

Amended September 14, 2009

The first meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 9:00 A.M. on Tuesday, September 1, 2009. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The President opened the meeting by welcoming new and returning members of the Committee of Six and said that he looks forward to working with the Committee this year. He turned briefly to the topic of the John Woodruff Simpson Lectureship and the John J. McCloy '16 Professorship of American Institutions and International Diplomacy. President Marx noted that, at present, Professor Goldsby and Richard Wilbur '42 hold appointments as Simpson Lecturers, but that, in recent years, the Simpson Fund has been primarily used to support graduate fellowships. After some concern was raised last year about the proposal to re-direct some portion of the Simpson Fund to support additional Simpson Lecturers, President Marx said that he decided, after consultation with the Student Fellowships Committee, to replace the level of funding used with a comparable level of support for post-graduate studies for Amherst alumni through the Croxton Fund. The Fellowships Committee was satisfied with this outcome, and consultations with the committee will continue. Part of the Simpson Fund will now be used to enrich the Amherst undergraduate experience by bringing eminent scholars to campus as Simpson Lecturers, as agreed by the Faculty.

Continuing his remarks in a related vein, President Marx informed the members that he had received a small number of nominations from the Faculty for the positions of Simpson Lecturer and McCloy Professor last year, and that the ad placed in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* has now generated some responses. He noted that a number of others, including prominent alumni who would like to teach at the College, have also expressed interest in the positions, and that departments have nominated a few alumni for these appointments. President Marx said that, while there can be only a very few Simpson Lecturers or McCloy Professors, he would be supportive of having a small number of accomplished alumni and/or others teach courses on a single-course basis, if departments wish to make proposals to the Dean, following regular procedures for requesting visitors. The Committee agreed. President Marx will make funding from the Croxton Lecture Fund available for a small number of these visiting positions. The Committee expressed no objection to having such visitors and asked the Dean to inform the Faculty of this opportunity, which some members felt that many departments would welcome. The Dean said that he would make an announcement at the meeting of department chairs that will be held on September 11, and that the Committee's minutes would also serve as a source of information about this opportunity.

President Marx continued with his remarks, noting that last year's Committee of Six had agreed that, for purposes of information, the Faculty should be provided with their individual grade distributions, and for purposes of comparison, the aggregated averages of their department(s), traditional divisions, and the College as a whole. While the hope had been to distribute this information this summer, other matters took precedence. The President suggested that the Dean confer with the CEP to reaffirm the committee's interest in providing these grading data to the Faculty. Dean Call agreed to do so.

Dean Call began his announcements with words of welcome to new and returning members. He informed the Committee that Assistant Dean Janet Tobin will continue to serve as the Recorder of Committee of Six minutes and that Nancy Ratner, Assistant Dean of Admission and Researcher for Academic Projects, will serve as the Recorder of the Faculty Meeting

Amended September 14, 2009

minutes. The Dean shared with the members a request from Neal Abraham, the recently appointed Executive Director of Five Colleges, Inc., that Amherst participate in a newly created Five-College Online Faculty Directory. Information for the directory would be drawn from public (online or print directory) sources, Dean Call explained. Professor Hall asked what information would be included in the directory. The Dean said that he understands that the following information would be made available: name, title, department/program, institution, contact information, and Five College committee memberships. Professor Hall asked if any information beyond that which is available publicly (e.g., photographs) could be suppressed upon request by a faculty member. The Dean said that he would check to be sure that this would be possible, and the Committee agreed that public information about Amherst faculty members should be included in the directory. Dean Call informed the members that Mr. Abraham would be pleased to attend a Faculty Meeting and to meet with the Committee of Six, if invited. The Dean noted that the Executive Director of the Five Colleges enjoys the status of Designated Guest at Amherst Faculty Meetings. The Committee asked the Dean to invite Mr. Abraham to the September 15, 2009, Faculty Meeting so that he could be introduced to the community, and the Dean said that he would be glad to do so.

Continuing his remarks, the Dean informed the members that the CEP had recently received and approved a proposal for a new course for the Fall semester. Since the proposal was submitted so late, Dean Call said that, if the members approve the course, he plans to send an email to the Faculty with a link to its online course description, asking that anyone who has any concerns about this course contact him by 4 P.M. on Monday, September 7, and explaining that the Faculty will proceed with a formal vote to approve the course at its meeting on September 15. The members voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the proposal to the Faculty.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Hall asked the Dean if the issue of paying stipends to the Faculty for participating in certain College activities, a topic that was raised by a Committee of Six member last year, would be included on the Committee's agenda this year. President Marx asked Assistant Dean Tobin to generate a list of programs for which the Faculty has been paid a stipend to participate, and she agreed to provide the members with this information. The Dean noted that this is not a practice of long standing, and that some programs (for example, the Faculty Innovation Fund and the Work-in-Progress Seminar program) for which stipends were offered have now come to an end, while some stipends for participating in remaining programs have been reduced for budgetary reasons.

Professor Rockwell next asked the Dean whether there is a College policy governing teaching overloads, specifically in regard to faculty members teaching three courses in one semester and one course in the other, during a given year. Professor Rockwell said that allowing a colleague to divide his or her teaching load in this way, with the department's approval, could offer advantages to the department and the College. For example, he noted, during a semester in which there might be high enrollments, a faculty member could teach an additional course, potentially avoiding the need for the College to hire a visitor. Professor Rockwell explained that, within his own department, there are often lower enrollments in the Spring term because more students study abroad at that time. The President noted, parenthetically, that he has asked the Committee on International Education to explore ways to encourage more students to study abroad during the Fall term, thus creating equivalence in enrollments during the two semesters. Dean Call said that he would be supportive of adjusting teaching loads in the way described by Professor Rockwell, as long as the faculty member's department approved of all plans to do so.

Amended September 14, 2009

The following language in the *Faculty Handbook* allows for such flexibility, the Dean noted: “Amherst tries to keep the teaching load at a level that permits the Faculty to devote considerable time outside of class to students and to scholarly or creative work. Generally, Faculty teach two courses each semester. Departments have historically adapted this norm to their individual circumstances. Faculty are encouraged to teach outside their own departments through participation in interdisciplinary and interdepartmental courses and seminars.” (*Faculty Handbook*, IV, B., 1.) President Marx said that, in regard to teaching a three/one load, he wondered whether such a structure would have a negative impact on student-faculty interaction. Professor Goutte reiterated the importance of having departmental approval as a requirement for teaching an overload during a semester. The Dean and the Committee agreed and decided that the permission of the Dean would also be required.

Continuing with “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Hall expressed concern about the substance of new language regarding diversity that departments have been asked to include in their advertisements for positions at Amherst. He also noted that the Human Resources Web site still includes language that the College agreed last year not to use any longer. Professor Hall said that the current language (included on the Dean’s site) seems to imply that the College has established a litmus test (valuing diversity) for hiring. While he emphasized that he shares this value, he said that he is uncomfortable with the idea that the College should necessarily require that all candidates for positions must hold this view, and he said that it would be helpful, in any case, if the language could be as concise as possible. He asked whether departments are being required to include the new diversity language in their ads, since this is the impression that many departments seem to have. Assistant Dean Tobin, who coordinates faculty searches with departments, noted that departments have been encouraged to use the new language but have not been required to do so, particularly when cost and space issues have arisen. President Marx asked Assistant Dean Tobin to consult with Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel, who developed the new language, to ascertain his views on this matter and to report back to the Committee. He said that Mr. Murphy would ask Human Resources to remove the diversity language that is currently on its site and to replace it with language agreed upon by the Committee and Mr. Murphy.

Dean Call then reviewed issues of Committee of Six confidentiality and attribution in the minutes, noting that the public minutes should be used as a guide in questions of whether matters discussed by the Committee can be shared with others. The President and the Dean discussed what matters other than personnel matters have been kept confidential. They said that minutes of discussions of certain sensitive or unresolved matters and plans in their formative stages, about which they are seeking the advice of the Committee of Six, are sometimes kept confidential. Often, discussions of these issues are made public once the matter is in a less tentative state. They said that very few conversations (typically those concerning personnel matters and committee nominations that are under consideration) have been kept out of the public minutes of the Committee. President Marx commented 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. He commented on how valuable it has been for him to have the Committee of Six as a sounding board, and said that he feels that having the elected representatives of the Faculty assume this role has been a governance structure that has served the College well. The President said that he is aware that some may not share this view, and he

Amended September 14, 2009

asked the members whether they would be comfortable discussing issues in confidence if he sought guidance about a matter that could not be made public. A lengthy conversation ensued in which some members expressed discomfort with having discussions in confidence about matters other than personnel issues, while other members said that they were open to offering the President advice in confidence, when appropriate.

Professor Rockwell expressed the view that the Committee of Six is not empowered to make up its own rules, and that all discussions of matters other than personnel issues should be recorded in the public minutes. He suggested that the Faculty as a whole be asked to affirm the role of the Committee of Six, if there are any ambiguities that emerge. Professor Barbezat, who said that he favors having the option of keeping some discussions confidential, noted that some issues about which the President has sought guidance have involved matters that should not be made public. He commented that the President would no doubt feel constrained about discussing some important issues and seeking the input of the members at important decision-making junctures, if confidential conversations were not permitted.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Hall said that he had felt extremely uncomfortable at times last year when he was asked to keep some conversations about important issues confidential. He was also concerned that some discussions were not minuted, even confidentially. He noted that, because of the lag time between Committee of Six discussions and the distribution of the minutes, he often felt that he could not discuss important issues with faculty colleagues at times he would have liked to have done so. He had often felt detached from the Faculty that he had been elected to represent and was uncomfortable being put in the position of being a firewall between the Faculty and the administration. Professor Rockwell said he would feel uncomfortable offering advice to the administration as an elected representative without there being in place a mechanism by which the members of the Committee of Six might be held accountable to the Faculty for that advice. Professor Ciepiela agreed. Professor Barbezat expressed the view that the Faculty benefits when the Committee and the President can have open discussions. Professor Hall agreed that there were such benefits, but argued that it might be appropriate for the President to consult with the Dean on speculative matters of sensitivity, suggesting that, if the President consults less in confidence with the Committee of Six, its interactions with the Faculty would be improved overall. Professor Goutte said that, as someone who had not yet been on the Committee, she had always assumed that the Committee had some discussions that were not made public. She said that it seems beneficial for the President to use a faculty-elected committee as his sounding board. Professor Saxton said that, in her last experience on the Committee, she had not had difficulty with the role the members were asked to play. After more discussion, it was agreed that the President should be explicit when he wishes to have a confidential discussion about a particular issue and if, or when, the matter can be made public. Professors Rockwell and Ciepiela agreed, but said that they were not entirely comfortable with this compromise. It was agreed that the plan is not a perfect solution, but that the Committee would try taking this approach and could always revisit the issue. The members then discussed tenure procedures.

The Dean next asked the members whether they would like to have direct attribution in the minutes. The members agreed that, for reasons of transparency, there should be direct attribution in the minutes. The President, the Dean, and the members agreed to strive for transparency in the minutes.

Amended September 14, 2009

The Dean next informed the members of the longstanding policy of appending letters to the minutes when the matters contained within them have been discussed by the Committee. Colleagues are informed by the Dean's office as to when their letters will be appended. If a colleague states at the outset that he or she does not want the contents of a letter discussed in the public minutes, the Committee will decide whether it wishes to take up the matter in question. The Committee then discussed the circumstances under which it would communicate via email. It was agreed that email communications would not be used to communicate about personnel or other confidential matters and that, in general, the use of email would be kept to a minimum. The Dean informed the members that there is a secure shared drive that the Committee can use for electronic communication.

The Dean next discussed with the members options for a regular meeting time for the Committee of Six, and it was agreed that the Committee would meet at 3:00 P.M. on Mondays. Dean Call noted that the possible dates for Faculty Meetings this semester, based on the Faculty's longstanding practice of reserving the first and third Tuesdays of each month of the term for possible meetings, are September 15, October 20, November 3, November 17, December 1, and December 15. The members reviewed the Agenda for the Faculty Meeting of September 15 and voted six to zero to approve and forward it to the Faculty.

The President reviewed with the members events that have occurred since the release of the report of the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC). President Marx noted that responses to the committee's recommendations from faculty, students, and staff members were circulated and shared with the Board of Trustees, prior to the Board's review of the report. After debate and discussion, the Trustees accepted the recommendations of the ABC, and the College is currently in the process of implementation. Eligible staff have been offered the opportunity to participate in a voluntary retirement program; staff have been offered the opportunity to reduce their work hours; searches have been authorized for one of the largest cohorts of faculty FTEs in twenty years; and previously "frozen" vacant staff positions are being reviewed (with the result that searches have been authorized for six of these positions at present). President Marx said that the senior staff and he would continue to consider which vacant positions should be filled, but that they would likely wait to see how many staff members take advantage of the voluntary retirement program before deciding which further openings to fill.

The President stressed that, as much as possible, existing committees of the College will be used to assess needs and modifications that arise in response to the implementation of the ABC's recommendations. President Marx anticipates that the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA), the Committee and Priorities and Resources (CPR), and the CEP in particular will be asked to recommend adjustments as needed. Any additional budget adjustments will be decided over the course of the year. Members of these committees and the Committee of Six will keep in close dialogue with the Trustees, with whom they will meet in October.

The President noted that, in response to the report, some faculty have argued for larger reductions in the College's financial aid budget than the ABC recommended, including consideration of reductions in the percentage of students on aid, the percentage of international students (on aid), and the return of modest loans to student aid packages. Some students have expressed significant distress about the opinions of this group of faculty, and some have come to feel that the Faculty is not supportive of them as members of the Amherst community. The President and Dean expressed deep concern about any rift that might develop between the

Amended September 14, 2009

Faculty and the student body over this issue. The members affirmed that ensuring the unique relationship between Amherst's faculty and students is essential, while being mindful of the needs of future generations of students and the College's future. The Dean and President said that the FCAFA will be asked this fall to continue their review of financial aid policies and, as the committee did in the spring, to prioritize a set of recommendations for further reductions. The President and the Dean noted that the financial aid budget will continue to be evaluated and modified, based on the College's financial condition. Discussions will continue about this very important issue, they said. This issue has never been "off the table" and could never be.

Professor Hall expressed his frustration surrounding the decision to continue some of the recently adopted admission policies, including need-blind for international applicants. President Marx noted that the ABC debated whether to roll back this program, but decided, after a good deal of discussion, that it is important to maintain Amherst's commitment to this initiative. The President said he will explore with the FCAFA whether targets should be set for the percentage of international students that make up Amherst's student body, among other issues. There are still decisions to be made in this area, he noted. Professor Hall commented that he was an early supporter of the international need-blind program and was chair of the FCAFA during the discussions surrounding its adoption. His understanding, however, was that the policy was contingent upon the College's continuing ability to afford it, and would be dropped if financial circumstances changed significantly. Indeed, his support was predicated in part upon such an assumption. He felt that these and similar faculty assumptions about policy changes (e.g., those of the Report of the Committee on Academic Priorities), both explicit and implicit, had been overlooked by the ABC. Professor Barbezat, who served on the ABC, noted that the committee discussed the possibility of scaling back the need-blind policy for international students but ultimately decided not to do so at this time, in the context of other adjustments that were being made.

Dean Call noted that the CPR will be asked to review the new financial projections that incorporate the ABC's recommendations and the actual endowment return for the year that ended June 30, 2009. The Dean said that he believes that the endowment's return (though not yet finalized) will be significantly better than the negative 30 percent projected earlier. That result combined with the budget reductions already achieved and recommended by the ABC implies that the College's financial projections will be significantly brighter than they appeared last spring. This better-than-originally-expected outcome offers the College additional time to make financial decisions, the Dean said.

