committee, the Dean agreed to speak with Ms. Coffey and to report back to the Committee of Six about the membership of the search committee once it is finalized.

Conversation turned to [Dean O’Hara’s cover note](#) regarding the [Orientation Committee’s proposal](#) to revise its charge and membership, and the [proposal](#) itself, which Dean O’Hara, chair of the committee, had forwarded to the Committee of Six. (See [Faculty Handbook at IV., S., 1.,q.](#) for the current charge and membership of the Orientation Committee.) Provost Uvin offered to leave the meeting if it was felt that his presence would constrain conversation. The members did not feel it necessary for the Provost to absent himself. Professor Kingston expressed the view that, since the Provost had been charged with reimagining Orientation, it would seem more appropriate for any proposal regarding a change to the make-up and charge of the Orientation Committee to have come from Provost Uvin. Professor McGeoch agreed, while noting that the Orientation Committee’s proposal does not seem to speak to the essential issue. The proposal suggests that the Orientation Committee’s view is that the committee should have

Amended April 11, 2014

determinative authority over Orientation. Professor McGeoch said that it is his understanding that the role of the Orientation Committee has been and should be advisory. The other members shared this view. The proposal also assumes that the College will create the new position of Orientation Coordinator, it was noted. President Martin commented that, while a position may be created to support Orientation, no decision has been made on that front, and no discussion has yet taken place about what the nature and responsibilities of such a position might be.

Continuing the discussion, Professors McGeoch and Kingston noted that Provost Uvin's working group has not yet reported about its recommendations regarding Orientation. Provost Uvin noted that the group had disbanded in January. Professor McGeoch asked if the group had done a report on its work. Provost Uvin said that he has discussed the group's findings and

recommendations with the Orientation Committee over the course of its last six meetings. He informed the members that his group had met all of his goals for reimagining Orientation, with the exception of shortening it. If the program were to be shortened, it would be best to shorten it by at least two days. Since there is a three-day program of off-campus trips in the middle of Orientation, the working group found it difficult to shorten the schedule from five-and-a-half to three-and-a-half days, even if that might be desirable. Professor Kingston asked if Orientation might be shortened and programming continued throughout the semester. Provost Uvin noted that, once students are involved in classes and settle in, it is more difficult to keep their attention, and it is harder for Orientation programming to have an impact.

Conversation turned to the implementation of the 2014-2015 Orientation. Provost Uvin informed the members that the College has engaged a former member of the Dean of Students staff, who has played a major role in coordinating Orientation previously, to support the program. Dean O'Hara, and then her successor, the incoming Dean of New Students, will continue to serve as the chair of the Orientation Committee and will hopefully be able to take up this task before the formal start of his or her appointment on July 1. The Committee expressed the view that the advisory role of the Orientation Committee should be stressed. The committee should not be responsible for implementing Orientation. The members expressed a preference for offering clarity in the revised charge of the Orientation Committee on this front, indicating that the committee advises the Office of Student Affairs, particularly since it has become clear that responsibility for implementing Orientation should not rest with the Dean of New Students alone and because the committee should not be advisory to its own chair. The members agreed that planning and administering Orientation should be the responsibility of the staff of the Office of Student Affairs, who will have the experience, expertise, energy, and time to carry out the program. Since the nature of the expertise needed on the Orientation Committee may change over time, the Committee felt that, rather than naming the Area Coordinator for the First-Year Experience, the Sexual Respect Educator or designee, the Orientation Coordinator, and the Dean of Residential life or designee, as the current Orientation Committee has proposed, the charge should be less specific in regard to naming titles of staff who will serve on the Orientation Committee in order to have more flexibility as needs change. Noting the language in the Orientation Committee's proposal that, "The four students should represent the broad experience of students at the College and include the two senators elected from Student Government and two other students," Professor Corrales expressed the view that either the process for assessing "broad

Amended April 11, 2014

experience” should be made more explicit or this reference should be removed. The members agreed that it would be preferable to have a mixed model for selecting students, much like the one used for the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid, with two chosen by the Association of Amherst Students and two chosen by the Office of Student Affairs. The charge could say simply “four students (two students elected by the student government and two other students).” The charge should also convey that the committee will have four members of the Office of Student Affairs, including the Dean of New Students, ex officio, who serves as the committee’s chair; two other members of the faculty; and the Provost or his or her representative. The Committee clarified that the term ex officio means “by virtue of an office” and does not mean “without vote,” as is sometimes assumed. The members decided that, since responsibility for issues surrounding diversity rests in the Provost’s office, it is important that the Provost or a representative from the Provost’s office serve on the Orientation Committee. Professor Harms noted that having four faculty members (including the Dean of New Students and the Provost) serve on the Orientation Committee will ensure that the Faculty’s academic interests will be represented.

Concluding the conversation, the members concurred that the Orientation Committee should approach its work through broad consultation, drawing on the expertise of members of the Amherst College community and being as inclusive as possible. The role of the committee should be to help develop and review the vision, policies, and programming of Orientation, giving special attention to academic, social, and regulatory expectations for this experience. Based on views expressed by the members of the Committee of Six during their conversation, it was agreed that the language proposed by the Orientation Committee should be revised and then discussed further. The members agreed that, in advance of bringing a revised charge before the Faculty, they would communicate with the Orientation Committee about the new language.

The members continued their conversation about attendance and voting at Faculty Meetings and reviewed the current rules. The Committee discussed the challenges of establishing criteria for attendance and voting, as well as the sensitivity surrounding changes that would result in excluding anyone who may feel that they have the responsibility to attend Faculty Meetings now. It was agreed that Faculty Meetings have gradually developed into something akin to community meetings, with many attendees (largely administrators) present without voice or vote. Since the primary purpose of the meetings is participatory and legislative, and not simply informational, the members decided that it would be helpful to review which members of the community can vote under the current system, to consider if changes are needed, and perhaps to shift to a system in which only those who are authorized to vote, and a very small number of senior administrators, will attend Faculty Meetings. In this way, the members agreed, the focus of Faculty Meetings, which should be faculty governance, would be clarified, and the body present would more accurately and effectively reflect the purpose of the meetings. The Committee, the President, and the Dean also welcomed the Faculty’s practice of discussing and offering opinion at Faculty Meeting about significant College matters that may be outside its direct purview, and, in this way, playing an important advisory role to the administration on these questions. The members stressed that there is great value in having gatherings of faculty, students, and staff of the College and agreed that structures should be put in place to do so. One thought might be to have community meetings at the beginning and end of each academic year. The Committee agreed that any change to the existing practice required further thought and discussion, and suggested returning to the topic in the future.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S.
Call
Dean of the
Faculty

Amended April 11, 2014

The twentieth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, April 7,

2014. Present were Professors Corrales, Kingston, Harms, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Provost Uvin was absent.

The meeting began with President Martin commenting on the sudden death of Marian Matheson, the College's Director of Institutional Research and Planning, on April 4, 2014. The President, the Dean, and the members expressed deep sorrow over the loss of Ms. Matheson. President Martin noted that a memorial service would be held on April 12, at 11:00 a.m., in Johnson Chapel. The Committee agreed that thought should be given to establishing a memorial on campus, perhaps in the form of a bench or tree with a plaque in honor of Ms. Matheson. President Martin agreed that such a memorial should be created and said that she would move forward with making the necessary arrangements, consulting with Ms. Matheson's family.

President Martin reported on the meetings of the Board of Trustees, which had been held the previous weekend. The President said that the Board had supported the administration's proposed measures to address the budget shortfall; had met with consultant Richard Keeling, who had offered a superb report on the area of student affairs at the College; and had greatly enjoyed its meetings and dinners with members of faculty committees. President Martin noted that Dr. Keeling had conveyed to the trustees the extraordinary "ethic of care" that the Amherst Faculty practice with their students, a level of devotion that the consultant had commented is over and above that of the faculty at any other school, in the consultant's view. The trustees had agreed that this portrayal of the Amherst Faculty is consistent with their own experience and understanding. The Committee noted that the Faculty would be pleased to learn of these views of the trustees and the consultant.

Continuing, President Martin noted that Dr. Keeling, while commenting on the need to make significant changes in the ways in which the Office of Student Affairs is structured, and in the College's approach to student life, more generally, reassured the Board that making the necessary changes would not require a significant financial investment above what is budgeted now. President Martin said that some faculty members with whom the trustees had met had raised issues surrounding the burden of administrative duties and the need to explore the place of athletics. President Martin thanked the Committee of Six for meeting with the Board.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the Committee that the members of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) had read the Committee of Six minutes on the proposal that had been brought forward regarding the electronic archiving of theses. The CEP will be discussing the Committee's feedback about the proposal, Dean Call said. The Dean next asked the members for nominations of colleagues who might serve on a Memorial Minute Committee for Gerald Brophy, Samuel A. Hitchcock Professor of Mineralogy and Geology, Emeritus, who passed away on April 2. Professor Harms said that she would continue to think about the constitution of the committee and would report back to the Committee, possibly offering additional suggestions of who might serve. Continuing his remarks, the Dean shared with the Committee the make-up of the search committee for the Dean of Students and thanked the members for their nominations. The members of the search committee are Amani Ahmed

'15; Julian Boykins '15; Suzanne Coffey (co-chair), Chief Student Affairs Officer; Nicola Courtright (co-chair), Professor of the History of Art and chair of European Studies; Kat

Amended April 11, 2014

Dominguez '16; Maria Heim, Associate Professor of Religion; and Paul Rockwell, Professor of French. President Martin noted that Professor Courtright has encouraged her to communicate with the Faculty background and plans for the area of Student Affairs. The President, noting her intention to distribute Dr. Keeling's report to the Committee of Six and the Faculty as a whole, asked the members if sharing that document would sufficiently inform the Faculty.