President Marx said that he is a bit more cautious than the Dean when it comes to projections for the future, and he noted that, despite the pain of the last year, the College has not suffered the degree of damage that many other institutions have endured. Amherst is now hiring a significant number of faculty, small increases in salaries are projected for next year, and only one staff member (who was paid on soft funding) has been laid off. He acknowledged that the College will have to be thoughtful about how best to make use of resources, particularly now that the staff has been reduced in a number of areas. He noted that, in recent years, the size of the staff had been increasing at a significant rate, and that cuts represent a return to previous levels. The President said that he views his job to be defending the core model of education at Amherst and providing access to it, recognizing that there are budget constraints and that the College's financial model is not very efficient by its very nature. He noted that significant inroads have been made, however. Notably, the College's efforts to reduce costs have resulted in a 10-12

Amended September 14, 2009

percent reduction in the amount that it costs to educate each student, roughly from \$76,000 to \$67,000 in constant dollars from FY 2009 to FY 2012. He explained that, while the College charges around \$49,000, less than half the students pay this amount because they are on financial aid. Even if a student does not receive any aid and pays all costs, the College subsidizes that person's education (providing an additional \$27,000 or so). The President said that, while the endowment may only be down around 22 percent, it is still down significantly, and it will be important that the College reduce its vulnerability by reducing its reliance on the endowment to support the operating budget of the College. He noted, that the College currently depends on its endowment as a source of funding for about half of the money it spends. This moment provides the opportunity to be thoughtful about where the College can do with less, President Marx said. He noted that faculty committees will play an important role in doing so.

Professor Hall asked whether the ABC will continue to exist. The Dean said that plans call for the committee to remain in existence until the end of this year. However, it was the consensus of the ABC that existing committee structures should carry on its work. The President said that there are no plans to reconvene the ABC unless regular committees become overwhelmed or some unusual circumstance arises. President Marx said that the ABC agreed that having staff representation on the committee was important to the committee's deliberations and to making inroads into mitigating the faculty/staff divide at the College, the potential for which increased as a result of the financial crisis. The President and the Dean expressed support for developing structures to increase staff participation in decision-making at the College. The Dean noted one possible proposal that the CPR formalize a regular role as members for staff on that committee. Last year, staff members participated as invited guests during the deliberations of the CPR. The President asked about having the Committee of Six bring a motion before the Faculty to add staff members to the CPR's membership. Professor Hall said that, while he is supportive of having staff input and feels that the concerns of the staff should be voiced, he said that it is important to recognize that faculty and staff serve different roles at the College. There should be opportunities for the different groups to meet separately and to come together, he said, but the existing governance structure recognizes these different roles, noting further that there has been no suggestion, for example, that faculty, staff, or students have direct representation on the Board of Trustees. The Dean agreed, but he noted that having faculty, staff, students, and trustees working together on the ABC enhanced the breadth of the committee's debate and was essential for building consensus. The Faculty would be asked to debate and vote on any proposal to add staff to the CPR, he commented.

On a final note, Professor Rockwell said that he observed a discrepancy between the "summer savings" figure (the minimum expected "student income contribution") cited in the report of the FCAFA and the figure cited in the report of the CPR. He asked the President if this figure has been changed, and, if so, what the contribution now is. President Marx noted that the requirement, which had not been changed in years, has been changed to reflect the requirements of peer institutions. From 1998-99 to 2008-09, the contribution was \$1,800 for sophomores, juniors, and seniors who are dependent students from middle-income backgrounds (and higher) and \$950 for students from lower-income backgrounds. For 2009-10, the figures are \$2,000 and \$1,100, respectively. The expectation for first-year students was not increased. Their expectations are \$1,600 and \$750, respectively. Canadian students' expectations are adjusted according to the exchange rate between the U.S. dollar and Canadian dollar. Independent students have an expected contribution of \$400. International students have no expected

Amended September 14, 2009

contribution, unless they work on campus in the summer and earn more than \$5,000, in which case the contribution is 25 percent of the excess. The expected contribution for independent students and the basic expected figure for international students have not been altered.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 5, 2009

The second meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, September 14, 2009. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Dean began the meeting by informing the members that they should expect an invitation for dinner and conversation with members of the Board of Trustees when the Trustees meet on campus in mid-October. The Trustees will be meeting with a number of faculty and College committees during their weekend here, Dean Call said.

In response to a concern raised by Professor Hall at the first meeting, the Dean shared with the members revised language about diversity that has been developed for advertisements for positions at Amherst. The Dean said that he would offer as a non-mandatory suggestion to departments whatever language is agreed upon by the Committee. If a department wishes to modify the language, they will be welcome to do so. Any diversity language revised by a department will be reviewed, along with the rest of the substance of the ad, according to normal procedures. The President offered a further revision of the language and suggested that Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel, review the change. The Committee agreed. Professor Hall commented that he was pleased to learn that, whatever language is approved, there will be flexibility about its use and that it will not be mandatory.

The members next discussed some issues raised during the process of editing the minutes of the Committee's first meeting (September 1, 2009) and reviewed the purposes and goals of the minutes.

Dean Call next asked the members to consider how and when to evaluate the new interdisciplinary theme-based structure that was initiated for the Copeland Colloquium on a pilot basis two years ago. The Dean noted that the Copeland program has been expanded and is now organized around a theme put forward by the Faculty. This year (2009-2010) is the third year that Copeland Fellows have come to campus for a year, rather than for a semester, with the intent of scholarly collaboration and engagement with the Amherst community. Some members asked to be reminded of the themes that have been explored thus far. The Dean said that, during the first year (2007-2008), the theme was "Art and Identity in the Global Community." The next year the theme was "Violent States." This year's theme is "It's Not Easy Being Green: The Science, Politics, and Ethics of Environmentalism." When the new format was launched, the Committee of Six suggested that the Copeland Committee review the new approach and report back to the Committee of Six and to the Faculty after three years. Since then, the Dean explained, the decision was made to redistribute the work of the Copeland Committee to the Faculty Committee on Research Awards (the FRAP Committee) and to eliminate the Copeland Committee. The faculty group that proposes a selected theme now administers the program for the year in which the theme is explored, the Dean said. Dean Call asked the members whether they felt it would be best to evaluate the new approach now or after completing the third year of the new approach. Professors Goutte, Rockwell, and Saxton commented on how the new format seems to have invigorated the program. The Committee agreed that it would be best to have three years of data before seeking to evaluate the program and decided to allow the Copeland Colloquium to run one more year in its present form and then to review it. The members then discussed which committees should conduct the review of the program. Professor Barbezat said that it might be beneficial to have a colleague who had been closely involved with the new format as part of the group that reviews the program. Professor Hall agreed, but felt that it would

Amended October 5, 2009

be even more helpful to enlist colleagues with personal distance from the program to achieve greater objectivity. After discussing some different possibilities, the members agreed that the FRAP Committee and the Lecture Committee together, or a self-selected subcommittee of the members of these committees, should conduct the evaluation of the Copeland Colloquium. Professor Rockwell commented that it would be ideal to have both the Lecture Committee and the FRAP Committee review the program because such a structure would provide the opportunity for breadth of opinion. The Dean thanked the Committee and noted that he would soon send a letter to the Faculty inviting colleagues to submit theme ideas for the 2010-2011 Copeland Colloquium.

The President informed the Committee that, during discussions with the senior staff, it had been suggested that there be a slight change in the order of presentations during the Faculty Meeting of September 15. President Marx asked the Committee if Mr. Shea, the Treasurer, might speak after the Dean of the Faculty makes his remarks and before the President. It was felt that the Treasurer's comments would provide a context for the discussions of the College's finances that would be a focus of his own remarks, President Marx said. The Committee approved the revision of the Agenda. The President said that, during the Faculty Meeting, he would apologize for the delay in distributing the minutes of the Committee's first meeting (September 1) to the Faculty and would extend the opportunity for questions about these minutes to the next Faculty Meeting, in addition to asking for questions at the upcoming meeting.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," a question was asked regarding a personnel matter.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Hall asked if a special invitation would be necessary for Ninni Carlsund-Levin, the STINT Fellow from Sweden who is teaching this semester in the Department of Physics, to attend Faculty Meetings. The Dean said that Professor Carlsund-Levin is eligible to attend since she is teaching at the College and that a special invitation would not be necessary. Professor Saxton next asked whether she could make a small number of coursepacks available in her department to her students. The Dean said that he would ask Associate Dean Courtright, who is helping to implement policies around copyright permissions and coursepacks, to contact Professor Saxton to provide clarification about what is acceptable practice.

The Dean reported to the Committee that, at his request, Assistant Dean Tobin had checked with the Five Colleges, Inc., regarding Professor Hall's question about whether, upon request by a faculty member, any information beyond that which is available publicly (e.g., photographs) could be suppressed in the new Five College online directory. Any of the information in the directory may be suppressed upon request, Assistant Dean Tobin was told.

The Dean asked the members whether they wished to discuss the report of the Task Force on Academic Support this week or next, since there was a great deal of material in the appendix that had been supplied to the Committee only recently. The Dean noted that the task force had begun meeting in the summer of 2008 and had been charged by the Committee of Six, at the Dean's request, to undertake a comprehensive review of academic support at Amherst and to make recommendations. Professor Rockwell asked why the document was being brought before the Committee of Six. The Dean said that he is seeking the members' response to the report, and that plans called for the report to be distributed to the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and to the Faculty as a whole. Professor Barbezat said that he was in favor of having a discussion of the report, since it appeared that the recommendations were straightforward and

Amended October 5, 2009

that the structures that would be used to implement them were outlined in the report. He felt that the Committee of Six's primary role was to forward the report to the Faculty and, ultimately, to the named bodies. Dean Call noted that, while only a few of the task force's recommendations would require a faculty vote, if departments and faculty committees decide to bring certain motions regarding academic credit forward, most recommendations would go to faculty committees and to deans in his office or the Dean of Students office. Dean Call expressed his gratitude to Professor O'Hara and to all members of the task force for their thoroughness and dedication. The members agreed that the members of the task force should be congratulated for their excellent work.

Professor Ciepiela, while praising the report overall, expressed the view that more attention should be paid to advising for study abroad. Professor Rockwell agreed, noting that study abroad is often marginalized at Amherst. Professor Ciepiela noted that the Committee on International Education, which she chaired last year, had been considering ways to bring the Faculty into the advising process for study abroad, a program in which as much as 45 percent of the student body participates. Study abroad, she stressed, should be treated as part of a student's academic program and should be integrated with Amherst academic work. Professor Ciepiela noted that the experience of studying abroad intersects in complex ways with students' majors, for example. She argued that processes should be developed for keeping faculty members across the College apprised of study abroad deadlines and procedures. Professor Ciepiela noted that Janna Behrens, Director of International Experience, is largely responsible for advising students about study abroad.

Dean Call noted that, at many colleges, oversight of study abroad falls within the Dean of the Faculty's purview. At Amherst, study abroad advising is housed within the Career Center, though the Committee on International Education (on which the Registrar and the Director of International Experience sit) evaluates credit-related issues. Professor Rockwell seconded the wisdom of the structures found at other institutions and maintained that the director in charge of study abroad should report directly to the Dean of the Faculty. Professor Ciepiela agreed. She stressed the importance of developing a sense of how Amherst understands the place of study abroad within students' academic programs. She suggested that departments might address this question in regard to their majors in formalized ways, for example by providing information on their Websites. The Dean asked if the members of the Committee on International Education should develop a charge to the committee to explore these questions. The members agreed that the committee should be asked to do so and then to report to the Committee of Six, which would forward the report to the Faculty.

Returning to the question of the role of the Committee of Six in regard to reviewing the report of the task force, the President asked whether the members feel that the Committee of Six should respond substantively rather than procedurally. He wondered whether commentary by the Committee of Six would provide a moment of "filtering" before the report was forwarded to administrative units of the College. Professor Hall agreed that consideration by the Committee of Six would be desirable and asked whether the CEP will also review the report. The Dean said that the CEP would do so. The CEP would receive the report after the Committee of Six's discussion, at which time he hoped the report would also be distributed to the Faculty. Professor Barbezat said that the report's recommendations for implementation fall into two categories—those that would be undertaken by committees and those that would be undertaken by members of the administration. Those to be considered by committees could simply be forwarded to them

Amended October 5, 2009

while the others should be reviewed by the Committee of Six before being sent to the Faculty. The members agreed that they should discuss the report in a substantive way at their next meeting, after digesting the full range of materials provided by the task force. The Dean noted that the task force has provided the appendix materials as background information, and it was the task force's hope that their report could stand alone.

The members turned to a question raised by Professor Hall and last year's Committee of Six about paying stipends to the Faculty for participating in certain College activities. The Dean provided the Committee with a list of programs (appended) for which the Faculty has been paid a stipend to participate. Dean Call reiterated that this is a relatively recent practice, and that some programs (for example, the Faculty Innovation Fund and the Work-in-Progress Seminar program) for which stipends were offered have now come to an end, while some stipends for participating in remaining programs have been reduced for budgetary reasons. Professor Hall said that there has been a concern that this practice had been proliferating, and he wondered what the decision-making process was for awarding stipends. He expressed the view that assigning a dollar value to activities, particularly for those that might have once been undertaken by the Faculty without payment, could be destructive and could erode the communal spirit of the Faculty. He noted, for example, that faculty used to advise students on Labor Day without being paid, while faculty are now paid to do advising before Labor Day. Professor Ciepiela disagreed, noting that faculty who are doing work when others are not, for example before Labor Day, should be compensated. Professor Barbezat said that there should be a principle for deciding when there should be stipends and there should be oversight. Dean Call noted that stipends typically have come about when there is a new project launched, often with grant funds. Frequently, workshops take place between semesters and in the summer, at which time attendees are on campus when other colleagues are not. The Dean said he views stipends in these cases more as expressions of thanks than as compensation.

Continuing the conversation, Dean Call said that Lisa Stoffer, Director of Corporate and Foundation Relations, has said that it would be very helpful for her to have a sense of the threshold for what is acceptable when it comes to stipends, and that she is looking for guidance on this issue. For instance, she has asked whether she should be building faculty stipends into grants if there are multi-day workshops involved, or would faculty consider that attendance at such events is part of their jobs. Ms. Stoffer has said that the College would have a practical problem with funders if a no-stipend policy was implemented retroactively for grant-funded activities. Ms. Stoffer has noted that, if the College wants to build events into grants, stipends might be needed to ensure ample attendance.

President Marx, after reviewing the list of remaining programs for which stipends are being paid, asked whether stipends should be paid, for instance, for Schupf Mentorship, Orientation Advising, and grant-funded workshops. Professor Hall wondered if a criterion for awarding a stipend might be that performance of the activity occurred outside the nine months of paid work for which a faculty member is responsible, by contract, to the College. He said that the availability for additional salary in the summer should be shared with all members of the Faculty, since everyone should be eligible. He said that he did not recall being solicited to teach in the Summer Science Program, and that he had not known about the new summer humanities and social sciences program. The Dean and Professor Goutte were surprised that Professor Hall was unaware of the former opportunity, since it is usually difficult to find science faculty who are available to participate, such that they assumed most science faculty had been asked multiple

Amended October 5, 2009

times. The Dean said he would welcome Professor Hall's participation in the program. Professor Rockwell noted that he is under the impression that the faculty are appointed to work for twelve months for the College and are expected to be involved in efforts concerning their scholarship, teaching, and creative work in the summer. He thought that permission must be given for a colleague to pursue additional paid work in the summer. Professor Hall said that it is his understanding that faculty work for nine months but are paid over twelve, and that faculty are allowed to receive up to two-ninths of their annual salary for two months of additional work during the summer, most often through external grants. For clarification, the Dean referred to the *Faculty Handbook* (V., A., 1. and 3.), which states the following:

1. **Payroll.** The fiscal year of Amherst College runs from July 1 to June 30th. Annual faculty salaries are for nine months' work but are paid in twelve equal installments on the last day of each month, July 31st through June 30th, inclusive.

3. **Summer Salaries.** Members of the faculty are permitted to receive up to two-ninths of their annual salary for additional work done during the summer as contract research or under research or foundation grants. Such grants are administered by the College and are subject to the normal allowances for overhead. Further details should be checked with the Comptroller's Office.