Professor Harms agreed that the Faculty would welcome having more information about plans to restructure the Office of Student Affairs, including the ways in which the Dean of Students position will be redefined. The President said that she would be happy to discuss with the Faculty the plans for changing the structure, which echo the recommendations outlined in Dr. Keeling's report and those of other consultants engaged by the College, as well as the contours

of the redefined Dean of Students position. Dr. Keeling has suggested a tripartite structure within the office, which would be overseen by the Chief Student Affairs Officer. The health and wellness area would include the Health Center and the Counseling Center; the Dean of Students area would encompass academic and personal support for students under a class-dean structure that would retain close ties to the Faculty, and student activities; and a residential life area with greatly enhanced programming for students. Professor Harms asked if emphasis will be placed on creating an Office of Student Affairs that will focus on the full student experience and on building a healthy community at the College, helping all students to grow and thrive at Amherst—both those who are facing challenges and those who are not. President Martin responded that this is indeed the aspiration for the office. In regard to the Dean of Students position, President Martin commented that the individual chosen will be a leader who will be expected to think broadly and creatively in the role, and who will contribute to the implementation of the new vision for the Office of Student Affairs.

Continuing with the conversation, Professor Corrales asked if candidates for the Dean of Students position will be informed that the College may be facing a lawsuit by a former student, and whether that information might deter good candidates from applying. President Martin said that the College has been transparent with candidates about this situation, which is not dissimilar to that of other colleges and universities at present. Members of the Committee asked how candidates for the Dean of Students might feel about the envisioned structure, including

reporting to the Chief Student Affairs Officer. President Martin said that candidates in this field would be accustomed to a structure with the divisions that she had described. It is imagined that candidates who seek the revised Dean of Students position will be professionals who are at an earlier career stage than those who might be seeking the more senior position of Chief of Student Affairs. The candidate may aspire, however, to head a Student Affairs office in the future. The redefined Dean of Students position, with narrower responsibilities, is expected to draw a high quality applicant pool that displays breadth and depth. Professor Schneider suggested that the Faculty would welcome having the President provide a synopsis of the Keeling Report, as well as sharing the report itself. President Martin said that she will share the redacted report and would be happy to offer a synopsis as well. Professor Harms reiterated that the faculty would welcome hearing from the President on the redefinition of the position of Dean of Students and on the restructuring that will constitute the Office of Student Affairs going forward.

Amended April 11, 2014

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Harms said that she has been reviewing the [report of the Special Committee on the Place of Athletics at Amherst \(2002\)](#), otherwise known as the [Diver Report](#). She asked the Dean if the coaches are now satisfied with the contract system that is in place, as the report suggests that the coaches at the time that the report had been done, had expressed the desire for a structure that resembled the one used for faculty tenure. Dean Call said the Diver Report was written before the current cohort of coaches had been hired, at a time when three coaches had faculty status. This status has been phased out over time, and only one coach currently is a member of the Faculty. The Dean noted that, over the past eight or nine years, efforts have been made to clarify, regularize, and formalize the contract structure for coaches. The College has moved away from past practices, including the status of “associate coach,” which had been problematic. The current process of appointment and review offers the professionals in Amherst’s coaching ranks more clarity and consistency, Dean Call explained. He offered praise for the coaches who have been appointed under this structure. Dean Call stressed that the Diver Report’s description of some coaches’ feelings of isolation, and its accounts of the separation that existed between athletics and the academic side of the College, do not reflect the current climate at the College, in his view. It is the Dean’s impression that coaches now have more connections with members of the Faculty, for example, through the faculty liaison program, and no longer seem to be focused on seeking faculty status. Dean Call said that he has seen a similar change of perspective among the librarians at the College, as these colleagues also work with the Faculty in new and exciting ways that promote cooperation and collaboration.

Continuing with questions that had been prompted by the Diver Report, Professor Harms asked if efforts are being made to quantify the effects of conflicts between athletic events and classes and laboratories. She noted that the report states that “Each year the Athletic Director submits and the Dean of the Faculty approves an athletic playing schedule that shows how many class conflicts can be expected. (The term ‘class conflict’ signifies merely that an athletic contest or necessary travel to an athletic contest has been scheduled for a time when one or more classes are regularly scheduled...)” Professor Harms asked the Dean if such a schedule is still submitted. Dean Call said that he had at one time received a schedule such as the one described,

but has not been provided with one in a number of years. He said that he would be happy to take steps to reinstate this practice. The members agreed that doing so would be helpful. Dean Call expressed the view that conflicts occur most often during post-season play. He also wondered whether newer coaches, in particular, realize the importance of minimizing the number of conflicts and suggested that this message should be reemphasized. Several members expressed frustration over the number of students who miss classes and labs on Friday because of athletic obligations. Professor Harms noted that it has been the practice of the Geology department to schedule weekend field trips on Sundays so as to avoid conflicts with athletic events, but that increasingly there are conflicts on Sundays as well. This is a hardship for both students and professors alike. Professor Kingston noted that, in his experience, some student-athletes may also refuse to consider classes that meet during times that conflict with their athletic obligations, which unfortunately limits their access to the curriculum.

Amended April 11, 2014

Professor Kingston next asked the Dean how the success of coaches is evaluated and whether having a winning record is stressed. Dean Call said that the coaches have a formal evaluation process that is similar to that of the Faculty. The department submits dossiers to the Dean that include student evaluations, letters from colleagues and peers in the profession, from faculty (at times), and a departmental recommendation. Dean Call said that he knows of no instance in which a coach received a negative evaluation because he or she did not have a winning record. At the same time, the Dean noted that, coaches naturally want to have strong, competitive programs and want their student-athletes to succeed.

At the conclusion of the discussion about these issues surrounding the place of athletics, the members asked President Martin to bring their concerns to the attention of the New England Small College Athletics Conference (NESCAC) and to take the lead in advocating for change, which all agreed will be a long-term process. President Martin said that she would be happy to work with the presidents of the NESCAC schools, but feels that the issues that Amherst would like to bring forward should be identified through a process of study conducted by an ad hoc committee modeled after the Diver Committee. The members agreed, while noting that proposing to lower the number of “athletic admits” would be one issue that they would like to see raised. President Martin said that, while she would pursue change on this front, push-back from other schools should be expected. The Committee urged the President to begin these and other conversations about athletics soon. The Committee agreed to have further conversation about the Diver Report at one of its future meetings.

Continuing with “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Schneider asked the Dean about the schedule for the upcoming election for the Committee of Six. Dean Call said that the election would be held after the Dean of New Students is selected, as this appointment would have an impact on the make-up of the ballot for the election.

Discussion turned to the role of the Provost at the College, including the position’s place within the Committee structure. President Martin commented that, over the course of the past year, Provost Uvin’s portfolio of responsibilities has been clarified, but his areas of focus may still not be apparent to the community. Now that Provost Uvin’s duties are identified, and the experiment of having him serve on a number of committees has been ongoing for some time, President Martin expressed the view that motions should be brought to the Faculty to revise the membership of the committees on which the Provost will serve. The members agreed. His key responsibilities remain what was anticipated when he was appointed—planning, diversity and community, and initiatives that require coordination among offices for faculty, staff, and students. In addition, the Provost has responsibility for initiatives that involve partnerships with communities outside the College. For that reason, the Center for Community Engagement (CCE) reports to the Provost, and he will be given responsibility for overseeing relations with the Emily Dickinson Museum and the Folger Shakespeare Library. Continuing, President Martin encouraged the Committee to bring motions forward to add the Provost as an ex officio member of the Committee of Six, with the stipulation that the Provost would neither attend discussions of reappointment, tenure, and promotion cases or related procedures, or play a role in the decisions made about these matters; the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR); and, perhaps, the College Council. Since the portfolio of responsibilities that has emerged is not centered on academic units, which will remain within the oversight of the Dean of the Faculty, the President and the Provost would not propose that the Provost become a member of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). The Committee agreed that adding the Provost to the suggested committees seems appropriate, while noting that a vote of the Faculty would be necessary to do so.

Professor Harms noted that one argument for creating the Provost position had been to address the issue of an overburdened Dean of the Faculty’s office. President Martin responded that conversations with both Dean Call and incoming Dean of the Faculty Catherine Epstein about the possibility of shifting the reporting line of some academic units have not resulted in a viable plan, and the decision has been made that all such units will continue to report to the Dean of the Faculty. Professor Epstein has said that she will focus on evaluating and addressing the needs and

Amended April 11, 2014

organization within the Dean's office, President Martin noted. Professor Harms asked if the Provost's office might play a role in regulatory and compliance issues. The Dean said that his office has worked effectively with the Office of Foundation and Corporate Relations and the Chief Policy Officer, as well as some committees that have compliance roles, on such matters.

He said that he anticipates that such a model will continue. In addition, the Associate Deans of the Faculty also work with individual faculty members in the area of sponsored research.

Professor Harms asked if Five-College collaboration might be an area that could shift to the Provost. Dean Call argued that the academic component of the collaboration is the most valuable and, in his view, is what works best—he feels strongly that Five-College efforts in the academic realm should remain within the Dean's office. While Five-College collaboration is time-intensive, it has become an essential element in meeting the needs of the “trailing partners” of candidates for Amherst positions, Dean Call noted. A recent example of a success story is the arrangement that the Dean negotiated that resulted in bringing one-and-a-half positions in Astronomy to the College, by creating a joint appointment with the University of Massachusetts for the spouse of a candidate for an Amherst position. The negotiations resulted in a full-time appointment at Amherst for one member of the couple and a half-time appointment at Amherst and a half-time research appointment at UMass for the other. Both of these hires would not have been possible without Five-College cooperation.

Returning to the topic of adding the Provost to faculty committees, Professor Miller agreed that motions should be brought before the Faculty soon, since the Provost's participation on committees was established on a trial basis only for this year. The Committee agreed that having a better sense of the Provost's responsibilities would help clarify which committees would be appropriate. It was agreed that, at the April 15 Faculty Meeting, it would be informative for the President to make a presentation to the Faculty about the Provost's portfolio of responsibilities, as well as the envisioned structure for the Office of Student Affairs. President Martin said that she would be happy to do so.

Conversation returned to the revision of the charge and membership of the Orientation Committee. After reviewing a draft based on the members' last discussion of this matter, and a conversation about some details within it, the Committee voted six in favor and zero opposed on the substance of the following motion:

The Committee of Six proposes that the following language replace the current language for the Orientation Committee in the [*Faculty Handbook* at IV., S., 1., q.](#), effective immediately:

q. *The Orientation Committee.* The Orientation Committee consists of four members of the Office of Student Affairs, including the Dean of New Students, ex officio, who serves as the committee's chair; two other members of the Faculty; the Provost (or his or her representative), who serves ex officio; and four students (two students selected by the student government and two selected by the Office of Student Affairs). The faculty members of the committee are appointed by the Committee of Six. The faculty and student members of the committee normally serve two-year terms.

The Orientation Committee acts in an advisory capacity to the Office of Student Affairs, which is charged with planning and administering orientation for new students and ongoing orientation programs. The committee approaches its work through broad consultation, drawing on the expertise of members of the Amherst College community. The role of the committee is to help develop and review the vision, policies, and programming of orientation, giving special attention to academic, social, and regulatory expectations for this experience.

Amended April 11, 2014

As the proposed language reflects, the members decided that having a mixed model of selecting student members of the committee, with the Association of Amherst Students (AAS) selecting two students and the Office of Student Affairs selecting two, would be the best way of ensuring flexibility and diversity when creating student representation. The Office of Student Affairs, it was agreed, would be aware of students who would be effective in their role on the committee, given current needs, and who could be chosen to complement the experience and skills of the student members selected by the AAS. Giving the Office of Student Affairs the discretion to select two students will help to ensure that a range of student constituencies and interests will be represented and will provide a means of ensuring balanced representation, in the Committee's view. There was also a brief conversation to articulate the reasoning behind adding the Provost or his representative to the committee. The members reiterated the view that the Provost's role in the area of diversity and in other relevant areas of campus life would enable him to inform the work of the committee in valuable and important ways. The members agreed that, in advance of bringing this motion to the Faculty, they would share the proposed charge with the current Orientation Committee.

The members next reviewed a draft Faculty Meeting agenda for April 15. The Committee discussed proposed modifications to the language of the *Faculty Handbook* describing procedures surrounding the annual conversation of the department chair with untenured faculty. Professor Harms noted the imbalance between attention given to evidence of progress in teaching versus progress on other fronts. She was concerned, however, that the annual conversation should remain just that, and not become a mini-reappointment review.

The Committee agreed, favoring language that makes clear the need to bring evidence of progress in teaching, research or creative work, and contributions to the life of the College to the tenured members of the department prior to the annual conversation without the prescribing the evidence.

The Committee next discussed the schedule for Faculty Meetings for the remainder of the academic year, noting that a number of issues should be brought before the Faculty before the end of the year, if possible. The issues include the proposal that the program in Environmental Studies become a new department at the College, the electronic archiving of theses, a proposal to add the Provost to some committees, and the new charge to the Orientation Committee. The Committee noted that, at the time that Faculty votes on adding the Provost to committees, and when the President discusses the position of Provost at the Faculty Meeting, the Provost should not be present for the conversation. The members then voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the agenda to the Faculty. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters. The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 30, 2014

The twenty-first meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, April 14, 2014. Present were Professors Corrales, Kingston, Harms, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, Provost Uvin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Martin informed the members that she had just sent an [email](#) to the community announcing the news that Professors López and Lyle McGeoch have agreed to take on central roles within the Office of Student Affairs. Professor López will become the Dean of New Students, and Professor McGeoch will take on the role of Dean of the Class of 2017. The President said that Professors López and McGeoch will begin their three-year terms as Class Deans on July 1, 2014. The Committee congratulated Professor McGeoch and expressed great enthusiasm for Professor López's appointment, as well, agreeing that the appointments are welcome news and excellent choices. President Martin informed the members that Allen Hart, Professor of Psychology, will continue as the Dean for the Class of 2016, and Charri Boykin-East, Senior Associate Dean of Students, will be the Dean for the Class of 2015. While Professor López will remain the Dean of the first-year class during his term, the other Class Deans will "follow" their classes, serving as their cohorts' Dean until the time of their students' graduation.

The Committee asked if the three-year terms of Professors López and McGeoch would be renewable. The Dean said that he expects that they would be, noting that some colleagues in these positions have taken sabbaticals, with the possibility of returning to their roles in the Dean of Students Office upon their return from leave. Professor Harms asked President Martin if she anticipates continuing the model of having more faculty serving in the role of Class Dean. The President said that, if there is sufficient faculty interest in taking on these roles in the future, she would support continuing this model. President Martin noted that some of the responsibilities of the Dean of New Students will shift to staff members in the office so that the position is not so overburdened. An example of such a change will be reducing the amount of responsibility that the Dean of New Students has for the implementation of Orientation. President Martin, the Dean, and the Committee expressed thanks to Pat O'Hara, Amanda and Lisa Cross Professor of Chemistry, for her excellent service as Amherst's Dean of New Students since 2010.

President Martin, referencing the email that she had sent to the Faculty earlier in the day with Keeling Associates' interim report on the area of student affairs attached, informed the members that she would summarize the report at the Faculty Meeting the next day. The members thanked the President for making the report available.

Conversation returned briefly to issues surrounding the place of athletics at the College. President Martin said that she had shared some of the Committee's suggestions (see the Committee's minutes of March 10, March 31, and April 7) at a recent meeting of the New England Small College Athletics Conference (NESCAC) presidents. She reported that there had not been much support initially, but there was recognition that discussion is timely and some changes might be desirable. The presidents had stressed that intensity and competitiveness around athletics begins very early on in many young people's lives; many students, for example, begin focusing on strength and conditioning in middle school. Dialing back on athletics will be changing what students have become used to before they come to college, the presidents noted. They argued that the problem of over-programming and over-professionalizing the lives of the young extends beyond athletics and is a broader cultural trend, rather than being a college-specific phenomenon. President Martin said that she continues to believe that an ad hoc committee should be appointed to study the place of athletics at Amherst, and that recommendations for change may emerge. When considering such suggestions, it will be important to take into account possible repercussions of making significant changes to current practices.

Amended April 30, 2014

Continuing the discussion, Professor Kingston suggested that the College should be willing to act independently of peer institutions in curbing the role of athletics if doing so would enhance the intellectual life of the College and student life in general. In his experience, he has found that many student-athletes at Amherst have difficulty finding the space and time to do all that they would like to do while at college because of the demands athletics places on them. He noted that in his department, fewer majors are doing honors work than previously, and he wonders if athletics is playing a role in this trend. Dean Call noted that the College had conjectured that having more successful athletic programs would draw student-athletes who are stronger academically. It is his sense that this has occurred. While this view is an intuitive one, he suggested that, since the College has now conducted this experiment, it would be useful to evaluate it. What are the costs, for example? As more successful teams go on to post-tournament play, for instance, what is the price that is paid in regard to students' time away from academics? President Martin said that, while she is open to change in the area of the athletics, the implications, which could be significant, must be studied carefully and the trade-offs weighed. It will be important to consider potential effects on various aspects of the College. President Martin commented that the place of athletics is an issue of great significance, noting that it will be essential to involve the trustees in the conversation. Professor Harms remarked on the difficulty that some student-athletes have with making the transition away from team sports, either at the end of their senior year or as juniors or seniors, when other priorities (e.g., honors work) often emerge. She suggested that any changes the College might make to de-emphasize athletics as a part of college life could also play a role in helping students with this inevitable transition.

Professor Schneider expressed frustration that students who have passions in other areas such as the arts are not supported in these endeavors by the College at the same level as student-athletes are. Professor Miller echoed this frustration, noting that she and colleagues have found it challenging to gain access to transportation for field trips for academic purposes, unless a good deal of notice is given that the trip will occur. Adding to this challenge is a lack of larger-capacity vehicles (twelve-person vans) to accommodate field trips with larger numbers of students. In her experience it is often necessary to reserve three or four vehicles for a single trip. She noted that both the Center for Community Engagement (CCE) and the Association of Amherst Students (AAS) have several vehicles outside of the academic motor pool, and wondered whether a single motor pool would be optimal.

The Dean discussed colleagues who might serve on a Memorial Minute Committee for Gerald Brophy, Samuel A. Hitchcock Professor of Mineralogy and Geology, Emeritus, who passed away on April 2, 2014. It was agreed that the Dean should invite Professors Cheney, Crowley, and Harms and Professor Emeritus Belt to serve. The Committee then turned to personnel matters. Provost Uvin left the meeting.

Amended April 30, 2014

The Committee next discussed the possibility of adding the Provost to a small number of faculty committees. The members noted that, to inform the discussion, it had been helpful to learn more from the President about the responsibilities of the Provost. (These duties include promoting diversity, building international programs and partnerships, coordinating strategic planning, advocating for the liberal arts, working to develop programs to link the curricular and cocurricular, and helping to enhance intellectual life and campus vitality.) The Committee had decided at its meeting of April 7 that, given the responsibilities of the Provost position, it does not seem appropriate to add the Provost to the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), though the committee should be encouraged to invite the Provost to attend, when doing so would be helpful. The Dean said that he had thought it might be helpful for the members to receive reports from the CEP and the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) about these committees' experiences having the Provost serve on their committees this year on a trial basis. The Dean noted that in response to his request for this report, Professor Honig had written that Provost Uvin's schedule has prevented him from attending many of the committee's meetings. For this reason, the committee feels that it is too early to come to a definitive conclusion on whether the Provost should become an ex officio member of the CEP. Professor Honig had reported that it is the CEP's sense that the Provost would be a useful member of the committee (ex officio and without vote), given that he knows a lot and will learn more about the College in the years to come. Just as with the Dean of the Faculty, having benefit of the Provost's knowledge would help the CEP make better decisions, Professor Honig had noted. He had commented that there may be downsides to having two powerful administrators on the committee, but the CEP hasn't seen them yet. He recommended that it makes sense to maintain the status quo for another year and then decide the role of the Provost on the Committee. If the Provost will be too busy with his other responsibilities, however, the CEP feels that it would fine with the Provost not being a member. Professor Honig had noted that, if this were to be the case, the Provost could always be invited to meetings. The Dean said that the CPR enthusiastically supports adding the Provost as an ex officio non-voting member of the CPR. The chair of the CPR, Professor Sanchez-Eppler, informed the Dean that the committee feels that having administrators serve on the CPR is very helpful.