Continuing the discussion about stipends, Professor Rockwell noted that, in his experience as Dean of New Students, it had become clear to him that it would not be possible to have Orientation advising if a stipend were not paid, unless participation in such advising was made mandatory for all faculty. Professor Hall lamented that the College seems to be moving toward a culture of advising with a somewhat mercenary quality. It would be his hope that the Faculty would participate in advising without the need for pecuniary incentives. He said that he supports the view that the College should work toward a "culture of advising" in which full participation on a regular or rotating basis is the norm, accompanying a strong sense that advising is a shared responsibility of the Faculty. Professor Goutte wondered if it might be possible to recognize that advising is a responsibility for all faculty members, but to allow colleagues to fulfill this obligation in different ways, for example, by just doing Orientation advising in an intensive way or just doing advising for first-year students. There was agreement that it might be possible for faculty to advise students in different ways and at different times, and that there might be a menu of different advising activities that could be shared among the Faculty. On the other hand, the members worried that the same small group of faculty members who value and excel at advising would focus their efforts on the various menu items, while many faculty might not. The President said that he had concerns about any system in which colleagues' contributions would be tracked, as there are many complexities associated with engaging in such a calculus he believes. Professor Ciepiela argued that tracking and crediting may be necessary if the College wants to have stability and full coverage when it comes to advising and within the curriculum, for example in staffing the First-Year Seminar Program. The members agreed that there should be broad faculty commitment to advising at Amherst, and that it would be beneficial for the Faculty to have a conversation about this issue.

The Dean responded to the President's question as to which programs, perhaps, should not provide stipends. He said that stipends have been part of the Schupf program since its

Amended October 5, 2009

inception, though they could, perhaps, be reconsidered. He wondered whether some opportunities for having faculty focus on areas of interest to the College might be lost if it was not possible to provide stipends for attending workshops. The Dean noted that the initiatives for which stipends have been offered emerged largely from the Faculty. He said that stipends are typically offered for similar programs at other institutions. Professor Ciepiela said that she views some of the stipended activities as forms of training for the Faculty and feels that it is appropriate for faculty to be compensated for such training. Gathering from this conversation that these stipends were not meant as full compensation, but rather as gestures of recognition for work that was beyond the usual teaching/research/advising, Professor Goutte wondered if using the word “honorarium” instead of “stipend” might help to more clearly define the underlying intention. Professor Goutte also commented that, at times, there has been pressure to include stipends as part of a large group grant proposal, noting that competing proposals from other institutions typically include such stipends. It is her understanding that the rationale behind these stipends is to ensure, or at least acknowledge, faculty participation in the goals of the grant project. However, this practice does not always easily mesh with existing practices toward non-granted faculty efforts along similar lines. At the conclusion of the discussion, Professor Hall said he appreciated the opportunity to have this and future conversations about this issue.

The members spent the remainder of the meeting discussing a revision of a proposal to the Charles Hamilton Houston Institute for Race and Justice at Harvard for collaboration between the College and the Institute. The Dean explained that colleagues from the Departments of Black Studies; Law, Jurisprudence and Social Thought (LJST); and Political Science had been in touch with the Houston Institute about developing a collaboration and had prepared a proposal. The proposal had been approved by last year’s Committee of Six, and the Houston Institute has now offered some revisions. He noted that both institutions are committed to honoring the legacy of Charles Hamilton Houston, Amherst Class of 1915, so a collaboration seems like a natural step and that there are endowed funds available to support this program at Amherst. Professor Sarat has worked with Professor Charles Ogletree, Director of the Houston Institute to work out the details of the collaboration. Professor Barbezat asked for clarification by the Dean about the selection process for the opportunities (conferences and symposiums, student internships, and faculty residencies) outlined in the proposal. He hoped that the residencies and symposia themes would be open to faculty members in a variety of departments at Amherst. The Dean said that this indeed would be the case. The Committee noted that clarification was also needed in regard to internal selection processes for choosing conference and symposium topics, students for internships, and faculty for residencies. The members agreed that the specifics of the internal processes need not be included in the agreement, but that this is a moment in which they should be addressed. The members decided that the Houston Committee (composed of faculty from Black Studies, LJST, and Political Science) should continue to select the conference, symposium, or workshop topic at Amherst, as they have done in the past; the Center for Community Engagement (CCE) should oversee the process of selecting students for internships; and that the Committee of Six should select faculty for residencies. The members further agreed that the agreement should state that each institution will designate a liaison to facilitate carrying out the collaborative agreement. The members agreed to the revisions proposed by the Houston Institute. The Dean said that he would incorporate the Committee’s changes and the proposals of the Houston Institute into the agreement and would ask Professor Sarat to share the revised document with the Houston Institute. The Dean, the President, and the

Committee of Six Minutes of September 14, 2009

15

Amended October 5, 2009

Committee expressed their thanks to Professor Sarat for his work on the development of this collaboration.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Programs for which Faculty Have Received Stipends

Program	Stipend
Center for Community Engagement Faculty Workshops	Stipends discontinued. Some were funded through grants
Faculty Fellows Program	Program/stipends discontinued
Faculty Innovation Fund (FIF)	Program/stipends discontinued
Faculty Seminar on Writing Instruction	Stipend reduced from \$1,000 to \$500
First-Year-Advising Project	Funded through a grant, stipend discontinued
A very limited number of grant-funded stipends for supervising students' summer science research	Yes
Schupf Scholars Mentors	Yes, paid from an Endowed Fund
Teaching and Advising Program (TAP) Programs	Occasionally done with grant funding
Teaching in Summer Humanities and Social Sciences Program	Yes
Teaching in Summer Science Program	Yes
Orientation Advising	Yes
Grant-funded multi-day workshops on research or pedagogy	Possibility of continuing to build into grant proposals
Work-in-Progress Seminars (WIPS)	Program/stipends discontinued

Amended October 6, 2009

The third meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, September 21, 2009. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with "Announcements from the Dean." Dean Call informed the members that President Marx and he had consulted with Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel, about the most recent version of proposed language about diversity at Amherst that is being developed for use in advertisements for positions at the College. Mr. Murphy emphasized to the President and the Dean the importance of communicating through the College's statement a commitment to encouraging applications from underrepresented groups. The Dean, the President, and the members agreed that the following statement should be suggested to departments for inclusion in ads, and that, if departments choose to revise this language, any changes will be reviewed under regular procedures for reviewing the substance of ads (the Dean and Assistant Dean review the language of ads, and questions about relevant diversity issues are brought to Mr. Murphy):

Amherst College is an equal opportunity employer and encourages women, persons of color, and persons with disabilities to apply. The College is committed to enriching its educational experience and its culture through the diversity of its faculty, administration, and staff.

Continuing with his announcements, the Dean asked that, in response to a correction made to the Committee of Six minutes of September 1, 2009, by Professor Umphrey at the Faculty Meeting of September 15, the minutes be corrected to reflect that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) had not been consulted last year about the issue of distributing grading data to the Faculty. Dean Call shared the following corrections to the minutes with the members and apologized for his error of memory.

President Marx continued with his remarks, noting that last year's Committee of Six ~~and Committee on Educational Policy (CEP)~~ had agreed that, for purposes of information, the Faculty should be provided with their individual grade distributions, and for purposes of comparison, the aggregated averages of their department(s), traditional divisions, and the College as a whole. While the hope had been to distribute this information this summer, other matters took precedence, ~~and~~ The President suggested that the Dean confer with ~~this year's~~ **THE** CEP to reaffirm the committee's interest in providing these grading data to the Faculty. Dean Call agreed to do so.

Professor Rockwell commented on the importance of noting for the record that the minutes were corrected and of informing the Faculty. The Dean said that, in addition to mentioning this fact in the minutes of the Committee's meeting of September 21, he would include a note about the correction the next time an email is sent to inform the Faculty that Committee of Six minutes have been posted. Dean Call noted that, at its last meeting, the CEP had begun a conversation about sharing grading data and that the committee plans to return to the topic.

Amended October 6, 2009

Professor Rockwell asked to return briefly to the issue of paying modest stipends (hereafter to be known as honoraria) to the Faculty for participation in particular programs, for example, Orientation advising. He commented that, now that he has been made aware that faculty members are appointed to work for nine months and are allowed to receive up to two-ninths of their annual salary for two months of additional work during the summer (most often through external grants), he has no concerns about faculty receiving small payments from the College for additional work. Indeed such payments of \$500 or \$1,000 seem inconsequential in comparison to additional compensation that is the equivalent of two-ninths of an annual faculty salary. Professor Rockwell expressed some concern that there may no longer be an institutional expectation that faculty members should spend the summer doing research or preparing for classes, which had always been his understanding. He said that the language in the *Faculty Handbook* (V., A., 1. and 3.), which was brought to the Committee's attention by the Dean at the last meeting in response to the Committee's questions, could be read to imply that faculty members are free to spend the summer working in other ways, such as teaching in summer programs at other institutions, that do not benefit Amherst. Particularly during times like these in which their compensation from the College has remained flat, this option might seem appealing to many colleagues. Professor Hall noted that for Orientation advising the consensus of the committee seemed to be that this work, done in the summer, is eligible for an honorarium in any event. He pointed out that the *Faculty Handbook* recognizes that seeking external grants funding serves as an incentive, and is sometimes a necessity, for one's research. The Dean, who said that he shares Professor Rockwell's hopes and expectations of what the Faculty's focus should be during the summer, said the culture at Amherst has long included an ethos for spending time outside the academic year on scholarly work and preparations for teaching. He would be saddened if there was a cultural shift away from this view, he said. President Marx agreed. He expressed concern that, should the liberal arts colleges withdraw from the commitment to scholarship at all times of year, he would worry that support for research as an endeavor would be weakened.

At 3:15, Dean Call next introduced Attorney James Wallace, who participated in the meeting by speaker phone. Each fall, Mr. Wallace is invited to speak with the Committee of Six prior to personnel discussions to provide general legal advice related to the tenure and reappointment processes. At the conclusion of the discussion with Mr. Wallace, the Dean and the Committee expressed their thanks.

Continuing with his announcements, Dean Call asked the members for advice on the question of the length of the term that should be served by the next elected member of the Advisory Committee to the Committee on Trusteeship. By vote of the Faculty in 1997, the faculty members elected to the Advisory Committee to the Committee on Trusteeship also serve as the faculty members on the Advisory Committee on Honorary Degrees, and work with the Dean of the Faculty and President to increase communication between the Faculty and the Board and to select candidates for honorary degrees, Dean Call noted. Professor Hansen's term on the committee ended with his resignation from the College at the end of June 2009. Since two faculty members serve on the committee (Professor Raskin's term began in January 2009 and will conclude at the end of December 2010), there is a need to have an election now, a bit earlier than is traditional, for a colleague who would replace Professor Hansen. The terms of the members are usually staggered, so that there is one continuing member and one newly elected member on the committee at any given time, Dean Call explained. The Dean said that it would

Amended October 6, 2009

be desirable for the new member to meet with the Board in October and therefore to have the election very soon. If the new member is elected this fall and serves until December 31, 2011, the typical end date of the term, he or she would have served a term that would exceed two years by three months or so. The Committee agreed that it makes sense for the newly elected member to be elected as soon as possible and to serve until December 31, 2011. The Dean said that he would make the ballot for the election available to the Faculty as soon as possible.

Dean Call next asked the Committee for advice on whether a Memorial Minute Committee should be constituted for a former Amherst faculty member who died recently. President Marx noted he had expressed his condolences in writing to the colleague's widow and that the College had posted the individual's obituary on the Amherst Website and provided the local newspaper with information about the person. Dean Call informed the members about the precedent for forming such committees and about the most recent discussion (see the Committee of Six minutes of January 30, 2006) about this issue by the Committee of Six. The Dean said that most Memorial Minutes, with some rare exceptions, have been done upon the death of a colleague who passes away while he or she is a member of the Amherst Faculty or after retiring from teaching as an Amherst faculty member. The members decided that a Memorial Minute Committee should not be constituted for the colleague under discussion, because he had left Amherst to teach at several other institutions—not upon retirement. Some members expressed concern about a possible proliferation of Memorial Minutes unless the guidelines, as outlined by the Dean, are normally followed. However, the members agreed with the decision by the Committee of Six in 2006 that the Committee should consider cases for Memorial Minutes that fall outside the typical guidelines as they arise and should use their best judgment to decide when such Minutes are read at a Faculty Meeting. The Dean thanked the members for their consideration of this case and this issue.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Barbezat asked a question about a personnel matter. He asked the President and the Dean if plans call for Mr. Murphy, who has taken on other legal responsibilities at the College, to assume Attorney Wallace's advisory role on tenure matters. The Dean said that, at present, Mr. Murphy does not feel that he has the specialized legal experience and knowledge of the tenure area that would be required to take on this role, though he may develop such expertise in the future. President Marx noted that, since Mr. Murphy has been at the College, the amount of money paid for outside legal counsel has decreased. Professor Hall raised some questions about changes that had been made to four standing faculty committees (Health and Safety, Housing, Doshisha, and Health Professions) that had taken place in recent years, without a vote by the Faculty. Professor Hall said that, while he is supportive of increasing efficiency by changing the make-up and/or charges to committees if proper procedures are followed, he is concerned that, in the case of these four committees, changes were made in a way that circumvented prescribed processes of faculty governance. Dean Call noted that, in 2007-2008, the Committee of Six had discussed committee restructuring multiple times in its public minutes and had agreed that minor changes should be made to these four committees in an effort to reduce the burden on the Faculty, without affecting the functioning of the committees. He had noted at the time (see the Committee of Six minutes of September 24, 2007) that several of the proposed changes would affect standing committees of the Faculty and, thus, would require a vote of the Faculty to implement. He explained that the Health and Safety Committee had not met for ten years, and that the Committee of Six had decided that it was not necessary to appoint members unless the committee was needed. It was

Amended October 6, 2009

noted at the time that the responsibilities of the Health and Safety Committee are now shared among administrators at the College, who meet when necessary. It had been agreed that the Department of Asian Languages and Civilizations should take on the responsibilities of the Doshisha Committee. Professor Steve George had been consulted about whether the number of faculty members serving on the Health Professions Committee could be reduced from four to three. He had agreed that doing so would not have a negative effect on the functions of this committee. When the Committee of Six had discussed issues surrounding the Housing Committee, the Committee had agreed that the membership of the Housing Committee could be cut back to three faculty members. Dean Call noted that the substance of the *Faculty Handbook* has evolved over the years via multiple mechanisms and represents language voted by the Faculty, as well as policies that have been developed and included that have not required faculty votes.

Professor Rockwell commented that rules appear to have been broken when these changes were made without a vote by the Faculty, and that there should be a vote now to align rules with practice. President Marx asked the members to consider how best to move forward—whether by filling these empty committee positions, or whether motions should be brought before the Faculty in regard to these four committees now, or whether the Committee might first want to re-visit the larger question of the structuring of committees. He posed the question of whether the College might be better served as a matter of governance by having a more concentrated number of committees on which the faculty would serve on a rotating basis. President Marx noted that the adoption of particular models of committee structures would have implications for how the Faculty's time is used.

The President asked whether it is most effective to have separate committees to address every issue when such a structure adds to the burden on faculty time and makes it difficult, because of a narrowness of focus, for such committees to place their arguments in a larger context. Some might argue that, in terms of faculty governance, generally, committees can be more effective at oversight if they are considering an array of interconnected issues and making informed decisions based on a broad charge and broad view, President Marx noted. He also asked if committees with broad agendas might also request at times to form working groups to address specific issues that require more intense study. Others, he said, might view movement away from a large number of small committees with narrower charges as a lost opportunity or as disempowering the Faculty. The President noted that this is a real and important debate. The Dean commented that having a small number of larger committees on which a smaller number of colleagues would rotate on and off would enable faculty members to have a break from committee service altogether at times. Serving on such committees would likely involve a substantial commitment, however. Others, the Dean noted, might prefer the model of sometimes serving on major committees and other times serving on smaller committees that are less burdensome.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Ciepiela commented that smaller committees that require less time serve the important purpose of allowing tenure-track colleagues to have the experience of serving the community without having too substantial a burden. Such committees also enable colleagues from different disciplines and across the ranks to get to know one another. The President noted that colleagues do also become acquainted in venues that allow for substantive intellectual exchanges. Professor Hall said that committee service encourages a shared sense of investment in the College among the Faculty. Professor Barbezat noted that it is

Amended October 6, 2009

a difficult question as to whether there should be a small number of committees that will have a tremendous amount of work to do and a broad array of issues to address, while noting that committees such as the CEP and the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) have been moving in this direction, as their roles have expanded in recent years. This has caused difficulties for them and taking on even more issues might be overwhelming. Professor Rockwell expressed the view that the issue of committee restructuring is sufficiently complex that the Committee should discuss this topic at a future meeting. In the meantime, the Committee should bring motions before the Faculty regarding the committees that were changed without a faculty vote. Professor Hall asked why there should be a vote to reaffirm what is clearly stated in the *Faculty Handbook*. President Marx asked if having a larger minuted conversation about committees before moving forward with such motions would be of service to the Faculty. The Dean offered to provide the Committee with the minutes of previous Committee of Six conversations about this issue to inform discussion. Professor Rockwell said that following such a course would be fine with him. Dean Call noted that, in addition to the standing committees of the Faculty, the members might consider the numerous ad hoc committees during their deliberations about this matter.

In another matter relating to the workings of committees, Professor Hall noted that last year's Committee of Six had agreed that it would be helpful for the CEP and the Committee of Six to meet each semester and outline their agendas. Another suggestion had been to have the committees put in writing at the beginning of each year a list of the issues that they plan to address, while recognizing that new issues can arise throughout the year. Professor Rockwell expressed the view that it would be best to meet only if there are specific issues that need to be discussed by the two committees. Professor Hall responded that the Committee of Six and the CEP had struggled a bit last year with questions around overlapping areas and process and had agreed that it would be beneficial to have ways of keeping lines of communication between the committees open. He commented that the CEP's role has expanded in recent years, and that the parameters of its broader mission are sometimes ambiguous, which has sometimes led to conflict and/or duplication of effort. The Dean noted that the CEP and the Committee of Six have discussed the make-up of the proposed Task Force on Class Scheduling and have different views. It might be useful for the committees to resolve this question together, he said. The members agreed that the Dean should ask the members of the CEP if they would like to meet with the Committee and, if so, whether the CEP would communicate its plans for the year in advance of such a meeting.

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

The members returned to their discussion of the report of the Task Force on Academic Support. Professor Saxton began the conversation by noting that some tension seems to be evident between the approach to support taken by the Writing Center, which favors the use of professionals who have been trained in writing pedagogy over peer tutors, who are used to providing academic support in other areas of the curriculum. Professor Barbezat wondered whether helping students with writing requires greater expertise than tutoring them in some quantitative areas, as the issues involved may be less well defined and more complex to address. Dean Call agreed, noting that many junior and senior math majors have been quite successful as tutors. He wondered whether there are counterparts in quantitative areas to the trained writing

Amended October 6, 2009

professionals who are available to help students with writing. Some members suggested that graduate students might play this role, though helping students who have considerable difficulty may prove to be challenging for graduate students, some members felt. Professor Barbezat wondered whether there are programs at schools of education that generate professionals who are specially trained in providing quantitative support.

Professor Saxton questioned whether there might be unequal access to academic support for students, depending on whether they are seeking help for courses within the humanistic social sciences and humanities or in the sciences, since all support for writing seems to be funneled through the Writing Center. It appeared to her that having peer writing tutors would enable the College to serve a greater number of students who need help with writing, but she deferred to the Writing Center's judgment that student support was not fully up to the task. The Dean noted that it may be that more attention has been given to supporting students in quantitative areas because such efforts grew out of a response by the Dean of Students office to concerns raised by students who were struggling to pass courses in quantitative areas. Professor Saxton wondered whether departments might be able to find ways to support students who are struggling in the humanities and social sciences, but who are not necessarily failing. The Dean commented that the CEP has been considering whether there should be a faculty discussion about writing, now that the Faculty has voted (last spring) that First-Year Seminars must include writing attentive instruction. President Marx said that assessing the success of support initiatives should be a priority. For example, if Amherst has a body of writing-attentive courses, the College should continue to track what percentage of students do not avail themselves of them and more about such students. He noted that twenty to twenty-five years ago, a study by Philip Uri Treisman, a professor of mathematics and of public affairs who is now at the University of Texas at Austin and who has explored for many years ways of strengthening teaching and learning, particularly involving less well-prepared students, found that one-on-one tutoring is less effective than group tutoring. President Marx asked whether Amherst has explored programs that are more consistent with the Treisman model. The Dean commented that Professor Cox has investigated the Treisman model, and that Professor Cox had hosted a visit by Professor Treisman to the College a couple of years ago. In particular, the Dean commented that Amherst continues to experiment with a variety of approaches to academic support, while noting the importance of assessing these programs.

Professor Rockwell expressed concern that the task force's recommendations appear to overlook the recommendations made in an external review of the Moss Quantitative Center, and the conclusions of a 1997 internal evaluation of the Summer Science Program. There is no mention in the report, for example, of reforming Summer Science in significant ways, even though the internal review demonstrated that the only benefit to the program was some additional retention in science courses. He wondered whether the College could modify the program—extending its length to four or five weeks, or longer for example—so that more substantive results can be achieved. Dean Call noted that Summer Science started at a time when there was “soft money” available to support it. It is a greater challenge now to secure funding for the program. It also can be a challenge to find Amherst faculty who are willing to teach in the program, even under its current schedule. Finding colleagues to teach for fifteen weeks (three courses for five weeks each) would be difficult, he conjectures.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Rockwell said that he understands that the College has been reluctant to have faculty other than Amherst professors teach in the Summer

Amended October 6, 2009

Science Program. However, he wonders whether, given the evidence that the program does not appear to enhance the academic performance of the participants significantly, continuing concerns about the preparedness of some Amherst students should prompt the College to consider new ideas and possibilities. Is it more desirable, for example, to leave things as they are or to consider whether colleagues from outside the College who are trained in teaching less well-prepared students might improve the success of the program? The President said that it is important to identify the goals of Summer Science and other such programs and to continue to assess what is working and what is not. For some support efforts, different disciplines seem to come to different judgments about whether success has been achieved, he noted. For example, the chemists and the mathematicians appear to be more convinced than the economists that intensive sections improve student performance. Outside reviews have recommended that it is important for students not to feel that programs such as Summer Science are remedial or stigmatizing, yet some students are in need of such programs, and they appear to be grateful to receive them. Professor Ciepiela noted that the report of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) emphasizes the importance of giving students access to the open curriculum. Professor Saxton said that it appears that the question of access is being pushed into the sophomore year, since there seem to be a number of support structures in place for the first year, while there are few in the second year. The Dean agreed, noting the example of having intensive sections of Chemistry 11 in the first year, while (except for 2008-2009) similar sections have not been available for Organic Chemistry in the second year. He feels that it will be important to find the resources to support students through such course sequences. Professor Barbezat noted that, generally, material becomes more difficult in the second year and students begin to self-select when it comes to continuing in a discipline.

In terms of the question of access to the open curriculum, President Marx noted that all students have greater and lesser strengths. He posed the question of whether it is Amherst's educational responsibility to provide access for all students to all areas of the curriculum. Is it the College's responsibility to ensure that students can excel in their one or two areas of great strength and are competent in others? Or, should the College be committed primarily to helping students succeed in the areas on which they choose to focus and to meet their educational goals?

The members discussed the comment on page 20 of the task force's report that "faculty felt a frustration with the difficulty of convincing students to register for intensive courses." President Marx asked if faculty members at Amherst are able to require a student to accept placement recommendations. Members of the Committee said that there can be tension around this issue, but that advisors can refuse to sign students' registration cards if they ignore advice about placement, and that departments can insist that certain requisites be met for enrolling in their courses. Professor Rockwell noted that, in his experience as Dean of New Students, having the correct placement (in quantitative courses in particular) early on is critical to students' success. President Marx raised concern about students who need additional writing help, who are advised to take courses so designed and chose not to do so.

Continuing the conversation, President Marx asked if advisors tell students that it may not be in their best interest to take a particular course. Professor Saxton said that students do not necessarily take such advice when it is offered. Dean Call noted that, if an advisor remains consistent in his or her advice and says "no" long enough, students will generally respond to the advice. Professor Rockwell commented that some advisors do not pay sufficient attention to placement information. He suggested that it might be best to establish an across-the-board

Amended October 6, 2009

policy that would require special permission to allow a student to enroll in a course above the placement recommended by the department. The members noted that the Department of Mathematics has implemented new rules in this regard. If a student wishes to take a math course that is not at the level that the department has recommended, he or she must speak with Professor Cox. President Marx asked if, in the next phase of online registration, prerequisites will be enforced, that is whether students will not be allowed to register for courses if they have not met the requirements established by the instructor. The Dean said that doing so is possible technologically, but that each faculty member will have to determine for his or her own courses whether to require or recommend prerequisites. If prerequisites are recommended, then students would be allowed to register if they have met the prerequisites or not. If prerequisites are required, students could be prevented from registering. Professor Barbezat commented that he has been asking for years that students not be allowed to register for his courses if they have not met his stated prerequisites. There has never been time to double check their records, however. The Dean said that one approach might be for faculty to be provided with the names of students who have registered for courses but who have not met prerequisites so that colleagues can decide about the make-up of their courses. Professor Goutte stressed the importance of having a way to override any online system that might prevent students from registering for a course if they have not met prerequisites. She expressed the view that students should continue to be able to ask instructors for exceptions to the rules.

Professor Hall asked whether any standard of success could be specified for all Amherst students, and posed the following questions: Is not failing the minimum standard? What do we want from our students and how should success be measured? Professor Barbezat suggested that grades, course selection patterns, and whether students stay in their chosen majors are some indicators of meeting the goals of an Amherst education. President Marx said that these are substantial and complex questions. He noted that it will be helpful to find ways to begin to assess the impact of an Amherst education on students, as he worries about an environment in which more and more value is being placed on such measurements. President Marx noted that he has provided modest support for Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research, to administer the College Learning Assessment as an experiment to a small group of students. While this is far from a perfect instrument, it is used by many of Amherst's peer institutions and is thought to be the best analytic test of its type, he said.

Professor Ciepiela commented that there are advising guidelines published annually in the College *Catalog* that recommend that students take courses that fall within six recommended areas. President Marx noted that, with the advice of the CEP, online resources are being developed both for purposes of self-assessment and advising, e.g., in software that will track course patterns of each student's course work for purposes of advising and self-assessment and to encourage (but not require) discussion between advisor and student on the breadth in course selection. Members of the Faculty are being asked to assign to their courses keywords that are tied to most of the six broad learning categories defined by the Faculty. The Dean noted that it will be important for faculty to categorize their courses accurately for the new advising aid to be successful.

Returning to the question of the agenda for a possible meeting with the CEP, Professor Rockwell suggested that the Summer Science Program be discussed, particularly whether it is being used effectively to address the remediation needs of less well-prepared students, which is an academic issue. The Dean noted that, even if Summer Science were to be expanded, he

Amended October 6, 2009

would have doubts about whether students in the program would be brought up to the level of their peers, who have had greater preparation. In his view, the program should be viewed as the first in a series of steps toward this goal. Professor Saxton said that it seems that the program does produce a cohort of students who bond with one another. Professor Goutte agreed with this idea and specifically noted that in a class in which she has this cohort of students along with others, she has found the Summer Science students to be the most participatory. Professor Hall noted that this result represents a counterbalance to concerns that some have had about Summer Science students (as well as students placed in writing-intensive classes) feeling stigmatized. The members wondered whether it is those students who choose not to receive support when they need it who associate a stigma with doing so. Professor Rockwell wondered whether Summer Science should be under the CEP's purview. Professor Rockwell noted that academic support services are currently part of the portfolio of the Dean of Students office, and he asked if, as an academic concern, it might make more sense for them to fall under the purview of the Dean of the Faculty's office. The Dean said that when Dean Lieber assumes his new position as Dean of Academic Support and Student Research, the Writing Center, Quantitative Center, and other academic support services will be brought under the umbrella of the Dean of the Faculty's office.

Professor Goutte said that she would have liked to see in the report data on how students perform when they take mathematics courses at the recommended level, because the performance data for students who do not follow recommendations would be much more meaningful with this comparison. The Dean noted that the number of failures in courses has declined since advising students on course placement and tracking have improved. Professor Rockwell agreed, noting that freshman drops have also decreased significantly. With improved tracking by the Dean of New Students, it is now possible to intervene quickly, in the first year in particular, if a student is struggling with a quantitative course. The Dean of Students office now has more contact with professors teaching Math 11, for example. He acknowledged that, when students fail, it sometimes has little to do with academics and more to do with other difficulties. President Marx said that one study conducted by the Office of Institutional Research has shown that the distribution of students who experience academic difficulty spans the academic reader ratings, evidence that reinforces what Professor Rockwell had just noted. Professor Saxton asked whether it might be necessary to have a standing committee of the Faculty for academic support or whether the CEP might add oversight of this area to its charge. The Dean said that he is interested in next steps now that the task force has made its recommendations and that he is open to suggestions. One idea that has been proposed has been to form a group of faculty that would serve in an advisory role to Dean Lieber in his new position. Returning to another question raised by the report, Professor Saxton asked why the Office of Advancement is developing programs for transfer and international students, noting that it seems odd for this office to take on this responsibility. The Dean said that he believes that the focus of such programs is on internships during Interterm and in the summer.

The Committee ended the meeting by considering next steps. The members agreed to return to consider the question of how best to address the recommendations of the report and the bodies that should do so. The members also decided to consider charges to committees that will be considering the recommendations of the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC). Professor Ciepiela commented that it seems unfortunate that faculty often leave one committee and are reassigned to a new one at the very time that they have absorbed information about a particular area. The Dean noted that the same is true of chairing a department. It often takes chairs a year

Amended October 6, 2009

or so to learn all that this position entails, and often chairs rotate out once they have learned the range of their duties. President Marx wondered if adopting this model of chairmanship, and possibly of forced committee rotation, might have been a counter-reaction to an earlier period in Amherst's history when such powers were consolidated into the hands of some faculty members for extended periods of time. One cost of the current system, the members and the Dean agreed, is often inefficiency and loss of expertise from committees.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 28, 2009

The fourth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, September 28, 2009. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The members began the meeting with conversation that would inform the drafting of charges to the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) and the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR). The charges would focus on questions surrounding the budget and associated recommendations of the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC). The Committee turned first to the charge to the FCAFA.

Professor Barbezat said that he favors having the charge to the FCAFA be explicit in regard to the specific areas—for example, the no-loan policy—that the committee should address, since the FCAFA had already submitted its ranked recommendations regarding the budget in its report of the spring to the ABC. President Marx asked what the Committee wished to accomplish with the charges. Professor Rockwell responded that some faculty members have expressed the strong desire for the Faculty to have a public discussion about the ABC's recommendations surrounding financial aid. Given the uncertainty about the economy, he said that it seems prudent to develop plans now for additional budget cuts that could be made in the event that the College's financial state worsens, rather than waiting for a moment of urgency to develop such plans.

Dean Call commented that he has envisioned that the CPR, in keeping with its defined role, would be the committee that would review new financial projections that incorporate the ABC's recommendations and the actual endowment return for the year that ended June 30, 2009. He noted that the endowment's return of -20.1 percent is significantly better than the earlier projected -30 percent, and that this more positive performance, in combination with the budget reductions already achieved and recommended by the ABC, has resulted in financial projections for the College being much stronger than they appeared last spring. As a result the Board and administration feel that there is a longer window of time in which to have conversations about the budget and to consider different plans, including ideas about future reductions that might be needed.

Professor Saxton asked if having the FCAFA consider the financial aid budget would be redundant, considering the imagined role for the CPR. The Dean noted that there is currently a three-year budget plan in place that has reduced the budget to the point that it would be difficult to scale it back further within the next three years, without affecting the core functioning and mission of the College. It will be the job of the CPR to weigh whether further adjustments to the budget should be made now, or whether any additional cuts should take place further off in the future, based on the adjusted budget projections. Professor Rockwell said that the Faculty has made a strong statement that suggests that there is a desire to discuss the issue of financial aid. A public discussion will enable the Faculty to affirm, take a middle position, or not to endorse the policy recommended by the ABC. He feels that there is value in talking out the details at a Faculty Meeting. The Dean asked whether it would be most useful to set an arbitrary range of targets for cuts in the charge or to have the CPR set some parameters. Professor Rockwell said that he is not attached to any specific targets, though he feels that there is some urgency among the Faculty to discuss this issue.