The members first considered the possibility of adding the Provost to the College Council. The members discussed the scope and responsibilities of the committee. It was noted that much of the work of the College Council is focused on issues surrounding student life and that some of the business of the committee is administrative and routine. Some members commented that, since the student affairs unit of the College is being reorganized, professionalized, and enhanced, and because the Faculty's time may not be being used most effectively when it comes to some of the business of the College Council, it might make sense to reimagine the charge of the committee. Professor McGeoch commented that the College Council could be envisioned as serving in an advisory role to the Office of Student Affairs, writ large. Professor Kingston wondered whether the committee should be renamed the Committee on Student Affairs. He suggested that the charge be revised to more effectively describe the work of the committee. The Committee noted that the College calendar and the Honor Code fall under the charge of the College Council and seem to be the most prominent areas that require faculty oversight. Professor Schneider commented that the calendar seems to be oddly situated and

Amended April 30, 2014

suggested that the CEP would seem to be a more logical choice to have responsibility for the oversight of this matter. The members wondered how decisions are made about the calendar. The Dean said that the Five-College registrars meet and identify important issues, which are brought to the Dean, who brings recommendations to the College Council. The registrars try to work a year-and-a-half to two years ahead of decision-making, but this timetable has been difficult to achieve. Every three years, the Faculty votes on the calendar proposed by the College Council, and typically the vote may be in the spring, approving a calendar that will begin in just more than a year. Professor Miller suggested appointing an ad hoc committee to consider the calendar, when needed. In this way broad participation in the consideration of the issue could occur. Professor McGeoch expressed the view that the question of the role of the College Council is sufficiently complex that the Committee should not attempt to address this question in the time remaining in this academic year. He suggested that the issue be added to the agenda of next year's Committee of Six. The other members agreed.

Continuing the conversation about adding the Provost to committees, Professor Miller commented that the College Council is not one of the committees on which the Provost served on a trial basis. She expressed the view that the Committee should focus its attention on deciding whether the Provost should become a member of the Committee of Six, the CPR, and the CEP. If any other committee is to be considered, the Health and Safety Committee might be appropriate, Professor Harms said. Professor Miller commented that, given the charge of the Committee of Six and its focus on personnel issues, she wonders why the Provost should be added as a regular member, particularly since it is envisioned that he would not play a role in personnel matters and would not attend meetings in which these matters are discussed. Professor Miller suggested inviting the Provost to relevant meetings, rather than changing the membership of the committee. President Martin said that she feels that the Committee of Six and the CPR are the committees that have roles that intersect most closely with the responsibilities of the Provost, particularly in regard to his planning function and diversity. Professor Schneider suggested that membership on the Committee of Six would inform planning. President Martin said that the Provost's knowledge of major issues would be enriched by serving on the Committee. Professor Harms advocated for making the Provost an ex officio non-voting member of the Committee of Six. Rather than viewing the purpose of adding the Provost to the Committee as a way of having the person in this position contribute to the work of the Committee of Six, she feels that an important reason for making the change would be to ensure that the Provost is present to listen to the Faculty's perspective on important issues. In her view, the Faculty will be well served if another senior member of the administration hears the Committee's best advice regularly. Professor McGeoch agreed. Professor Kingston also agreed, but noted that he would be interested in hearing from Provost Uvin about whether he feels that it has been helpful to attend Committee of Six meetings this year, and what he feels his role on the Committee would be.

President Martin said that, as an engaged and highly curious person, the Provost is always interested in engaging in conversation about important issues facing the College and higher education more generally. During his first year at Amherst, he has found that he has a great deal

Amended April 30, 2014

has much that he cares about, the President said. Provost Uvin has reported that he has learned much from attending meetings of the CEP. He has said that he has no desire to be involved in the personnel matters that are within the purview of the Committee of Six, as participation in this area is outside his role. Continuing, President Martin noted that Provost Uvin has served as the chief diversity officer, with good effect. While his efforts in this area have had the most impact on staff who work on various aspects of diversity, and on students, the incoming Dean of the Faculty has expressed the desire for Provost Uvin to work with her on diversity efforts directed toward faculty. President Martin noted that the Gender and Women's Center (GWC), Multicultural Resource Center (MRC), and Queer Resource Center (QRC), which were part of the Dean of Students Office previously, now report to the Provost. A number of students and staff have expressed their enthusiasm for Provost Uvin's oversight of the centers. President Martin explained that, when the current planning effort concludes, the Provost will continue to have responsibility for planning, thinking strategically about Amherst's future, and helping implement the recommendations that emerge from the current process.

Continuing the conversation about committees, Professor Miller commented that she wishes that the Committee of Six had more time to consider major issues, but often finds that personnel matters leave little time to devote to big questions facing the College. Professor Miller suggested that it might be helpful to split the functions of the Committee of Six, creating a separate tenure and promotion committee. Divorcing the responsibilities of personnel and the work of the executive committee would allow for more sustained focus on college-wide matters, Professor Corrales agreed. At present, the Committee spends so much time on personnel matters in the fall, in particular, that it is difficult to move other business forward to the Faculty during this time, and a backlog of important matters can occur as a result. Professor McGeoch commented that a split of this kind would have to be considered very carefully. Professor Harms expressed the view that the Committee of Six's current structure, while daunting, arises because the members' experience of being immersed in personnel matters gives them a unique and valuable perspective from which to address college-wide issues. The Dean said that he shares this perspective. Another suggestion was to have members of the Committee of Six serve two years on a tenure and promotion committee and, immediately afterward, serve two years on an executive committee that would focus on college-wide matters. No conclusions were reached.

Returning to the question of the committees on which the Provost might serve, the members agreed that they would not bring forward a motion proposing that he serve on the CEP, but encouraged the committee to invite the Provost to attend appropriate discussions. The Committee agreed that next year's Committee of Six should charge the College Council with exploring with the Office of Student Affairs the responsibilities that should be within the purview of the College Council, as the Office of Student Affairs begins to operate under a new structure, with a new Dean of Students and reenvisioned Residential Life arm in place. Any changes to the College Council's charge would require a vote of the Faculty, it was noted. The members decided to propose that the Provost be added to the Committee of Six as an ex officio member without vote, with the stipulation that the Provost would neither attend those portions of meetings during which the Committee discusses reappointment, tenure, and promotion cases or related procedures, nor play a role in the decision-making about these matters. The Committee also agreed to propose that the Provost be added to the CPR as an ex officio member without vote. The Committee voted six in favor and zero opposed on the substance of the two motions to revise the *Faculty Handbook* to reflect these changes, and six in favor and zero opposed to forward the motions to the Faculty.

Amended April 30, 2014

The members next discussed a [proposal to convert the Environmental Studies Program into the Department of Environmental Studies](#), noting that [the CEP](#) and [the CPR](#) have endorsed this change. While most members supported the proposal, others raised concerns. These apprehensions focused more on the process of decision-making that should be used to create new programs and departments and to shape the growth of the College—including the ways in which scarce resources are most effectively allocated—and less on the details of the Environmental Studies proposal itself.

Professor Harms led off the discussion by asking the Dean about the process used when a faculty member requests to shift part of his or her appointment to another department. Dean Call responded that the faculty member is asked to write a letter to the Dean requesting the change. The Dean shares the letter with both departments and the CEP. If there are no objections to the request, the Dean will typically grant it. If the Environmental Studies Program becomes a department, how would the tenure cases of current untenured faculty who teach courses in the Environmental Program be considered, Professor Harms asked. Dean Call said that an agreement has already been made that the current departments of these untenured colleagues would be responsible for preparing their tenure cases, with input from colleagues associated with the Environmental Studies program. The agreement would remain the same if a Department of Environmental Studies were established. If granted tenure, these colleagues could request to move a fraction or all of their FTE to the new department if they wish to do so. Professor Schneider, noting that some colleagues have agreed to move one quarter of their FTE to the Department of Environmental Studies, should the proposal for the department be approved, asked how binding such commitments are. The Dean said that the CEP and he feel that colleagues who are department members should at least be fractionally in the department, and that the contributions of these faculty would be recognized in this way. The fraction assigned represents an approximation of the colleague's time, as the number of courses that individuals teach within the new department may vary from year to year. Professor Miller noted that colleagues are contributing at least this amount of time to the program now; moving a fraction of their FTEs will at least offer some recognition of their commitment to Environmental Studies. Having fractions of FTEs would also serve to bind the individuals who run the department together, in her view. Professor Miller noted that FTEs, or a portion of them, cannot be allocated to Environmental Studies under the present structure, because it is a program. Creating a department would allow for full or joint appointments. Professor Corrales expressed the view that such appointments could lead to floating and fractured allegiances. He wondered why it makes more sense to create yet another small department in a small college, rather than strengthening existing departments, in this case, by approving more Environmental Studies-related appointments, as needed. He would prefer an approach that would bring environmental studies into the curriculum by fortifying existing departments with new FTEs.

Continuing with the conversation, Professor Harms noted that Professor Dizard has been the mainstay of the Environmental Studies Program for years, and that his retirement will leave a void. She said that she would support the creation of a department in the hope that one or two

Amended April 30, 2014

fully committed FTEs could then be allocated to Environmental Studies and become a center of what would otherwise be a fractured group. In her view, it will be harder to sustain a vision and a plan for Environmental Studies at the College without such a center. Professor Corrales said that creating additional micro departments does not seem like the best approach for a small college. He favors bolstering existing departments, as he mentioned earlier. Professor Miller advocated for forming a Department of Environmental Studies, noting that departmental status would facilitate long-term planning and better serve students in terms of course coverage in this broad field. If the College recognizes this area of study as a priority, it should be supported as such, she noted. Professor Harms said that she sees the environment as the pivotal issue of this generation. Without the commitment to Environmental Studies that a department demonstrates, the College will lose excellent students who wish to focus in this area. Environmental Studies is also attractive for its interdisciplinarity; it brings many disciplines together to consider a problem and how to solve it. She views this area as an exceptionally important case that deserves special consideration, despite understandable concerns about the proliferation of departments at Amherst.