President Marx asked how there could be an effective analysis of the budget if one piece is pulled out to be discussed in isolation. Professor Barbezat noted that the CPR would soon be charged with consideration of the other ABC recommendations, and

Amended October 28, 2009

that issues of financial aid were therefore not being singled out for discussion in isolation. Professor Hall suggested that the ABC recommendations were explicitly for the Trustees, but also implicitly for the Faculty, because the Trustees have delegated to the Faculty responsibility for formulating particular policies—including those surrounding admission and financial aid—that have budgetary implications. He noted that charging the ABC, which was not a faculty committee, with making recommendations to the Board regarding financial aid policy represents a departure from the typical process of having the FCAFA do so. He feels it would be helpful now, as a part of its regular charge, for the FCAFA to have the opportunity to review the ABC recommendations that fall within the FCAFA's purview. President Marx agreed, though also noted that the FCAFA deliberations had fed into the deliberations of the ABC, which itself had been largely devised by the Faculty. The President commented that, while the Faculty has the responsibility to formulate certain policies, including those relating to admission and financial aid, it should be noted that faculty committees make recommendations to the Board, which has delegated this responsibility. Though the Board has accepted the recommendations of the Faculty and there has been little disagreement between the Trustees and the Faculty (e.g., on the recommendations of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) or ABC in recent years), the Trustees do retain final legal and fiduciary responsibility over all College policies.

Professor Rockwell asked the Dean to describe the schedule for the budget cycle. Dean Call noted that budget requests are made in February and that the budget is constructed throughout the spring. The CPR reviews the entire budget as a draft before that draft comes to the Board for review in the spring. The final details about the budget are worked out over the summer, and the Board votes on the final budget in October. Professor Rockwell noted that some colleagues feel that there was a rushed quality to the ABC process and the deliberations that transpired over the summer. The Faculty would now like to weigh in, particularly on the question of financial aid. While there is now a push to have a conversation, he noted that, if the administration is concerned about discussing sensitive issues in a public meeting, it is free to contextualize the conversation in a way that would seek to de-personalize the discussion.

Professor Ciepiela asked if it wouldn't be useful to the CPR for the FCAFA to return to the recommendations that the committee made to the ABC last spring and to re-examine them in light of the new financial projections. The FCAFA could then bring its current views to the Faculty. If the College were to face a moment in which there would be a need to reduce the financial aid budget, Amherst would be well positioned to do so in a considered way. The Dean agreed and noted that he imagines a procedure in which the FCAFA makes its recommendations to the Committee of Six, the Committee of Six has minuted discussions of the recommendations, and then the recommendations are brought to the Faculty for discussion. He noted that, to inform the deliberations of the CPR next semester, which would have a broader context, it would be best for the FCAFA to submit its recommendations to the Committee of Six by mid-November and for the Faculty to complete its discussion by the end of the semester.

President Marx raised the question of how to have a discussion about financial aid policy on the floor of the Faculty that encompasses the full range of sensitivities and complexities associated with this issue, without students coming to feel that the Faculty is debating the merits of a particular group of students within the student body. Professor Rockwell said that it is important that students not be excluded from the discussion. He feels that the educational benefit to students of learning about College governance

Amended October 28, 2009

through participation in the process outweighs the damage that might occur as a result of misinterpretations that might arise. He stressed the need for faculty to be aware of the strength of the student response to its communications and for colleagues to be clear when making points. Even in the worst of moments, Professor Rockwell noted, students will benefit from being a part of the dialogue.

Professor Goutte noted that, when forming impressions, most students focus on the present and are relying on their own experience at the College, which is of short duration. They most often do not have a sense of institutional history surrounding financial aid policy. Professor Goutte wondered whether there might be an effective way to provide students with some background about financial aid at the College so that they can get a sense of how policies have developed. They may gain a new perspective and the ability to step back and see the big picture. Professor Saxton agreed that it would be useful to frame the discussion that would take place at the Faculty Meeting beforehand. Professor Hall said that it would be helpful for everyone, not only students, to become better informed about the evolution of financial aid policy at the College. The members suggested that Tom Parker, Dean of Admission and Financial Aid, should be asked to make a presentation about developments in financial aid policy over the past ten or fifteen years.

The Committee agreed that, as planned, it would be helpful for the FCAFA to continue its review of financial aid policies and, as it did this spring, to prioritize a set of recommendations for further reductions, which may or may not be needed. Plans could then be considered by the Faculty, the administration and the Board for the next budget cycle. Having the FCAFA work with hypothetical targets of 5, 10, and 15 percent cuts seems fine for planning purposes, the members agreed, while noting that the CPR would be working with “real numbers.” The Dean commented that, should changes be made to the financial aid policy, they should not take effect with next year’s incoming class. Any changes in policy would need to be made public in the fall for the class that would then be applying and would enter the following September. President Marx clarified that any changes to the financial aid policy at any time will not affect students who are already at Amherst or who have been accepted to the College prior to the change. The President reiterated the import, and also the challenge, of having conversation about financial aid and admission policy in a public setting because of the sensitivity of some issues that could be relevant to any such discussion.

Turning to the role of the CPR, the members noted that, as the committee considers the many components of the budget, including financial aid, their deliberations would be informed by the FCAFA’s work. In terms of targets for the CPR, the Dean expressed some concern that, if contingency plans are developed that include significant cuts in the near future, he would worry that last year’s conversation would be repeated and that fears would again arise about lay-offs and other frightening scenarios, when it does not appear that such steps will need to be taken. Professor Rockwell reiterated that it seems best to be prepared for the worst by making plans for a full range of situations that may arise.

Professor Ciepiela wondered whether broader language for both charges, such as the following passage (on page seven) that appears in the ABC report in reference to the work of the FCAFA, might be best to encourage reflection, rather than placing the emphasis on calculation:

Amended October 28, 2009

...Should the broader set of recommendations outlined in this report prove insufficient to put the College on track to achieve financial equilibrium within ten years, the committee recommends that the Board, in consultation with the FCAFA, further review the sustainability of Amherst's financial aid policies.

The President, the Dean, and the members agreed that it would be helpful to use more expansive language in the charges that the members would draft. At the conclusion of their discussion, the members agreed on the following two charges and asked the Dean to forward them to the FCAFA and CPR respectively:

Following on the report of the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC), the Committee of Six hereby charges the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) to:

- 1) Develop a prioritized list of recommendations designed to meet or surpass the financial aid savings projections described on page thirteen of the report of the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC) and forward that list to the Committee of Six in mid-November for discussion by the Faculty at a Faculty Meeting that will be held by the end of the Fall semester 2009.
- 2) Continue to monitor the implementation of the Board-approved recommendations defined in the ABC report and report to the Faculty in the spring about their budgetary impact.
- 3) Develop contingency plans that would define mechanisms by which 5 percent, 10 percent, and 15 percent reductions in projected financial aid expenditures, beyond those defined on page thirteen in the ABC report, might be achieved, should the financial exigencies of the College necessitate such savings. The FCAFA should draw up these plans in the form of a prioritized list of recommendations and forward that list to the Committee of Six by mid-February 2010 for discussion by the Faculty at a Faculty Meeting that will be held in March 2010.

Following on the report of the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC), the Committee of Six hereby charges the Committee on Priorities and Resources to:

Develop a prioritized list of recommendations designed to meet or surpass the savings projections described on page thirteen of the report of the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC) and forward that list to the Committee of Six by mid-March for discussion by the Faculty at a Faculty Meeting that will be held in the spring.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," the Dean asked if the members could meet on Tuesday, October 13, since Monday, October 12, falls within the Fall break. The members agreed to meet on October 13 at 3:30 P.M. Dean Call then discussed a personnel matter with the Committee.

The Dean next informed the members that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has asked to meet with the Committee on October 13 (the meeting was later re-scheduled for November 3). The members agreed to do so, and the Dean reviewed with

Amended October 28, 2009

the Committee agenda items that Committee of Six will undertake this year that might be discussed with the CEP, which might be considering them in the future as well. The CEP is also preparing an agenda, the Dean noted. The members agreed that the two committees might consider a number of issues, including the proposal for a Film and Media Studies major, the charge and membership of a Grade Inflation Working Group, the structure of a Class Scheduling Task Force, structuring of faculty committees, housing policy, the Doshisha faculty exchange (which is up for review this year), and the report of the Task Force on Academic Support. The members commented that they welcome the meeting with their colleagues on the CEP and look forward to an informative discussion.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Rockwell asked if there is now a new seating arrangement for the Faculty during Convocation, since the Faculty was asked to be seated on the pews on the sides of the chapel, rather than in the middle, which is traditional at the opening Convocation. President Marx said that an error had resulted in the new seating pattern, and that the usual model would be followed at future opening Convocations. Professor Hall next asked if the College would be offering flu shots. The Dean said the College is hoping to receive initial supplies of the H1N1 vaccine in the next few days to weeks. As for the usual seasonal flu vaccine, manufacturers have notified the Health Center (and all other medical providers) that supplies will be delayed due to resources being shifted to H1N1 vaccine production. The Dean understands that, until the vaccine is in hand, the College will not be able to publicize dates for student and employee immunization clinics. He noted that he is a member of the College’s Influenza Working Group, which is developing plans in the event that there is an outbreak of the flu on campus.

In light of earlier conversations about the format and substance of the Committee’s minutes, the Dean asked the Committee to consider ways that the minutes can be kept as transparent and informative as possible, while ensuring that they are concise. The members agreed that, while the goal should be to convey the substance of the Committee’s conversations, moving toward more summary and less documentation of all individual comments would be desirable to prevent the length of the minutes from becoming an obstacle to reading them. In addition to agreeing on guidelines and aspirations for the substance of the minutes, the members agreed that the Dean should, with the Committee’s help, move the meetings along as efficiently as possible, as Committee of Six meetings in recent years have expanded to three hours on a regular basis. Having shorter meetings will result in shorter minutes and better communication with the Faculty, it was agreed.

The members next considered the recommendations of the report of the Task Force on Academic Support, noting that the CEP would also consider [the report](#) and its [supporting documents](#), which would also be shared (via a link in these minutes) with the Faculty, and made some [changes to the recommendations](#) (shared via a link in these minutes) listed at the end of the document (see [all documents](#).) The Committee agreed that the Dean of Academic Support and Student Research should monitor the progress of all of the recommendations. Professor Rockwell expressed some concern about the recommendation that “Whenever possible, incoming students would be matched with advisors who may be familiar with their culture or demographic.” He commented that, in his experience, while shared ethnicity with an advisor might be helpful in assisting students with issues surrounding the transition to Amherst, the relationship between an advisor and student is strongest when an advisor has expertise in the academic area in

Amended October 28, 2009

which the student is most interested. President Marx asked if it might be helpful, for example, for international students, who face particular transitional challenges, to have advisors who have expertise in working with international students and/or an international background. The Committee agreed to support this Task Force's recommendation as long as it is applied with sensitivity.

Professor Ciepiela suggested that study abroad be considered in the context of the recommendation that an advising culture be created to improve pre-major advising. It was agreed that the Teaching and Advising Program (TAP) should play a role in improving advising by organizing discussions and training for the Faculty on this topic. The Committee also asked the Dean to continue conversations about support that might be provided in the sophomore year. The President noted that some of these proposals have budget implications. The Dean agreed and commented that plans include applying for grants to support some proposed programs. Professor Hall suggested that department chairs should be involved in the recommendation to improve pre-major advising to further involve departments in this process. He noted that keeping abreast of information to inform pre-major advising can be a challenge, and he imagines that most colleagues would welcome a refresher session. The Committee suggested adding the Dean of New Students to the list of those who would be implementing programming about pre-major advising and that opportunities be developed for the Faculty to discuss advising in informal settings.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Hall suggested, in reference to the Task Force recommendation that information be disseminated about academic support resources more effectively, that signs be made to indicate where the Moss Quantitative Center is located within Merrill Science Center. Currently, it is very difficult to find the center since there are no signs. The Dean agreed to talk to Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities/Associate Treasurer for Campus Services, about having signs created. Professor Hall offered the services of the Physics Department to create signs. He also noted concerns about the lights being turned off in Merrill as part of a green initiative because of safety concerns and a lack of visibility. The Committee agreed that the recommendations to revise course descriptions for intensive sections in quantitative courses and to provide course descriptions for the intensive program in writing instruction should be forwarded to the CEP and then to the Faculty for a vote. The members agreed that the same path should be used to create courses that serve as introductions to critical thinking and active learning at the college level for transfer students in the spring semester, rather than having the Dean of ASSR take on this role, as the Task Force suggested. In the context of discussing the recommendation that orientation sessions be expanded for transfer students in the spring semester, the Committee noted that it can be a challenge for such students to enter the College in the spring. The President asked why the College accepts transfer students in the spring. It was suggested that they are accepted to fill spaces that arise when juniors study abroad in the spring. The President noted that he has asked the Committee on International Education to explore ways to encourage more students to study abroad in the fall to alleviate the imbalance that currently exists between the two semesters when it comes to study abroad. More students study abroad in the spring than fall. Professors Rockwell and Ciepiela said that such a shift will be difficult to accomplish because there are structural factors (for example, the mismatch between our fall semester and the first term of the British system, and the timing of some major requirements) that lead more students to study abroad in the spring. The members agreed that, in addition to the Dean of

Amended October 28, 2009

Students, the Orientation Committee should also consider the issue of orientation sessions for transfer students.

Turning to the recommendation to create academic support programs during Interterm and the second summer for students from the pre-orientation program, the Committee suggested that an advisory board be formed to work with the Dean of ASSR on this issue and that departments be involved. It was agreed that an assessment component should be built in to any programs that are created. The members also suggested that the Dean of ASSR, as well as the Dean of the Faculty and the Dean of Students, be involved in the effort to improve peer tutoring by increasing the involvement of the Faculty and providing resources and oversight. In regard to the recommendation that the position of Student Life Fellow be continued, the President and Dean noted that this position is currently funded through a grant, which will expire soon, and that the decision to continue the position has budgetary ramifications that will be considered by the administration. The Committee noted that the Alumni office, rather than Development, should be one of the entities involved in creating expanded opportunities for international and transfer students during breaks, Interterm, and the summer. In addition to having the Office of Institutional Research involved in assessing academic support programs, the Committee agreed that those directly involved in these programs should be encouraged to organize them in such a way that considers assessment and to participate in the development of assessment tools.

The Dean reviewed briefly with the members some background on the restructuring of committees. In reviewing the *Faculty Handbook*, he has found that some committees, and their charges, were voted into existence, while some appear to have evolved in other ways. He suggested that any future changes to the charge and/or membership of standing committees should require a faculty vote. The members agreed to discuss committee structuring at a future meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 23, 2009

The fifth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Tuesday, October 13, 2009. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 30, 2009

The sixth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, October 19, 2009. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The President began the meeting by informing the members that Andrew Bacevich has accepted an appointment at Amherst as a John J. McCloy '16 Professor of American Institutions and International Diplomacy and, in this role, will teach one course at the College in the Fall term next year. President Marx noted that Professor Bacevich will be affiliated with the Department of History, and that History and other departments with which the President consulted about the possibility of bringing Professor Bacevich to Amherst were enthusiastic that the historian has agreed to teach at the College.

Continuing his announcements, the President informed the members that, following the meeting that occurred between the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) and the Board on Friday of the previous week, some student members of the committee asked why the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has not been charged by the Committee of Six to consider educational questions in the context of the implementation of Advisory Budget Committee (ABC) recommendations, while the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) and the FCAFA have been charged to focus on questions surrounding the budget and associated recommendations of the ABC that relate to their committees' regular areas of focus. The students questioned why financial aid was being singled out for what appears to be more rigorous analysis and possible actions. Noting issues of parity and the possibility of creating an odd impression by not charging the CEP, President Marx asked for the members' thoughts.

In response to this question, Professor Barbezat noted that the CPR is being asked to review the full array of ABC recommendations, serving as a clearinghouse of sorts. He imagines that, if curricular questions arise in the course of the CPR's deliberations, that committee could charge the CEP with examining a particular educational issue. Professor Rockwell concurred, noting that he envisions the CEP participating in the second phase of deliberations involving implementation of ABC recommendations, that is responding to any specific budgetary proposals that focus on areas within the CEP's purview. Dean Call commented that the CEP spent a good deal of time last year discussing at a general level the educational impact that changes to the budget might bring, in response to the request last year that that the CEP (as well as the CPR and the FCAFA), in consultation with the Amherst community, think about ways to maximize efficiency and lower costs in areas within their charges, with the goal of informing the work of the ABC. Noting the difficulty of situating these conversations, Dean Call suggested that one approach might be to begin discussions with a focus on the budget and then to address questions surrounding education that might emerge from decisions about the budget. The other approach would be to begin with a conversation that is explicitly focused on education. He noted that, conceptually, he much prefers a discussion that focuses first on liberal arts education and on how it may evolve, rather than one that starts by contemplating educational changes motivated by budgetary considerations. He said that a challenge in the latter approach would be knowing what steps might be needed or are viable, without a specific request or goal. Dean Call suggested that the Committee of Six discuss the question at hand on November 3, when the Committee of Six meets with

Amended October 30, 2009

the CEP. Professor Ciepiela asked if all three committees were given charges as part of the ABC process, suggesting that any new charges should relate to the previous ones. The Dean said that he would review the Committee of Six minutes to answer this question fully.

Under “Announcements from the Dean,” Dean Call asked the members if they would like to meet with the Registrar, Ms. Goff, to receive an update on the progress of the development of online registration at the College. He noted that the Registrar had recently given a presentation on this topic to the CEP. Professor Barbezat said that, now that his questions have been answered about whether the new system will allow professors to block a student from registering for his or her course if the student has not completed the articulated prerequisites (the answer is “yes”), he is satisfied. The other members agreed that they did not feel that it is necessary to meet with the Registrar at this time.

Continuing with his announcements, the Dean informed the members that the CEP is in favor of returning to a two-week add/drop period and may craft a motion to bring such a change before the Faculty, possibly in time to change the add/drop period for Spring pre-registration and in time to inform members of the Five-College Consortium of the change. The committee had recommended, and the Faculty had voted to approve, a shortened add/drop period last year. Returning to a two-week add/drop period would require a vote of the Faculty, as the academic calendar is set by faculty vote, Dean Call said. Professor Goutte noted that 2009-2010 is an unusual year because Labor Day falls very late, so that, during the first week of classes, Monday classes were held on Tuesday, and Tuesday/Thursday classes did not meet until three days into the semester. The Dean agreed that Labor Day was as late as it could possibly be this year, and that, in six out of seven years, the unusual pattern of this year would not occur. Professor Barbezat asked if faculty are permitted to close registration for their classes before the end of the add/drop period. Professor Ciepiela said that it is her understanding that courses must remain open during the entire pre-registration period, even if the number of students who register is higher than the enrollment limit set for the course. At the conclusion of pre-registration, faculty members who have set enrollment caps and who have enrollments above that cap may drop students from their courses. Those colleagues who have not set caps cannot drop students, she noted. The Dean said that the Faculty approved this procedure in 2004, as a result of motion brought before the Faculty by the CEP. He agreed to provide the voted language to the Committee.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Ciepiela and Barbezat said that they would not be in favor of returning to a two-week add/drop period, agreeing with Professor Goutte that this year presented special circumstances, and that the shortened add/drop period should be given another chance. Professor Hall agreed, as did Professor Rockwell, who said that the CEP should be asked to provide a rationale for its position in regard to this matter, if the committee brings forward a motion. The Committee suggested that the Dean share with the CEP the members’ view that they are in favor of retaining the shortened add/drop period for now. He agreed to do so.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Hall commented that he has become frustrated that some Five-College students’ unfamiliarity with Amherst’s add/drop policy, and their desire to withdraw from a course after the add/drop deadline,

Amended October 30, 2009

obligates him to give them a failing grade. Other members noted that it is possible for special arrangements to be made with the Dean of Students' office and a Five College Student's home institution so that a faculty member is not required to give a failing grade to a student from another college who withdraws from a course after the deadline. Professor Hall thanked the members for this advice. Professor Hall next noted that he had received information about the installation of new doorknobs that would allow faculty and/or the campus police to lock a classroom in the event of a security threat on campus. This email reminded him that it might be useful to have a venue for faculty consultation on this issue, inter alia, but that one no longer exists because appointments to the Health and Safety Committee have not been made in recent years. Professor Hall noted that, particularly in the aftermath of 9/11, Virginia Tech, and the presence of H1N1 flu, he sees a greater need than ever for vehicles that encourage campus-wide communication about health and safety issues, and he thought that appointments should soon be made to the Health and Safety Committee. President Marx and the Dean, who said that they would be happy to discuss this proposal in the context of the Committee's upcoming conversation about the structuring of faculty committees, expressed the view that any additional benefits that might result from the reactivation of the Health and Safety Committee for the purpose of enhancing communication should be weighed against the possibility of using the Faculty's valuable time to focus on what might be seen as relatively minor administrative matters.

The members turned briefly to a personnel matter.

The members next considered a revised proposal for a new major in Film and Media Studies (FMS), including supporting materials ([appended via this link](#)), from the Advisory Committee on Film and Media Studies. Discussion began with Professor Rockwell noting that he had some questions after reviewing this material. He wondered what the committee's rationale was for having the major consist of nine courses. He also expressed concern that the committee has proposed that the major be restricted to no more than fifteen students, "based on the limited equipment available and the intense advising/mentoring involved." Professor Rockwell commented that he knows of no other Amherst major that limits students' access to a major so explicitly, though the Dean noted that some departments certainly do so by capping the enrollments of their required courses. Professor Rockwell said that he worries about the precedent that would be set by restricting access to the FMS major to fifteen students. The members commented that there clearly would be budgetary implications if the major were to expand. Professor Ciepiela noted that the proposal offers the view that the major will be so demanding that many students will not want to pursue it. Some members expressed doubt that this would be the case. Professors Hall, Goutte, and Ciepiela also worried that, in addition to proposing enrollment caps for the introductory course sequence that would serve as a barrier to the major for most students because of the small sizes of these classes, the proposed caps on enrollments in required upper-level courses could have the result of making it impossible for a student to complete the major at a point in his or her Amherst career when it could be difficult to complete an alternative major. Anticipating that the new major promises to be very popular among students, the members expressed some concern about how faculty affiliated with the major would respond to a larger-than-anticipated demand by students who wish to become majors. How would majors be

Amended October 30, 2009

selected if the major proves to be very popular? The Committee asked the Dean to ask these questions of the Advisory Committee, and he agreed to do so.

President Marx asked, for the sake of discussion, how to weigh the costs, real benefits, and trade-offs involved in any additions to the curriculum, as additional resources will be needed now and in the future. Presumably, in terms of FTEs, if positions are allocated to a new endeavor, then there may be fewer available to support already existing majors.

Professor Ciepiela commented that, in the case of the proposal before the Committee, that apart from the recent hiring of a new tenured professor (Professor Hastie) to lead the program, the major will rely on human and technological resources that already exist on campus. In the case of the FTE that is discussed as a possible need in the future, she noted that adding a position in the arts is in keeping with the recommendation of the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP), and of the Faculty, that the practices of art at the College should be strengthened, in addition to the CAP's emphases on supporting the global and the interdisciplinary within the curriculum.

Professor Barbezat said that he is a bit perplexed about the Advisory Committee's characterization of the proposed major in relation to the committee's description of the Five College Film Studies Major (FCFSM). It appears to him that the qualities that the Advisory Committee describes as being integral to the proposed Amherst major are also fundamental to the FCFSM. Both majors seem to share the qualities of being interdisciplinary (designed to stretch across a broad spectrum of the Liberal Arts curriculum); integrative (designed to combine theory, history, and criticism of the moving image with various forms of creativity or artistic production); and student-centered (designed to allow each student to pursue his or her intellectual and/or artistic interests within a contractual model, under the supervision of an interdisciplinary faculty committee, drawn from the faculty involved with the major program), though the Advisory Committee feels that these attributes distinguish the Amherst proposed major. Professor Saxton responded that the proposed Amherst major takes a broad liberal arts approach that allows for many creative and integrative possibilities and which does not require that students master film as a medium. The FCFSM major takes a more traditional approach, she noted, that requires more courses that focus on film. President Marx said that he would like to understand why a collaborative process to configure the FCFSM to meet the needs of all Five College institutions has not been successful. Dean Call noted that it is the hope of a number of Amherst faculty members that the FCFSM will eventually evolve to resemble the proposed Amherst major, because the field, generally, is moving in the direction of the Amherst model. Professor Rockwell said that he finds it troubling that the proposal calls for a major to be staffed largely by colleagues who do not have Ph.D.s in film and media studies, with the exception of Professor Hastie. Professor Ciepiela noted that Professor Woodson, who would teach a number of courses in the major, has long used visual media in her artistic practice.

Dean Call noted that the Committee of Six, the CEP, and the CPR expressed the strong desire last year that the proposal for the FMS major be brought before the Faculty for discussion and vote. In light of concerns raised by the Committee, he asked whether the Committee wished to forward the proposal to the Faculty. The members agreed that the Advisory Committee has put a great deal of thought and effort into the proposal and

Amended October 30, 2009

that there appears to be a good deal of support for a FMS major. Despite their reservations about some details of the proposal, the members agreed that the Dean should place a motion to create the FMS major on the draft Faculty Meeting agenda for November 3. The members would then review the motion and the full agenda and vote on both the substance of the motion and whether to forward it to the Faculty. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to a personnel matter.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 31, 2009

The seventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, October 26, 2009. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with the members discussing agenda items that might be the focus of their upcoming (November 3) meeting with the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). It was agreed that, among other topics, it would be productive to discuss the structure and work of a contemplated class scheduling task force. This was a topic of conversation last year when the two committees met. President Marx stated that finding ways to use all of the time slots available, rather than having courses “bunched” during particular times of day, represents an example of a seemingly simple issue that in fact has consequences for many different areas of the college. He noted that there are significant budget implications for Amherst of not using the full schedule of the day, such as inflation of the need to build new classrooms. In addition, the Dean said that another result of the current bunched schedule is overcrowding at Valentine, since students end up eating lunch within a limited timeframe that is interrelated with their class schedules. Dean Call commented that, if classes were distributed throughout the schedule, congestion at Valentine would lessen. Similarly, if more classrooms were used throughout the day, there would be less difficulty in reserving classrooms of a desired size and/or with particular equipment. Students will also have more course choices, making the curriculum more open.

Under “Questions from Committee members,” Professor Hall asked the President and the Dean if they would describe highlights of the Trustee meetings that had been held during the weekend of October 16. President Marx noted that the Trustees had met with the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR), the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA), and the Advisory Committee on Personnel Policies (ACPP), and, informally, with some members of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and some members of the Committee of Six. The President said that the Trustees are eager to work with the Faculty in the areas under the purview of these and other committees and asked how committee structures might best meet this need. Dean Call commented that some of these committees have expanded their focus in recent years in positive ways. He offered the example of the CEP now spending less time on routine tasks such as editing course proposals and directing more of its efforts to considering broad educational issues. President Marx noted that issues also discussed by the Trustees ranged from options for renovating the Lord Jeffery Inn and Merrill Science Center to how best to draw on the knowledge of frontline staff when considering when or if open positions at the College should be filled. Professor Hall noted that he had just given a lecture at Williams and had been impressed with the science facilities there. He said that he now understands better why the Trustees view the Merrill Center as a potential liability in recruiting students and faculty. President Marx said that there is agreement among the Trustees that Amherst needs an excellent science facility. He noted that plans for the science building will be considered also as part of the campus landscape as a whole. Architects will soon be solicited to make proposals for the science building, the President said, with the likely site being on the current Merrill site or adjacent to it. Those involved in planning efforts, including the Board, support the development of a design that will be flexible enough to accommodate the development and growth of science education and research in the long term.

The members reviewed sixteen new course proposals. Professor Rockwell raised a question about a course proposal that specified that majors would be given priority if the course

Amended October 31, 2009

was oversubscribed even though the course was not required for majors. The members then voted six to zero in favor of forwarding the courses to the Faculty. The Committee next voted on the following motion to create a Film and Media Studies major:

To create a new major in Film and Media Studies to commence
with the Class of 2014

The members voted one in favor and two opposed on the substance of motion. Three members abstained. The Committee then voted six to zero in favor of forwarding the motion to the Faculty. The members next reviewed a draft Faculty Meeting Agenda for November 3 and voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the Agenda to the Faculty.

The Committee turned to personnel matters for the remainder of the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 4, 2009

The eighth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Tuesday, November 3, 2009. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with "Announcements from the President." President Marx distributed to the members the CVs of scholars for consideration as possible Simpson Lecturers or McCloy Professors. He said that these scholars had emerged as individuals of interest through a process of faculty nomination or had responded to an ad that had been placed in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. President Marx asked the members if they would review the CVs and make recommendations about these candidates to him at the next Committee of Six meeting. Professor Saxton asked for more information about these positions. President Marx noted that, at present, Professor Goldsby and Richard Wilbur '42 hold appointments as Simpson Lecturers. He said that, after discussions last year with the Committee of Six and the Faculty, it had been agreed that, with the advice of the Committee of Six, he could invite a small number of highly distinguished scholars to be appointed as Simpson Lecturers or McCloy Professors to teach at the College for a period of up to three years. In addition, President Marx noted, he had recently agreed to make funding from the Croxton Lecture Fund available to support a small number of visiting positions for accomplished alumni and/or others to teach courses on a single-course basis. Departments have been asked to make proposals to the Dean for these Croxton Lectureships, following the regular procedures for requesting visitors. The Dean said that he has received a number of such requests recently. The members agreed to discuss the CVs of those being considered for the McCloy Professorship, Simpson Lectureship, and Croxton Lectureship at their next meeting.

Continuing with his announcements, the President noted that the voluntary retirement program and attrition have resulted in close to seventy staff and administrative positions at the College (12 percent of non-faculty employees) that are or will be vacant by the end of the academic year. President Marx and Dean Call discussed with the members the process through which the staff will provide their insights into how some structures and positions may be re-configured and into decisions about which positions will be filled. President Marx explained that the Dean, the senior staff, and he would assess the recommendations made by managers who report to them, who, in turn, will be consulting widely with staff who report to them before making any recommendations regarding positions. President Marx said that the process of decision-making will involve complex choices. By weighing these choices slowly and carefully, it is his hope that there will be space to make adjustments.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call asked for the Committee's thoughts about how to respond to an invitation from colleagues at Five Colleges, Inc., to a faculty retreat next month. The Dean explained that, with the arrival of a new Five Colleges director, and with it being more than a decade since Five Colleges undertook its last review, this year has been chosen for a Five-College strategic planning process. Dean Call said that one advantage of this type of exercise is that a serious attempt is made to look beyond immediate constraints and try to envision how Five Colleges can be most useful in supporting the work of each of the member institutions. Noting that the request is for six faculty members from each college and the university, with no deans, the Dean asked for the members' advice on who should be asked to participate from Amherst. He said that his initial thought would be to ask colleagues from the

Amended December 4, 2009

Committee of Six, the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), and the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR), but that he would welcome other ideas.