Turning to the broader question of the process that should be used to consider how the College should grow, some members noted that the CEP, and perhaps the Provost, as part of his planning function, should play a central role. Professor Schneider asked President Martin for her views. The President said that she has some concern about adding departments because of the problem of having more departments vying for what are limited resources. She agrees that Environmental Studies is a particularly important case and recognizes that the program already has many of the resources that it would need to function as a department. At the same time, she feels strongly that the College needs to develop some mechanisms for deciding about its priorities and should set a strategic direction for growth. Professor Harms agreed and said that the College needs to consider that some departments are reducing and some are expanding. The members then voted four in favor and zero opposed, with two abstentions, on the substance of the motion to propose a Department of Environmental Studies, and six in favor and zero opposed to forward the motion to the Faculty.

Conversation returned briefly to the issue of attendance and voting at Faculty Meetings. The members decided that further conversation is needed before moving forward with a proposal. President Martin said that she sees a compelling argument for having some portion of the meetings with only the Faculty present, as she feels that she would be able to be more open about certain issues under such a structure.

The Committee turned to personnel matters. The members next 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 meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended May 1, 2014

The twenty-second meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, April 21, 2014. Present were Professors Corrales, Kingston, Harms, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, Provost Uvin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Martin informed the members that, after becoming aware of Professor Miller's frustration with the process that is used for allocating College vehicles for academic use, she had consulted with Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services. Professor Miller had previously informed the President that the biology department, which does not have vehicles (unlike the Department of Geology, which maintains two vans), struggles to obtain vehicles to transport students to the field as part of class trips. Frequently, the department must rent vehicles from outside the College or borrow the geology department's vans because there are an insufficient number of vehicles available through the facilities department's van pool, for example. Professor Miller had noted that student groups and the Center for Community Engagement (CCE) have their own vans. She conjectures that the athletics department most likely has vans. (The President said that she has learned that athletics rents some vans for the academic year and crew season and rents Peter Pan buses). Professor Miller had suggested that the College needs a few larger vehicles that are regularly available for academic use. Given the course sizes in the Department of Biology, she had noted, having vans would simplify arrangements for field trips and would mean that instructors need only to take one or two vans instead of four vehicles per section.

President Martin informed the Committee that Mr. Brassord has recommended that a thorough analysis of use patterns and a needs assessment should be conducted to determine if there is a need for a change in practices and the best path to take in regard to this issue. Three potential paths were suggested:

- Maintain the status quo
- Increase the size of the College fleet
- Better utilize rental and lease options that are available locally

Continuing, President Martin noted that, to make renting easier, Mr. Brassord has suggested that a general College account be created with Enterprise and Potters. In that way, departments could simply ask that rentals be charged to Amherst's account, without having to do a lot of paperwork. Professor Schneider noted that students cannot drive rental vehicles, but can drive College vehicles, and the members wondered whether the insurance that permits students to drive College vehicles could be extended to rental vehicles. Professor Harms commented that Potters does not deliver and requires that vehicles be dropped off at times that are quite inconvenient and result in faculty members having to spend a good deal of additional time on the rental process. Dean Call suggested reviewing the records of van usage over the last couple of years and tracking the usage of vehicles over the next year to inform decision-making about the best course for the future—purchasing vans, renting them or a combination of both. There may be a need for separate fleets for different uses, he commented, but at the very least better coordination of resources may help. President Martin noted that having a College point person for rentals would make the process easier for faculty.

Amended May 1, 2014

She suggested that, at times, it might be helpful to rent a bus, depending on the size of the group and the needs. It was noted that buses are quite expensive to rent. President Martin said that she would continue to work with Mr. Brassord to develop solutions for the issues that had been raised. The President commented that Dean Call has informed her that his office makes funding available to faculty to support field trips.

Under “Announcements from the Dean,” Dean Call noted that a colleague has requested that future Committee of Six ballots include the titles and departments of those on the ballot. After a brief discussion, the members agreed to include the departments of colleagues on the ballot. Continuing his announcements, the Dean informed the members that he has received a proposal from the Library Committee regarding the allocation of faculty carrels (see [cover letter from the Library Committee](#) and [the proposal](#)). He said that he would share the proposal with the Committee and the Faculty, and would include a discussion of the proposal on the Committee’s agenda for its meeting on May 5.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Harms noted that, at the Faculty Meeting on April 15, time had not permitted a full discussion of the new structure envisioned for the Office of Student Affairs. She expressed the view that it would be helpful for President Martin to offer clarification on the revised responsibilities envisioned for the Dean of Students and the reporting structure of the Office of Student Affairs, specifically in regard to the Dean of Students and the Class Deans. President Martin said that the Dean of Students and the Class Deans would report to the Chief Student Affairs Officer. The Class Deans would not report to the Dean of Students. Professor Harms thanked the President and noted that, in her view, the Faculty would feel uncomfortable having the Class Deans report to the newly envisioned position of Dean of Students. She said that she was pleased to learn that there is no intention to establish such a structure, but since this represents a significant change from the past reporting structure, she thought it would be useful to bring this to the attention of the Faculty at the next Faculty Meeting. Referencing the April 15 Faculty Meeting discussion about plans to require training on the Faculty’s responsibilities as mandated reporters, Professor Harms suggested that the Committee of Six and the Faculty endorse the proposal that the Faculty undertake whatever training is necessary. The Faculty could then be asked to vote on this endorsement. The Committee noted that votes at Faculty Meetings are binding on all Faculty. President Martin commented that this seems to be an excellent approach. She noted for the Committee’s information that, according to the College’s legal counsel, training is not required by law, but it is expected by the Department of Education (DOE), which is charged with interpreting and enforcing the law. The President explained that all public and private elementary and secondary schools, colleges, and universities receiving federal funds must comply with Title IX or risk the DOE revoking the institution’s federal funding. To assist schools, the DOE issues guidance documentation about how the department determines whether schools are complying with their legal obligations. In accord with this guidance, the DOE requires all employees who are likely to witness or receive reports of sexual violence, including professors, to receive training. Professor Kingston said that he did not believe the Faculty should be asked to vote on whether to comply with legal obligations. Most Committee members felt that it would be helpful, as a matter of self-governance, for the Faculty to endorse making the training a requirement. The Committee expressed

Amended May 1, 2014

confidence that the Faculty would recognize the importance of doing so. Provost Uvin left the meeting.

Continuing with “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Schneider informed the President that the City Streets Street Fair, a College event that would begin at 7:00 P.M., in just a matter of hours, in fact, had created a conflict for students who have musical rehearsals during this time period. Music students and faculty felt somewhat blindsided, as not much notice had been given about the fair in advance, he said. Professor Schneider said that, while he recognizes that having some conflicts is unavoidable, he asked if it might be possible for the organizers of this event to check with the music department in the future before setting a time and date for this and other events like it. President Martin said that she would share these concerns with Pat Allen, the College’s Director of Conferences and Special Events.

Continuing with “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Miller commented that she had found the conversation led by Professor Basu, Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee on The Internationalization of Liberal Arts Education, at the April 15 Faculty Meeting to be productive and helpful to her in terms learning about the challenges of language study. She noted, however, that during the discussion language study and study abroad were tied very closely together. While clear that this is often the case, she commented that study abroad in the absence of language study can also provide terrific opportunities for students. Professor Kingston agreed. As part of the planning regarding internationalization, he suggested that the College consider bringing international students to Amherst for a study-abroad experience in the junior year, as their presence would enrich Amherst classes.

Professor Miller next asked about the timetable for the ongoing benchmarking survey of staff classification and compensation. President Martin said that the process for determining position responsibilities for the survey, and the schedule for completing it, is being reimagined. In the newly envisioned process, less of a burden will be placed on supervisors, she noted.

Continuing with “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor McGeoch asked if the Orientation Committee had offered feedback on the Committee of Six’s motion to revise the charge of the committee. The Dean said that he had not received a response. (The Orientation Committee later wrote to the Dean and requested to meet with the Committee of Six. The members agreed to meet with the committee on May 5 and to postpone bringing a motion to the Faculty about the committee, until they had heard the views of the Orientation Committee.) Professor McGeoch expressed the view that the Committee would benefit from gaining feedback from the Orientation Committee. As a general matter, and in regard to the motions that would be brought to the Faculty to add the Provost to some faculty committees, Professor Harms reiterated her view that that having the Provost better integrated into the work of the Faculty—and in this way hearing from the Faculty on a range of issues—would serve the Faculty well. She suggested that, as Professor Rosbottom had recommended at the April 15 Faculty Meeting, it would be a good idea to add “Remarks from the Provost” as a regular item on the Faculty Meeting agenda in the future. In this way, the Provost would also be sharing information with the Faculty with regularity. The other members agreed.

Professor Kingston, noting that only he and Professor Corrales would be continuing on the Committee next year, asked whether it would be helpful to extend an invitation to Catherine Epstein, incoming Dean of the Faculty, to meet with the outgoing Committee of Six before she becomes

Amended May 1, 2014

Dean and Secretary of the Committee. The members agreed that the Professor Epstein should feel welcome to meet with the Committee at any time. Professor Harms noted that Associate Dean Cheney will prove to be an excellent resource for Professor Epstein, as he has amassed a great deal of experience through his extensive service on the Committee of Six.

The Committee turned to a personnel matter.

Discussion returned briefly to the issue of attendance and voting at Faculty Meetings. The Committee agreed that, with the end of the academic year quickly approaching, there would not be sufficient time to make progress on this issue, and that there seems to be no urgency to addressing this question. The members decided that the best course might be to provide a framework for discussion for the Committee of Six next year. Professor Harms noted that, while there is no crisis, it would be helpful to know why some faculty members have not been attending the meetings. She feels that the exploration of the procedures for attendance and voting might prompt some answers to this question. Professor Schneider noted that, in the past, the Dean at times has sent a letter reminding members of the Faculty that it is their right and responsibility to attend Faculty Meetings. Dean Call said that he believes that at some point that predates his tenure in his position, there had been a concern that some faculty members were not attending Faculty Meetings on a regular basis. He has not had the sense more recently that this has been the case. The members asked if a discussion about faculty governance and the importance of attending Faculty Meetings are part of the orientation for new faculty. The Dean said that new faculty are told that it is their right and responsibility to attend Faculty Meetings. More emphasis could be placed on explaining the role of faculty governance at the College and the purpose of Faculty Meetings, he noted. The members briefly returned to the idea of having executive sessions of Faculty Meetings, which would be for members of the Faculty only and which would be informational in nature. The members felt that, under the current procedures, it does not appear that such a format would be prohibited, and that it could prove beneficial to have it available as an option. The President agreed, commenting that, for particular issues at certain times, having an executive session with the Faculty would allow her to feel more comfortable sharing information.