In response to the Dean, Professor Rockwell said that he would be happy to volunteer to attend this event, if it is felt that a Committee of Six member is needed. Professor Saxton said that it would be ideal to have colleagues from a mix of departments represent the College. Professor Ciepiela suggested that it might be preferable to have colleagues attend who are interested in doing the work that is being requested, rather than drawing faculty based on whether they are participants in significant governance structures. Dean Call responded that there is the notion that those who participate in governance structures have been discussing issues that will be relevant to the conversations that are expected to occur at the retreat. Professor Saxton said that it would be valuable to have colleagues attend who have first-hand experience with Five College joint appointments. President Marx proposed a hybrid model, suggesting that representatives from the CEP, CPR, and Committee of Six be invited to the event and that the other participants be volunteers from the Faculty at large. Professor Hall proposed sharing the invitation with the Faculty, an approach that he feels would have the greatest flexibility. In light of the views expressed, Professor Rockwell said that he would be pleased to withdraw his offer to participate on the Committee's behalf or to serve, if needed. It was agreed that the Dean should share the invitation to the retreat with the Faculty and ask members of the CEP and CPR if one of their members would attend.

Dean Call next reported the response that he had received to Professor Rockwell's question about a course proposal that had specified that majors would be given priority if the course was oversubscribed (which was defined as being more than thirty students). The department chair noted that, by giving majors priority, the department hopes to ensure that those who wish to focus on the topic of the proposal will not be cut from one of the small number of courses they can take to satisfy their concentration within the major. The chair noted that this restriction is "pretty hypothetical." In practice, courses at this level of specialization rarely attract as many as thirty students, the chair noted. In the unlikely event that the course were to become over-enrolled, there would be nothing to prevent a student with a focus on the particular topic in another major from pleading his/her case with the professor. In the past, members of the department have usually been flexible in responding to such requests. Professor Rockwell said that this explanation was satisfactory to him. The Dean then reviewed with the members the schedule for upcoming meetings of the Committee.

Dean Call informed the members that two faculty members were needed to serve on the Orientation Committee. He proposed a number of faculty colleagues who did not have regular committee assignments. The members recommended two faculty members, and the Dean agreed to invite these colleagues to serve. Professor Rockwell noted that, in 2007, the Committee of Six had considered whether there is a continuing need for an Orientation Committee, since the program is overseen by the Dean of New Students. It had been proposed that the Dean of New Students should be added, ex officio, to the College Council, and that the Council should oversee Orientation, which is largely an administrative function of the Dean of Students Office. Professor Rockwell asked why the Committee's proposal, which he would support, to dissolve the Orientation Committee, had not been implemented. The Dean said that, after consultation with Deans Lieber and Hart, it had been decided for the time being that it would be preferable to retain the Orientation Committee as a separate entity from the College Council. A faculty vote would be needed to dissolve formally the Committee, the Dean said.

Amended December 4, 2009

In a matter relating to orientation, President Marx informed the members that he had asked the Dean of New Students to consider the pros and cons of continuing to have fall athletes spend three days of first-year orientation on campus in practices, when a third of their class is away on freshman trips. The President wondered if it might be beneficial for all students to participate fully in the orientation program.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Barbezat asked for more information about the process that will be used to guide managers in evaluating staff members during this period in which positions are being examined closely from a structural perspective. He wondered whether there would be a common procedure used. The Dean noted that there is an annual review process for evaluating the job performance of individuals and that there will be a separate process used to evaluate positions themselves. Individual performance evaluations will not be linked to the structural questions at hand, Dean Call said. Professor Barbezat asked whether the protocol was that the annual reviews/evaluations are shared with the individual. Dean Call said that is indeed the case, and each staff member's comments are solicited as part of his or her annual evaluation. Professor Barbezat commented that he can imagine that the results of individual evaluations will inform the process of considering positions. President Marx said that supervisors will be asked to have conversations about positions with those who report to them and to request that managers have conversations with those with whom they work. Through these channels, staff will be asked to pass on their knowledge of positions and their views on any possibilities for re-distributing work. In addition, members of the Managers Council and the senior staff will be asked to consider staffing from a broader perspective, across the College.

Professor Hall next raised the topic of the Committee of Six minutes. He expressed concern that altering the minutes in certain ways during the review process is not in keeping with Committee's agreement that the minutes should be faithful representations of what occurs at meetings. Professor Hall said that he would not favor having the minutes be an exact transcript of meetings, but he feels that it is not appropriate for them to be merely policy pronouncements. He noted that the minutes are an important part of the College's historical record. President Marx agreed, while commenting that the Committee has an interest in communicating effectively. Communication can become unclear when conversations that occur and are recorded in one set of minutes end up changing dramatically in subsequent sets. Colleagues might assume that decisions have been made or views are moving in a particular direction, when the course of the conversation later changes and views move in opposite directions. Professor Hall agreed that good communication is important, but he said that recording the evolution of the thoughts of the Committee and the administration, and representing the different points of view that are informing policy decisions, are not inconsistent with effective communication. It was suggested that making it clear that the Committee would return to a particular topic and that conversation had not concluded at a particular meeting would be helpful. The Committee agreed to adopt this practice. The Dean expressed the view that representing the evolution of the Committee's views is valuable, while recognizing that it will be helpful to the Faculty if the minutes convey that some conversations do not begin and end during a single Committee of Six meeting. Professor Rockwell, who agreed with Professor Hall that the Committee should strive to produce minutes that faithfully represent what occurs at the meetings, said that he is heartened that any inaccuracies that might appear in a set of minutes, and which are overlooked initially, can later be corrected, if necessary. Professor Barbezat said that he has been concerned that

Amended December 4, 2009

some members' discussions have been excised, and that ensuing comments sometimes appear without the necessary context. He said that he would find it problematic if members make remarks during a meeting and other members respond to them, and then the first individual later wishes to retract his or her comments. Other members' responses then no longer make sense or have a context, he noted. The same is true if parts of conversations are recorded and later stricken during the review process, even if this step is taken for purposes of clarity. Professor Goutte agreed that it is essential for the minutes to reflect what transpires at Committee of Six meetings, while expressing the view that, sometimes, when comments are translated from oral arguments to words on paper, adjustments need to be made to ensure that the written words accurately reflect the spirit of the discussion. Professor Hall agreed, commenting that such adjustments would fall within the category of faithful representation.

Continuing with the discussion about the minutes, Professor Hall noted that he has been concerned for some time that some discussions are not being included in either the confidential or public minutes. The President, the Dean, and the members agreed that discussions should be recorded and included in either the confidential or public minutes, depending on the nature of the conversation. The Committee, the President, and the Dean agreed that they would take care to adhere to the agreed upon principles when reviewing the minutes and suggesting changes.

The members next discussed whether the Faculty might wish to consider re-imagining how committees are structured. President Marx noted that, at present, there are a plethora of committees, and many committees are devoted to addressing specialized issues. He said that, as some members have noted, this structure has a positive social effect, as it enables many faculty members to be involved in College governance and to interact with one another and members of the administration. On the other hand, it might be questioned whether this structure puts the faculty's time to the best use. President Marx asked whether there might be ways to ensure effective governance without taking so much of the Faculty's time away from teaching and research. President Marx reiterated his view that having a smaller number of committees might be preferable to the current structure of having many different committees with narrower charges. While service on such committees would be a substantial commitment, service would be limited to a relatively small number of faculty members each year, with efforts to ensure rotation and sharing of this burden. President Marx said that, in terms of faculty governance, he believes that, generally, committees can be more effective at oversight if they are considering an array of interconnected issues and making informed decisions based on a broad charge and broad view. Pressing or more specific issues can be addressed in such committees, but, when necessary, ad hoc groups can be formed. President Marx asked the members whether they thought that proposals should be developed for different models of committee structures to be considered by the Faculty.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Saxton asked whether the goal of any restructuring would be to increase efficiency. President Marx responded that preservation of the Faculty's time for teaching and research, as well as efficiency, and effectiveness, would be the goals. He wondered whether, for example, the issue of the College's housing policy would be addressed most effectively through the current structure of a committee that focuses only on this issue, or if effectiveness would be improved by having the housing policy fall under the purview of the CPR, which would consider this issue in the context of a set of related issues. Professor Rockwell asked if there is a sense that the Faculty has a general level of discontent with committee work and, if so, how much discontent there is. He suggested consulting the Faculty at

Amended December 4, 2009

large, in some form, to gauge whether the Faculty is interested in re-imagining the current governance structures. If there is no interest, it would be a waste of time to spend time developing proposals, he said. Dean Call asked whether Professor Rockwell thought this issue should be discussed at a Faculty Meeting or whether the Committee might write to the Faculty to gather views. Professor Saxton asked if questions about the effectiveness of current committees, perhaps from the Trustees, are motivating the proposal to examine the structure of committees. Professor Goutte noted that she has often heard that Amherst has an extraordinary and unique system of governance, but she wonders if there are data available about the governance structures and responsibilities of the Faculty at peer institutions. It is her impression that other similar institutions have similar governance structures, but offer course release for faculty who serve on major committees and/or who chair departments. Dean Call said that, through his conversations with other deans, he has come to believe that Amherst is an outlier, requiring more participation in College governance from faculty members than most other similar institutions. He noted that the visiting reaccreditation team and the response from the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) had raised the issue of the burden placed on the Faculty by the committee structure. The Committee asked to see the relevant excerpts of these reports and the Dean agreed to provide them.

Continuing the conversation, the Dean noted that the College's two/two teaching load has also been unusual, though more institutions have adopted this model in recent years, and has been the argument for not having release time. Professor Goutte noted that, since other institutions now have a two/two teaching load and offer release time for service, Amherst may still be an outlier in what the College requires of its Faculty in regard to service. Professor Ciepiela said that the effectiveness of Amherst's governance structures and the burden placed on the faculty by committee service are two separate issues. She wondered if faculty members feel that they are being asked to take on onerous responsibilities that take away time from their teaching and research. Professor Barbezat noted that what is seen as effective by some may not be seen as effective by others; the administration and the Faculty may have conflicting interests. President Marx noted that it would be helpful for the Faculty to give voice to its views. Professor Barbezat said that he believes that it is effective for faculty to devote themselves to specialized issues through more focused committees. He prefers the model of having such committees bring informed policy statements to committees with broad charges, such as the CPR, which can then consider the issue in a broader context. He does not think that the larger committees should take on additional areas, as committees such as the CPR and CEP are already considering a great deal of issues.

Professor Ciepiela commented that the model of the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC) appears to be a sound one, and she wondered if this model could be generalized. Information was gathered quickly and efficiently by having committees with specific charges channel information to a larger committee with a broad charge, she noted. President Marx commented that the circumstances surrounding the creation of the ABC and its work were extraordinary, and he wondered whether this model should be replicated more generally. Professor Ciepiela said that the model of the ABC could be helpful when thinking about the relationships among specialized committees. Professor Rockwell reiterated that he thinks that it will be important to get a sense of whether the Faculty feels that committee structures should be re-imagined.

President Marx asked the members for their thoughts on the most effective way to learn the Faculty's views on this question. The Dean said the issue is whether the Faculty finds

Amended December 4, 2009

sufficient value in the current committee structure to justify the Faculty's significant investment of time and energy in it. Professor Rockwell suggested colleagues be asked to vote on whether the Faculty is inclined to ask colleagues to re-imagine Amherst's system of governance. Professor Ciepiela said that a questionnaire could be sent to the Faculty about this question. It was agreed that the question of how best to gather the Faculty's views on this issue should be explored further at a future Committee of Six meeting, and that the question of whether or not to develop proposals for new committee structures should not be bound to a particular outcome or prior commitment. Professor Barbezat noted that the Committee of Six had considered whether to revise the committee structure several years ago but had rejected the idea and had ended up recommending only to tweak a small number of committees. Those changes were never brought before the Faculty, however.

At 5:00 P.M., the Committee of Six was joined by the members (Professors Dizard, Ferguson, Gilpin, Lyle McGeoch, Williamson, Dean Call, Rose Lenehan '11, Aaron Nathan '10, and Erik Schulwolf '10) of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and its recorder, Nancy Ratner. The two committees met to discuss issues surrounding committee re-structuring, class scheduling, the shortened add/drop period, academic support, curricular links with Five-College institutions, and possible changes to the course approval process. The Dean thanked the CEP for meeting with the Committee of Six, and the members of the two committees introduced themselves.

Professor Dizard, chair of the CEP, began the conversation by noting that the members of the CEP had recently discussed the issue of committee re-structuring and had decided that they have no opinion to offer at this time. He said that the CEP would weigh in on this issue if changes are suggested that affect committees (for example, the Library Committee) that have a direct relationship to the curriculum and implications for what the Faculty teaches. Professor Barbezat noted that the CEP itself could be affected by any re-structuring plan that would put new areas, by folding in the work of committees that might be eliminated, under the committee's purview. He asked whether it would be possible to add to what the CEP already does. Professor Dizard responded that the CEP has a full plate. Given the expansion of the CEP's role over the last decade, he feels that it would be very problematic to add anything more to what is required of the committee.

Discussion turned to the topic of class scheduling. Professor Dizard noted that this year's CEP has come to share the view of the Committee of Six that the envisioned Class Scheduling Task Force should consist of a small core group—representatives from the Registrar's office and the Institutional Research Office and two or three faculty members—that would consult with relevant constituencies on campus. Like the Committee of Six, the CEP felt that a larger structure would be unwieldy, Professor Dizard explained. He said that it would be important for the task force to meet with the CEP after it is charged by the Committee of Six. The goal of the group should be developing ways to encourage the Faculty to use more of the hours of the day when developing teaching schedules. Among the possibilities would be requesting that departments use all available time slots before doubling up on any one slot. Professor Dizard commented that the College cannot have a truly open curriculum if all courses are taught between 10:00 and 2:00. He noted that the CEP had discussed the possibility of setting aside without any co-curricular activities, including athletics, one afternoon and/or evening—perhaps on Mondays—for academic seminars.

Amended December 4, 2009

The experiment with shortening the add/drop period was the next subject of conversation. Professor Dizard explained that, in light of the Committee of Six's discussion about the peculiarities of this fall's schedule and the desire to continue the experiment of a shortened add/drop period, the CEP had decided to support keeping the shortened period in place for the spring. He noted that the shortened period had been quite problematic for the Registrar's office, and that anecdotal reports from advisees suggested that the shortened period posed significant difficulties for students. An increasing number of courses meet only once a week and, because of the shortened add/drop period and this year's calendar, some students could attend only one class before having to make a decision about enrolling in the course, in some cases, immediately. If a class took place once a week in the late afternoon on Wednesday, it was already beyond the add/drop period deadline when the students completed the first class session, Professor Dizard noted. It would not have been possible, under such circumstances, to enroll in the course because the Registrar's office closed for the day. The Registrar was able to make adjustments, but there was a good deal of consternation. In the end, after adjustments were made, some students experienced a de facto two-week add/drop period, it was noted.

Continuing the conversation, Ms. Ratner commented that, when online registration is in place, some of the problems with the shortened add/drop period would likely be solved. Professor Dizard noted that, a number of continuing circumstances—fewer courses being offered and more limits on course enrollments—will continue to add to students' stress and to the stress on the registration system, as students on waiting lists will at times not know if they have gotten into a class for quite some time. If students find out that they have been bumped from a class, they may have little time to find an alternative. The committees discussed what had prompted the change in the length of the add/drop in the first place. Professor Dizard said that colleagues had found it uncomfortable not knowing who was enrolled in their courses for a two-week period. Some students would miss a number of class meetings and would then be so far behind that it would be difficult for them to catch up. Professor Rockwell said that he does not think there should be a rush to revert to the two-week add/drop, but that the new schedule should be allowed to play out for several years. It was noted that making better use of the available time slots for classes would also help with the crunch during add/drop. Professor Williamson remarked that the difficulties associated with add/drop period are not symmetrical in the fall and spring. The spring should be smoother, with one factor being that first-year students lack experience with the course selection process in their first semester and are savvier by their second. Professor Dizard noted that Professor Gilpin had suggested that it would be helpful for information about what courses are still open to be made available to faculty and students during the add/drop period. Ms. Ratner said that she would inquire whether it would be possible to make this a feature of the new online system.

Conversation turned to the report of the Task Force on Academic Support. Professor Dizard noted that the CEP had not yet discussed the report, while commenting that he had read it and that the document raises many issues. Dean Call noted that the Committee of Six would like the CEP to consider some aspects of the report, including the Summer Science Program. Professor Rockwell asked if the CEP should oversee this program, with the result that it would be integrated further into the curriculum. Professor Williamson asked if the intention would be to have the CEP play an oversight role with the new summer humanities and social sciences program as well, and Professor Rockwell said that doing so would make sense. Professor Dizard commented that the Summer Science Program has been regarded as an extra-curricular program

Amended December 4, 2009

in the past. He asked what area of the College currently supervises these programs. The Dean responded that the Director of the Moss Quantitative Center coordinates Summer Science in collaboration with the Dean of New Students. It was noted that, when Dean Lieber joins the Dean's office this year in his new position of Dean of Student Research and Academic Support, responsibility for the two summer programs will shift to the Dean of the Faculty's office, which makes more sense pedagogically. Professor Dizard agreed that it would be in keeping with the CEP's charge to play an oversight role in regard to these programs. Professor Rockwell suggested that it would be helpful to evaluate the academic components of the programs and to propose innovations, without regard to costs. Costs could be weighed at a later time.

Continuing with the discussion of the task force report, Professor Dizard said that implicit in the document is the question of whether there should be a writing requirement at the College (in addition to the First-Year Seminar). He noted that the question of whether there should be a quantitative requirement should also be addressed. Professor Barbezat asked the CEP to note the characterization of study abroad in the report, as the Committee of Six had agreed that the manner in which this issue had been discussed is worthy of examination. Dean Call said that it would be informative for the CEP to weigh in on the topic of advising, to which significant attention is devoted in the report. Professor Dizard said that the CEP plans to have discussions about advising that are proximate to its meeting with teachers of First-Year Seminars, who are responsible for the bulk of pre-major advisees. Professor Williamson suggested that, since this is a moment of transition to online registration, a significant period of adjustment, perhaps as long as a year, will be needed while faculty learn the intricacies of the new system. He suggested that it would be best to wait several years before adding more technological tools to enhance advising until faculty become more comfortable with using the new online registration system. President Marx noted that there are time sensitivities surrounding the advising issue, as online tools that will support advising should be incorporated into the online registration system that is being developed.

One such online tool will provide a structure for calling attention to students' patterns of course selection for the purpose of generating discussion between advisors and advisees. To this end, faculty will need to begin categorizing their courses in ways (for example by assigning keywords) that will enable the online system to make use of the information. It was agreed that it would be desirable to begin developing now the online tools that will inform advising by finding ways to easily map what categories of courses students have and have not taken.

Turning briefly to the topic of course proposals, Professor Dizard noted that, in order to streamline the process, the CEP had decided to eliminate the requirement that faculty justify the need for pre-requisites for their courses and the requirement that faculty justify limiting the class to particular categories of students, such as first-years or sophomores.

Five-College collaboration was the next subject of conversation for the two committees. Professor Dizard began the discussion by commenting that there has been a shift for some time within higher education toward interdisciplinarity, noting the examples of ethnomusicology and biophysics. Faculty are being asked to wear more hats than ever before and to participate in more and more programs outside their home departments. It will be important for Amherst to explore how to retain its traditional strengths, while responding to new interdisciplinary undertakings, Professor Dizard said. Five-College collaboration is one way of doing so, he noted, while commenting that it will be important to determine how far to go with such collaboration, before Amherst's own identity might be diluted.

Amended December 4, 2009

Continuing the conversation, Professor Dizard commented that Five-College collaboration should not be limited to joint appointments. He noted that Amherst's practice of offering all of the courses that are needed to complete its majors should, perhaps, be re-examined. For example, departments might decide that particular electives for their major would need to be taken at another campus. Professors Rockwell and Ciepiela noted that this model might be a challenge for majors in foreign languages and other majors in which courses must be taken in a sequence. Professor Ciepiela noted that scheduling could also be problematic, as the campuses would need to coordinate when courses would be offered to ensure that particular courses would be available to students when they need them. Professor Dizard agreed that much more planning and up-to-the minute scheduling information would be essential to success. Mr. Schulwolf noted that not having a car is currently a disincentive for students who might otherwise want to take courses on other campuses, because of the length of time that buses take to go back and forth among the colleges and university. President Marx noted that the question of how to improve transportation and scheduling is currently being considered by the Five-College presidents. Professor Dizard noted that the CEP is fully aware of the complexities associated with any plans for enhancing Five-College collaboration and is moving cautiously. Thus far, Five-College single course "borrowing" seems to have worked reasonably well.

Returning to the subject of the course approval process, Professor Dizard noted that the CEP had considered whether the Faculty should, perhaps, vote online to approve courses, and that there had been a diversity of views on this question. Professor McGeoch said that he does not see any advantage to moving to such a system. Professor Dizard agreed and said that he wondered whether fewer colleagues would review the proposals if an online system was implemented.

Professor Barbezat next noted that the President and the Dean had met with the CEP on September 25, and that the President had made a request of the CEP that the committee consider four areas. He noted that the committees had discussed three of them (writing instruction, task force on course scheduling, course keywords), but not the fourth: ensuring "quality and access." Professor Barbezat noted the CEP minutes mention that the committee might discuss a change in faculty teaching loads with the Trustees. Professor Dizard said that the topic of moving to a three/two teaching load never came up when the committee spoke with the Trustees, but the CEP had prepared for a conversation on this topic, just in case the issue was raised. President Marx said that, in this case and in general, a question that is asked by one Trustee should not be interpreted as a view held by the Board as a whole. The Dean noted that, if this suggestion had come up, he was fully prepared to express his strong opposition to a shift in teaching loads.

In a final matter, President Marx noted that last year's Committee of Six had agreed that, for purposes of information, the Faculty should be provided with their individual grade distributions, and for purposes of comparison, the aggregated averages of their department(s), traditional divisions, and the College as a whole. The President asked Professor Dizard if the CEP had discussed whether such grading data should be provided to the Faculty. Professor Dizard replied that the CEP favored doing so, though some reservations had been raised about the possibility of departmental grading patterns being leaked to students, which might influence which courses they choose to take. Some members said that students already make use of informal (and possibly inaccurate) information of this sort when selecting courses. Professor Williamson suggested that, before an envisioned grading working group is constituted, the

Amended December 4, 2009

Committee of Six should wait to see if sharing these grading data will stimulate faculty discussion.

The President, the Dean, and the Committee of Six thanked the CEP for a very informative meeting and agreed that the two committees should meet again in the spring.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 9, 2009

The ninth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, November 9, 2009. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with a conversation about scholars who are currently under consideration for the Simpson Lecturership and/or McCloy Professorship. The members discussed the scholarly records and stature of each candidate and decided that they wanted to review the work of some candidates, and that others could be invited to teach single courses as Croxton Lecturers, if departments agree to host them. The Dean informed the Committee that David Bollier '78, who will be hosted by the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, has accepted appointments as Croxton Lecturers.

As the members discussed the candidates for these positions, questions emerged about the criteria that might be used to select McCloy Professors and Simpson Lecturers. Professor Ciepiela suggested that candidates' potential to contribute something new and exciting to Amherst's curriculum should be a criterion for selection. Professor Barbezat said that it is his understanding that those appointed as McCloy Professors and Simpson Lecturers should be scholars who have made significant contributions to their fields, are highly accomplished, and are very well known. It was agreed that it would be desirable, through their teaching, for such individuals to expose and/or attract Amherst students to fields or approaches that the students might otherwise not have been inclined to explore. The members agreed to return to their discussion of the candidates for these positions after they have familiarized themselves with the scholarly work of the candidates who remain under consideration.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the members that Professor Rabinowitz, Chair of the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA), has requested a meeting between the Committee of Six and the FCAFA and that a Faculty Meeting be scheduled for December 15. Dean Call said that Professor Rabinowitz has informed him that, as requested by the Committee of Six, the FCAFA will provide the Committee with a re-configured and re-imagined prioritized list of recommendations by November 20. Professor Rabinowitz said that the FCAFA's purpose in requesting the meeting with the Committee of Six is further elucidation and explanation of what the FCAFA has done—and will continue to do—to meet the (entire) charge that was recently given to the committee. Professor Rabinowitz requested that the meeting between the two committees take place, ideally, either on November 30 (the FCAFA's preference) or December 7. He said that, during—or slightly after—these dates, the FCAFA would hope to hold a meeting for students on admission and financial aid to inform, and be informed by, members of the Amherst community. For these reasons, Professor Rabinowitz said, a delay of the final Faculty Meeting of the semester from December 1 to December 15 would be desirable. The members agreed to meet with the FCAFA on November 30 and that a Faculty Meeting should be held on December 15.

Continuing with his announcements, the Dean noted that he had invited Professors Leise and Maxey to serve on the Orientation Committee and that they had accepted this assignment. Dean Call next informed the members that, by prior arrangement, he plans to ask the Committee of Six to review the Amherst-Doshisha Faculty Exchange Program, which was renewed in its present form for a period of five years in 2004-2005. Under this agreement (which began in 2001-2002), the Dean explained, one Amherst faculty member annually has offered three lectures during a three-week stay at Doshisha University, typically in late-May or June. Amherst provides an honorarium of \$2,500 and covers travel expenses. Doshisha provides housing at no cost. Doshisha faculty, with less regularity until recently, have also come to Amherst for three

Amended December 9, 2009

weeks. Dean Call said that Doshisha is now publicizing the exchange program with more vigor, and it is hoped that a result will be that more Doshisha faculty will participate. Amherst pays an honorarium of \$2,500 to Doshisha faculty who participate in the exchange, as well their travel expenses, and provides housing at no cost. The cost to Amherst for this program is about \$10,000 a year, the Dean noted.

Continuing with his remarks about the exchange program, Dean Call said that Professor Morse has informed him that those colleagues who have been involved with the program offer high praise for it, and that Amherst faculty members have reported both to Professor Morse and to him that they have had worthwhile and stimulating experiences at Doshisha. While commenting on the importance of the historic relationship between Amherst and Doshisha and the wonderful opportunity provided by the exchange, President Marx noted that Amherst pays for both Amherst and Doshisha faculty to participate in the program. While it was agreed that the arrangement is somewhat one-sided, the members, the Dean, and the President agreed that it would be best not to propose changing this model at this time, pending the upcoming review. Dean Call asked the members what material they would require in order to evaluate the program. It was agreed that the Dean would provide a list of Amherst faculty who have participated in the program, and that he should ask Professor Morse for a list of Doshisha faculty who have participated, and for further information about what these colleagues did while at Amherst. Dean Call said that several colleagues had written reports about their experiences at Doshisha and that he could request that others who have participated in the program provide information about their experiences. Professor Saxton, who participated in the exchange in 2006, expressed great enthusiasm for the program, recounted some of her experiences in Japan, and recommended that the program continue.

Dean Call reported to the members that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) have each agreed to have one of their members participate in the retreat being organized by Five Colleges, Inc., in December. He noted that Professor Rockwell will attend on behalf of the Committee of Six if necessary, but, if at all possible, he wondered if another colleague might volunteer in Professor Rockwell's place, since a conflict had arisen in his schedule. Professor Saxton said that she would consider doing so. The Dean said that, since the request is for six faculty members from each institution, without deans, to attend, he would share the invitation for the event with the Faculty, as the Committee had requested. It is hoped that three additional colleagues will volunteer to attend this event.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Ciepiela asked for clarification about the attendance at Faculty Meetings of the Director of Five Colleges. She noted that, while the Committee of Six had been consulted about inviting Neil Abraham, the new Executive Director of Five Colleges, to the September 15 Faculty Meeting, the Committee had not been consulted about inviting him to the November 3 meeting, which he had attended and during which he had participated in a discussion about the Amherst curriculum. Professor Ciepiela said that she could not recall another instance when someone who was not an Amherst faculty member had participated in such a conversation. Dean Call responded that, according to the *Faculty Handbook* (IV, R., 2.), the "Five College Coordinator" is statutorily designated as a guest (without vote) at Faculty meetings," so Mr. Abraham is entitled to attend Faculty Meetings, without a special invitation. President Marx said that at the November 3 meeting, he recognized the Director to speak about a Five-College issue that had been raised.

The members returned to the issue of whether the Faculty might wish to consider re-imagining how committees are structured. President Marx asked the members for their views on

Amended December 9, 2009

the best approach for ascertaining the Faculty's views on this question. He noted that the question might be posed, perhaps through an online vehicle, about whether the Faculty would like to explore this question; or the Committee could develop some alternative models for committee structures and ask for the Faculty's response; or a survey could be developed for the Faculty in which colleagues could be asked to comment on what they like and dislike about the current system. Professor Rockwell reiterated his view that bringing forward alternative models should be avoided before determining whether the Faculty wishes to engage in the project of revising the current committee structure. If it is learned that the Faculty is disinclined to do so, the unnecessary work of developing alternative models could be avoided.

Continuing the conversation about committee restructuring, Dean Call wondered about the approach of examining how existing committees might be organized so that each smaller and more specialized committee would have a clear reporting line to a major committee, which would have a broader purview. For example, he noted that the Library Committee could report to the CEP and that the Housing Committee could report to the CPR. In effect, the more specialized committees could function as subcommittees of the major committees. Professor Ciepiela expressed worry that those colleagues who would serve on the small number of large committees that would have broad responsibilities would have a tremendous burden. She does not find the current system to be burdensome, she said, and feels that there is some logic to a system in which the type of committee assignments given to faculty members is generally in sync with their scholarly and pedagogical development. As a tenure-track faculty member, she found that committee service was light, as it should be, but that serving on committees exposed her to College governance. After receiving tenure, she and other colleagues at this phase of their careers often find themselves chairing their department for the first time, their first substantial governance responsibility. As a senior colleague, she has found that she and other colleagues at this stage are better positioned to know how College governance works, so that they can effectively take on assignments on major committees such as the CEP and the CPR. Professor Ciepiela said that she is supportive of having a range of service options—large committees with broad purviews and smaller, more specialized committees, so that faculty members can develop the skills and experience they need to participate in College governance, as they move through the professorial ranks. In addition, if it is decided that committee service should be concentrated in a few major committees with a great deal of work, she feels that course release should be considered.

Addressing the topic of course release, Dean Call said that the argument for avoiding this model of compensating faculty for committee service has long been that, once that door is opened, it would be difficult to define boundaries. President Marx agreed, noting that he has seen elsewhere that course release can be a slippery slope, and that much unhappiness can be a result of real and/or perceived inequities within such a system. Dean Call commented that one argument for not having course release has been that Amherst has a two/two teaching load. While a number of institutions have moved to a two/two model over the past decade, the system of course release at those institutions sometimes remains as a vestige of a time when the teaching load was three/two or higher.

Continuing with the discussion about committees, Professor Goutte said that she could not imagine finding the time to serve on one of only a few large committees that would have an even broader workload than any of the existing large committees. President Marx asked Professor Goutte if she would still feel this way if she knew that serving on such a committee would enable her to be free of all committee service for some time, once her term on the large committee had been completed. Professor Goutte replied *yes*, because certain types of scholarly

Amended December 9, 2009

work cannot be put on hold for a year or two, but rather require constant involvement. President Marx asked whether specialized committees that have a narrow focus may in some ways diminish their effectiveness. When such a committee advocates for the particular interest on which it is focused, it is not weighing multiple needs against one another.

The Committee discussed the issue of housing as an example. President Marx noted that the College owns a number of houses that are in less-than-perfect condition. Yet until this situation becomes a crisis, it doesn't receive much attention. President Marx wondered whether it might be more effective to have a governance structure that would continually weigh a number of needs and charge other committees with answering questions that emerge on a regular basis, as a result of such a process. At present, Dean Call noted, questions from the Faculty or administration often prompt an issue to be brought forward and explored. Professor Ciepiela said that there needs to be a menu to follow, so that faculty have a clear sense of which structures will address particular types of questions. President Marx reiterated that, if a committee of X advocates for needing more X and nothing else, the committee's argument might be less compelling than it would have been had the committee been positioned to weigh X against other needs and determined that the need for X had risen to the top. President Marx wondered whether governance might be more effective if committees are given broader charges and oversight over a portfolio of issues.

Professor Hall responded to the President's remarks by noting that he does not see the problem with having committees with narrow and specific charges, noting that committees with broader portfolios, such as the CPR, CEP, and Committee of Six, already exist. What is needed is to clarify the flow of