The members next reviewed a draft Faculty Meeting agenda for a May 6 meeting and voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward it to the Faculty. The members then reviewed draft letters to candidates and chairs regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion and suggested some revisions. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended May 20, 2014

The twenty-third meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, May 5, 2014. Present were Professors Corrales, Kingston, Harms, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Provost Uvin was absent.

The meeting began with President Martin seeking the Committee's advice about a format and timetable for announcing the Board of Trustees' decision to reaffirm the *1984 Trustees' Resolution on Fraternities* and, effective July 1, 2014, to prohibit student participation in fraternities and sororities and fraternity-like and sorority-like organizations, either on or off campus. She noted that one of the recommendations of the Special Oversight Committee on Sexual Misconduct (SMOC) last year had been that the Board of Trustees "should comprehensively visit the issue of whether underground fraternities should be permitted to influence the social life of Amherst students." After some discussion about the options, and their advantages and disadvantages, the Committee recommended that Cullen Murphy '74, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, send an email to students, faculty, and staff the next day, May 6. (See [email](#) and [attached resolution](#) later sent.) It was noted that Mr. Murphy and Trustee Andrew Nussbaum '85 would be on campus on Monday, May 12, to answer questions from 6:30 P.M. to 8 P.M. in Cole Assembly Room. The members asked the President for an estimate of the number of Amherst students who are members of off-campus fraternities. President Martin said that, while the College cannot be certain of the precise number, the estimate is that eighty to ninety students are members of underground fraternities, of which there are three. She commented that [the Student Handbook lists violation of the Trustees' Resolution on Fraternities as an example of a violation of the Honor Code](#). The College Council Statement on the Fraternity Policy and the *Trustees' Resolution on Fraternities* are also included in the [Student Handbook](#). The Board has decided to reinforce its previous decision in regard to fraternities, in light of the practices of the organizations. President Martin noted that she has become aware of two other secret, exclusive student societies—the Scarabs, which is said to be focused primarily on drinking, and the Emily Dickinson Society, the emphasis of which is intellectual.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the members that the Committee's May 12 meeting would be the last for this academic year. He provided an update regarding the Committee's request this fall that the Office of the Dean of Students (now known as the Office of Student Affairs) provide recommendations to the Committee of Six concerning first-year advising (see the Committee of Six minutes of September 16, 2013). The Dean said that he had recently inquired about the status of this request. Suzanne Coffey, Chief Student Affairs Officer, had responded that, due to the challenges in the area of student life this year and transitions within the Office of the Dean of Students, more time will be needed to focus on the question of advising. She and her staff will have discussions over the summer and offer recommendations to the Committee in the fall of 2014. The Dean next reported that the Association of Amherst Students (AAS) had informed him that Professor Poe would receive the AAS's teaching award this year. He asked the members if an announcement of this award should be made at the May 6 Faculty Meeting, and it was agreed that the Dean should inform the Faculty of the honor at the Faculty Meeting.

Turning to a brief discussion of the coming Faculty Meeting, the Dean informed the Committee that a colleague had made a request for information about the reporting lines of the Provost. At the Committee's request, and in anticipation of the votes that would be taken at the Faculty Meeting on adding the Provost to some faculty committees, President Martin said that she would review the portfolio of responsibilities of the Provost and the positions that report to him at the Faculty Meeting, as a prelude to the discussion and motions. She reiterated that the

Amended May 20, 2014

Provost's key responsibilities remain what was anticipated when he was appointed—planning, diversity and community, and initiatives that require coordination among offices for faculty, staff, and students. In addition, the Provost has responsibility for initiatives that involve partnerships with communities outside the College. For that reason, the Center for Community Engagement (CCE) reports to the Provost, and he will be given responsibility for overseeing the College's relations with the Emily Dickinson Museum and the Folger Shakespeare Library. The Dean noted that a member of the Faculty had asked that the votes on adding the Provost as an *ex officio* member of the Committee of Six (with the stipulation that the Provost would neither attend discussions of reappointment, tenure, and promotion cases or related procedures, nor play a role in the decisions made about these matters) and the Committee on Priorities and Resources be taken with paper ballots. The members agreed to this request.

Much of the remainder of the meeting was dedicated to a discussion with members (Pat O'Hara, Dean of New Students, the committee's chair; Professors van den Berg and Reyes; Susie Mitton Shannon, Interim Assistant Dean of Student Conduct; and students Siraj Sindhu '17, Liya Rechtman '14, and Christian Aviles '14) of the Orientation Committee, who joined the Committee of Six at 4:00 P.M. Dean O'Hara said that prior commitments had prevented Orientation Committee members Torin Moore, Assistant Dean of Students and Director of Residential Life, and Denise McGoldrick, Assistant Dean of Students and Director of Health Education, from attending the meeting.

The Dean thanked the members of the Orientation Committee for meeting with the Committee of Six. Dean O'Hara, who chairs the Orientation Committee, expressed her gratitude to the Committee for making time in its schedule to speak with the Orientation Committee. She thanked the Committee of Six for waiting to bring a motion before the Faculty to revise the charge and membership of the Orientation Committee until after a conversation could take place between the two committees. Dean O'Hara reminded the Committee that the Orientation Committee had made a proposal (see [cover note](#) and [proposal](#)) to revise the committee's [current charge and membership](#) (*Faculty Handbook IV., S, 1., q*), which had been shared with the Committee of Six in March. (See the Committee of Six minutes of November 4, 2013, February 3, 2014, February 24, 2014, March 3, 2014, March 10, 2014, March 31, 2014, April 7, 2014, and April 21, 2014 for previous discussions relating to Orientation.) The Committee of Six had reviewed that proposal, and had drafted new *Faculty Handbook* language to revise the charge and membership of the Orientation Committee, agreeing to bring the motion below to the Faculty:

q. *The Orientation Committee.* The Orientation Committee consists of four members of the Office of Student Affairs, including the Dean of New Students, *ex officio*, who serves as the committee's chair; two other members of the Faculty; the Provost (or his or her representative), who serves *ex officio*; and four students (two students selected by the student government and two selected by the Office of Student Affairs). The faculty members of the committee are appointed by the Committee of Six. The faculty and student members of the committee normally serve two-year terms. The Orientation Committee acts in an advisory capacity to the Office of Student Affairs, which is charged with planning and administering orientation for new students and ongoing orientation programs. The committee approaches its work through broad consultation, drawing on the expertise of members of the

Amended May 20, 2014

Amherst College community. The role of the committee is to help develop and review the vision, policies, and programming of orientation, giving special attention to academic, social, and regulatory expectations for this experience.

With its proposed changes, the members had sought to indicate that the Orientation Committee advises the Office of Student Affairs, particularly since it has become clear that responsibility for implementing Orientation should not rest with the Dean of New Students and because the committee should not be advisory to its own chair. The members had thought that it would be helpful to add the Provost or his representative to the committee as an ex officio non-voting member because it was felt that the Provost's role in the area of diversity and in other relevant areas of campus life would enable him to inform the work of the committee in valuable and important ways. The members had also come to the conclusion that planning and administering Orientation should be the responsibility of the staff of the Office of Student Affairs. Dean O'Hara said that the Orientation Committee supports the charge, as formulated by the Committee of Six. The Committee of Six had agreed that the charge should be less specific than that proposed by the Orientation Committee in regard to naming titles of staff who will serve on the Orientation Committee in order to have more flexibility as needs change. The members had decided that it would be preferable to have a mixed model for selecting students, and that the Orientation Committee should approach its work through broad consultation, drawing on the expertise of members of the Amherst College community and being as inclusive as possible. In the Committee's view, the role of the Orientation Committee should be to help develop and review the vision, policies, and programming of Orientation, giving special attention to academic, social, and regulatory expectations for this experience. The Committee had drafted its motion with these ideas in mind.

Dean O'Hara said that the Orientation Committee supports the Committee of Six's motion as a whole, with one concern about the proposed membership of the committee. She commented that, while determining the best make-up for the committee is important, it has long been the practice of the Orientation Committee to invite many others within the College community to be "at the table" during discussions about vision and planning. The Orientation Committee recommends that the position of Provost not be added to the committee as a member, but that the Provost be invited to attend meetings of the Orientation Committee, as needed. Dean O'Hara noted that the planning for the fall 2014 Orientation has been atypical, in that the Provost not the Dean of New Students, played a central role. Professor Reyes expressed concern about the Provost's role in the planning of Orientation and Provost Uvin's participation at meetings of the Orientation Committee. Background discussion by the Committee of Six that led to putting the Orientation Committee on hiatus and charging the Provost to revise the 2014 Orientation are contained in the Committee of Six minutes referenced earlier in these minutes. Additional discussion about the response of the Committee of Six to Professor Reyes's concerns can also be found in these minutes.

With a new Dean of New Students now in place and the finishing touches being put on the planning for this fall's Orientation, the Orientation Committee said that it feels that the Provost's role in what is essentially a student life activity should now recede, with the locus of governance for Orientation returning to the Office of Student Affairs. Dean O'Hara expressed the committee's view that it makes sense for the Provost to be added to the Committee of Six and the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR), given the emphases of his responsibilities and

Amended May 20, 2014

that they cut across many areas of the College, and given the overarching work of these two committees. Professor Harms argued that, since Orientation is an overarching, multi-faceted project for the College, it would be helpful to have the Provost, who is responsible for considering the future of Amherst in overarching ways, in the room, so to speak, listening, and involved. The Orientation Committee expressed the view that some of its efforts to work in a consultative manner have been inhibited as a result of the leadership role played by the Provost this year. In future, it will be difficult for the Dean of New Students and the Chief Student Affairs Officer to assume leadership roles if the Provost is a part of the committee, the members of the Orientation Committee argued.

Continuing, Professor Reyes commented that the Orientation Committee is a “non-marquee” committee and wondered why it had been singled out as one on which the Provost should serve. After reviewing the list of faculty committees, she had noted that a significant number of committees focus on areas that overlap with some of the Provost’s responsibilities, but that the current proposal is to add him to two major faculty committees and the Orientation Committee only. Professor Miller observed, as had Dean O’Hara, that the ways in which planning Orientation had been conducted this year were anomalous and due to unusual circumstances. The Provost had been given a charge to reimagine Orientation, the Orientation Committee had been on hiatus this fall, and the Provost had been making recommendations based on the efforts of his working group. Professor Miller wondered if the Orientation Committee feels that the dynamics of the relationships among committee members would change in the future, given that the roles of the members and that the work would begin anew. Ms. Rechtman expressed the view that, while the student and faculty members of the Orientation Committee are accountable to their peers and the Faculty, respectively, and filter their opinions through their constituencies, the Provost does not have similar ties to stakeholders “on the ground.” Instead, she argued, he is tied to the President and the Committee of Six. Ms. Rechtman commented that the ways in which decisions have been made this year are not practical or workable for building effective Orientation programs.

Professor Harms disagreed with the opinion articulated by the Orientation Committee, offering the example of the ways in which the Faculty Committee on Financial Aid (FCAFA) operates as an analogous situation. The faculty members of the committee do not do admission work, she pointed out. Instead, they are responsible for monitoring the admission process to make sure it is operating as the Faculty feels it should. The Orientation Committee’s role should also focus on oversight. Just as it is important to have the Dean of Admission and Financial Aid present to hear what is being said as part of the FCAFA’s deliberations, it would be important, Professor Harms said, for the Provost to be present during the Orientation Committee’s conversations. Doing so, would enable him to hear from those in the Office of Student Affairs what Orientation should be accomplishing and to contribute to the committee’s efforts. The meetings are important moments of communication, in Professor Harms’s view. Concerns may be expressed, and the best ways to move forward can be communicated. The Orientation Committee agreed that its role is one of oversight and monitoring, not doing the detail work of Orientation, but providing feedback to the Office of Student Affairs. Given its experience of the past year, it believed this task could be accomplished most productively by inviting the Provost to attend meetings when necessary, not as a standing member.

Continuing, Professor Corrales asked if the proposed status of the Provost—as an ex officio non-voting member—might solve the problem by ensuring that the Provost acts as a source and recipient of information rather than a decision-maker. Dean O’Hara pointed out that the Orientation Committee rarely votes. The committee’s practice has been to work toward

Amended May 20, 2014

consensus through dialogue. Voting is not germane. President Martin said that negotiating with constituencies and arriving at consensus should not obscure the ultimate goal of designing and implementing an Orientation that will meet students' needs.

Dean O'Hara noted that reducing the number of days of Orientation, combining events and streamlining, should be a priority. While one of the goals for the coming Orientation had been to shorten it, this objective has not been met, as the Provost himself has noted. Professor Kingston said that, going forward, it will be important for the committee to spend less time "in the weeds" and more time considering how best to integrate students into the community. Ms. Mitton Shannon commented that there is a tremendous need for a professional with experience to serve full time as the Director of First-Year Orientation. Such a person would be aware of best practices, would attend professional conferences, and could aid the committee by helping it be more playful in its work. The director could also relieve the Dean of New Students of the burden of the day-to-day responsibilities surrounding Orientation. Professor Schneider said that he feels that too much is being asked right now of the Dean of New Students and that the current model for planning and implementing Orientation is not sustainable. Dean O'Hara said that she has been discussing with the Chief Student Affairs Officer ways of redistributing some of the responsibilities of the position of Dean of New Students. Dean Call said that his own first-year experience as the Dean of New Students, which had been sixteen years ago, had taught him that shortening Orientation would be a serious challenge because of the investment that all of the stakeholders have in their events. It will be necessary to bring the stakeholders together in order for the effort to succeed, in his view. It was agreed that the Orientation Committee will need help with doing that. Some members of the Committee suggested that the Provost could provide such assistance by bringing constituencies together, some of which report to him.

Dean O'Hara commented that it had been necessary for Orientation to be reimagined and that the programming has been enriched through Provost Uvin's efforts. She appreciated the decision to have a senior member of the administration take on this project for this year, but the normal operation of the committee should now resume. At the moment, Orientation is an amalgam of the new and the old, and future efforts should focus on refining the program, which should be the job of the Office of Student Affairs, in her view. Professor McGeoch agreed. Continuing, Dean O'Hara commented that the envisioned Director of Orientation, who would have the responsibilities and expertise described by Ms. Mitton Shannon, could weave together the many ideas that have emerged. Ms. Rechtman noted that the Orientation Committee has not simply been involved in minutia surrounding scheduling, but in policy questions. She offered as an example consideration this year of whether those who are over twenty-one and are providing staffing support during Orientation should be permitted to consume alcohol. The Provost and the Orientation Committee had agreed that, rather than having all student workers sign a pledge that they would not consume alcohol during Orientation (as happened in 2013), they would be reminded that the Honor Code governs their behavior during Orientation as it does at other times of the year. However, it was not clear that this was the message delivered during the actual training sessions led by the Provost.

Continuing, Ms. Rechtman noted that the Orientation Committee had also considered the requirements for participation in programming that should be placed on first-year athletes during Orientation. Provost Uvin's working group had suggested that first-year student-athletes be required to attend all Orientation events, with the exception that the first-year athletes be permitted to train during a two-and-a-half-day period of Orientation when other students participate in trips and related programming (First-Year Outdoor Orientation Trips, a.k.a., FOOT, Community Engagement Orientation Trip, a.k.a., CEOT, etc.). This would be a change

Amended May 20, 2014

from previous years when first-year athletes were required to attend only the events designated as mandatory for all first-year students. Professor Reyes and some of the student members of the committee had expressed the view earlier that student-athletes should participate in the entire Orientation program and should not be excused from any programming, including the two-and-a-half days during which various programs take place. The Orientation Committee had voted unanimously to recommend that first-year athletes should participate for at least half a day, each day, in Orientation trips and related programming. Further conversation about this issue is expected. In this way, athletes would be integrated into all Orientation programming, which would be consistent with the emphasis being placed on community-building. Captain's practices, in their view, should not be held during Orientation, and this recommendation has been implemented.

Dean O'Hara and Professor Reyes commented that the Orientation Committee works best when it shapes the programming in a collaborative fashion from the ground up, rather than developing counter-proposals, a structure that has emerged this year. Professor Harms reiterated her view that it will be important to have the Provost as part of the committee so that he would be available to listen to plans and the arguments for them. In her view, it seems best to move beyond the challenges of this year, which took place under anomalous conditions, and to work with the Provost under the newly proposed structure. President Martin asked the Orientation Committee what the vision is for the next Orientation and what messages will be conveyed to students as part of the program. The President noted that student evaluations of past iterations of Orientation have been quite negative, and that it is critical that changes be made to create a program that will be successful on all fronts. Determining what the College is trying to achieve with Orientation should be paramount, and clarifying and implementing the best ways to introduce new students to Amherst should be the goal.

Mr. Sindhu agreed and said that, in his experience, Orientation events fall into three categories—logistical events that help students with practical matters such as establishing their Amherst email accounts, events that seek to inform students about matters relating to diversity and sexual respect, and events that focus on academics. It is important that some Orientation events in the second category be focused on health and safety, helping students become acclimated to academics and everything else—from clubs to athletics. Professor Reyes and Mr. Aviles stressed that the theme of Orientation is trust, community, and respect. Professor Reyes said that planning is moving in the right direction, with more emphasis being placed on academics, while also addressing the shifting policy and regulatory climate. President Martin and Professor Reyes agreed that the regulatory environment has become more and more complex and that the composition of the Orientation Committee must include decision-makers with the specialized expertise that is needed to evaluate plans as they are developed, and not merely offer advice. President Martin mentioned the Chief Policy Officer/General Counsel, or his or her representative (one of whom is the Title IX Coordinator), as an example of such a colleague.

President Martin asked the committee about the status of planning for the fall Orientation. Professor Reyes remarked that, while she believes a plan is in place and has seen drafts, the Orientation Committee members did not necessarily know exactly what was going to happen because the Provost was still actively shaping the program. Professor Reyes said that she herself does not feel that she is in a position to say what would happen in Orientation since she had only partial information. Some members commented that the planning of events has been ad hoc and that there is a need to examine the programming in a comprehensive way.

Amended May 20, 2014

Dean O'Hara agreed, while praising the work that the Provost has done to bring disparate constituencies together. This year's Orientation, through his efforts, will have more events geared toward "intersectional identities" and the ways in which diversity intersects with opportunities at Amherst. A focus will be on the ways in which one exists in a diverse community and on encouraging students to see the idea of identity in more nuanced ways. Consistent with this emphasis, renowned social psychologist Claude Steele has been chosen to deliver this year's DeMott Lecture. Dean O'Hara noted that the Provost has created some Orientation events that are simply designed to be fun and have no agenda. Another change has been to weave discussions about sexual respect throughout the Orientation program. The Committee thanked the members of the Orientation Committee, which left the meeting at 5:30 P.M.

The members discussed the structural and interpersonal challenges that the Orientation Committee has faced this year and the lack of trust that has developed during what has clearly been a challenging time. It was noted that the Provost had been asked to step in to re-envision Orientation and to oversee its planning this year because of a series of transitions and challenges and because Dean O'Hara had made it clear that the demands of her position as Dean of New Students would not allow her to assume responsibility for re-imagining Orientation. Taking this step had been necessary under the circumstances, and the members of the Committee, the President, and the Dean noted their gratitude for the important work the Provost had done. The members expressed the view that now that the Office of Student Affairs has new leadership and pressures have been alleviated, the responsibility for developing and planning Orientation—with significant input from the Faculty in regard to the vision and oversight of the program—should rest in the Office of Student Affairs. While the Provost would contribute valuable perspectives, particularly in the realm of diversity, planning, and policy, at the level of structure, most members felt that the responsibilities of his position do not seem to fit with permanent membership on the committee. Most members agreed that, as the Orientation Committee had suggested, it would be best for the Provost to be invited to meetings of the Orientation Committee, as needed. Professor Harms said that she continues to believe that the Provost would be an asset to the committee as a regular member, in particular, to help with the difficult decisions that will need to be made in order to shorten Orientation in the future, a change that all parties seem to prioritize.

The Committee agreed that some director of Orientation is needed, and that the student life professional who fulfills this role would relieve the Orientation of a great deal of the burden of implementation, allowing the committee to focus on the vision and oversight of the program. In addition, since the complexities surrounding Orientation have increased, particularly in the regulatory realm and in educating students about sexual respect, it would be helpful if the Chief Policy Officer/General Counsel, or his or her representative (perhaps the Title IX Officer) were added to the Orientation Committee. The members voted six in favor and zero opposed on the substance of the motion below and six in favor and zero opposed to forward the motion to the Faculty:

q. *The Orientation Committee.* The Orientation Committee consists of four members of the Office of Student Affairs, including the Dean of New Students, *ex officio*, who serves as the committee's chair; two other members of the Faculty; the Chief Policy Officer/General Counsel (or his or her representative), *ex officio*; and

Amended May 20, 2014

four students (two students selected by the student government and two selected by the Office of Student Affairs). The faculty members of the committee are appointed by the Committee of Six. The faculty and student members of the committee normally serve two-year terms. The Orientation Committee acts in an advisory capacity to the Office of Student Affairs, which is charged with planning and administering orientation for new students and ongoing orientation programs. The committee approaches its work through broad consultation, drawing on the expertise of members of the Amherst College community. The role of the committee is to help develop and review the vision, policies, and programming of orientation, giving special attention to academic, social, and regulatory expectations for this experience.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended June 10, 2014

The twenty-fourth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2013-2014 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, May 12, 2014. Present were Professors Corrales (who attended via speaker phone), Kingston, Harms, Lyle McGeoch, Miller, and Schneider, Dean Call, Provost Uvin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Much of the meeting was devoted to regular business of this time of year. The members reviewed the nomination from the Department of Physical Education and Athletics for the Edward Hitchcock Fellowship and voted unanimously to support the awarding of the fellowship to the nominee and to forward the nomination to the Faculty. The Committee also reviewed three proposals for Senior Sabbatical Fellowships and agreed that they should be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Miller said that, during a recent meeting of the chairs of science departments, there had been a discussion about lengthening Interterm. It had generally been agreed that abbreviating Interterm has had a negative impact on faculty productivity, student research, and also some laboratory courses. Professor Harms commented that, in her recollection, last year's Committee of Six had asked the College Council to gather data on the impact of shortening Interterm. She noted that the Amherst Faculty had been opposed to shortening Interterm, but had acquiesced to the change in the spirit of Five-College cooperation. It was noted that the calendars of the schools are not in sync, in any case, with Amherst in the middle between UMass and Smith in terms of conformity with other calendars. While Smith had initially agreed to change its calendar to match the UMass one, and the Amherst Faculty had made its decision with this knowledge in mind, Smith had ultimately decided not to do so. Dean Call said that he would check with the College Council about gathering data on the impact of the shortening of Interterm and would ask that the Council report to the Committee of Six. Professor Miller next thanked President Martin for facilitating the creation of the report on the process that is used for allocating College vehicles for academic use, which Mr. Brassord, Chief of Campus Operations, had provided. Professor Miller noted that she has shared the report with her colleagues and replied directly to Mr. Brassord with thoughts about improving access to College vehicles.

The members turned to a conversation about the theses and transcripts of students who had been 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 noted that the Committee had also been asked to review 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 honors guidelines. After discussing the merits of the theses, the members voted unanimously to forward the recommendations to the Faculty and offered high praise for the quality of the work done by this accomplished group of students. Professor Harms, while agreeing that the theses are outstanding, commented on the "narrowness" of a great many of the students' transcripts. Professor Miller concurred that some of the "summa" transcripts were troubling in this regard, as some students had taken courses in a small number of departments and that some students had not taken any courses in the sciences. Professor Miller asked whether the level of honors awarded is linked to students' overall grade-point average (GPA) or their GPA within their major and/or division. Dean Call responded that the overall GPA is used to calculate honors. Professor Schneider said that

Amended June 10, 2014

he is not troubled when students who have passionate interests within a small number of disciplines choose to concentrate exclusively on these areas, as is permitted by the open curriculum.

The thesis conversation prompted Professor Miller to recall a recent discussion that she had had with the chairs of the strategic planning committees about possible changes to the ways in which credit is awarded at Amherst, proposing the idea of adopting variable credits. A radical idea would be to re-think credits for all courses across the College, she said. If there is a desire not to make too much of a change to the current credit system, Professor Miller had proposed offering variable credits (e.g., 1.5 credits for courses with lab) for labs to represent the workload more effectively. Doing so, while still only requiring that students take four credits per semester, might well make a big difference in terms of outcomes for students with less preparation, she noted; for example, some students might choose to take two courses with labs and only one additional course for four total credits in a semester. Some members raised the concern that students in the sciences (i.e., those who take many labs) might then not take courses in other disciplines and not take full advantage of the curriculum. Professor Miller said that, in her experience, the problem is the opposite; science majors distribute themselves fairly effectively across the curriculum, but non-science majors are less likely to do so. Professor Harms agreed. Dean Call noted that the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), the College's accrediting body, is placing more emphasis on ensuring that colleges and universities comply with the federal definition of a credit hour when determining and awarding credit.

The Committee then turned to committee nominations. Associate Dean Cheney, who had prepared some suggestions of faculty to serve on standing committees, joined the meeting at 4:10 P.M. and left the meeting at the conclusion of the conversation. Professor Harms asked what the paradigm is for assigning assistant professors to committees. Associate Dean Cheney said that some tenure-track faculty members would have the opportunity to serve on committees and that some would not, depending on the need for replacements on committees. Every effort is made to protect assistant professors from committee service that would be extremely time-consuming.

Following the discussion about committees, the Dean presented nominations for endowed professorships. The next step will be for President Martin to recommend these professorships to the Board, Dean Call noted. The members then reviewed draft faculty meeting agendas for meetings to be held on May 22 and Labor Day, September 1, and voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the agendas to the Faculty.

The members discussed some [possible revisions to the guidelines for departmental external reviews](#) that had been proposed by the Committee on Educational Policy and agreed that the Committee of Six should take up this topic in the fall, when time would allow for a fuller discussion. The members decided that it would be fine to share the proposed revisions with departments that would be undergoing reviews in the next academic year, noting that approval of the changes is pending discussion by the Committee of Six. The members next returned briefly to the topic of attendance and voting at Faculty Meetings and agreed that this matter should also be placed on the agenda of the new Committee of Six. The members thanked Professor Harms for her excellent work in preparing information about the pertinent issues.

Conversation turned to the Library Committee's new policy for the allocation of library carrels in Frost Library. The proposal had already been shared with the Faculty

Amended June 10, 2014

via a link from the Committee of Six minutes of April 21 (see [cover letter from the Library Committee](#) and [the proposal](#)). The Library Committee is seeking to address drawbacks to the current system, practices that have evolved without a formal policy. The prevailing feeling at present is that a carrel, once allocated, belongs to a faculty member “for life.” Under the new policy, current carrel-holders who are full professors as of July 1, 2014, and emeriti faculty will be “grandfathered,” that is allowed to continue to use their assigned carrels without term. Under the policy, in the future, study spaces, like offices, will not be provided to emeriti faculty. Each spring, the Library Committee will ask those who are occupying carrels without limit if they would be willing either to give up the carrel or to loan it to another faculty member for the next academic year, a single semester, or the summer. All other faculty members who currently occupy a carrel will be asked to vacate their carrels by August 15, 2019. These faculty members will then join the request pool under a series of new procedures. Open carrels will be divided into two categories. Group A carrels will be intended for long-term use, and Group B carrels will be for short-term use. Carrels in Group A will be reserved for tenure-track faculty members in the humanities and social sciences, and are available for five-year terms upon request. The Library Committee will try to meet as many of these requests as possible, while still reserving carrels for Group B. Carrels in that category may be assigned to regular faculty members for terms ranging from one semester or summer to two academic years. Each year, those requesting carrels will be asked to send an application to the Library Committee. The committee will consider all requests and forward recommendations to the Office of the Dean of the Faculty. Final decisions about the allocation of carrels will be made by the Dean’s office. Professor Corrales commented that it might be helpful to offer incentives to faculty to encourage them to apply for carrels in Category B. Perhaps there could also be some kind of disincentive for applying too frequently for carrels in Category A. Professor Kingston said that some carrels are currently under-used because faculty members have an incentive to keep their carrels in case of a future need. Because the new system reduces the incentive to hoard carrels, there may not be a shortage of carrels under the new system. Professor Harms applauded the new system as a way to start changing attitudes about carrels. Professor Schneider said that he has no objection to the new system, as outlined, but raised the topic of considering and formalizing the benefits that the College extends to emeriti. He commented that, at present, emeriti are provided with study spaces, offices, and/or other services by means that are largely ad hoc and as a result, inequities may occur.

On the occasion of his last Committee of Six meeting as Dean, and on behalf of the Committee of Six, Professor Harms read the following citation for Dean Call and asked that it be included in the minutes of the meeting:

The Committee of Six, and the faculty we represent, have been immeasurably well served by Dean Call. His care for and care of not only the corps of the faculty but for and of each individual faculty member has been the hallmark of his tenure. Dean Call has worked with superhuman patience and limitless generosity to support the work that we do, to pave the road to excellence and to remove obstacles along that road.

Dean Call has affectionately been called, and with typical good humor has referred to himself as the “Dean of Free Lunch” and the “Dean of Yes”—and

Amended June 10, 2014

we can think of no more appropriate recognition. All that *Free Lunch* and *Yes* has, over the past decade, produced a remarkable Faculty that is international, multiracial, socioeconomically diverse, cross-disciplinary, innovative, and academically accomplished. Dean Call has given Amherst this most-far reaching legacy that is at the very heart of the College's mission, and in so doing has preserved Amherst's leadership position in American education for decades to come. The Committee of Six, and the Faculty we come from, is often contentious, occasionally insane, but always aware of our great good fortune to do our work under his administration—the Committee of Six, on behalf of the Faculty, is grateful to Dean Call and happy to welcome Professor Call back to the fold.

The meeting concluded with the members expressing their appreciation to the Dean.
The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty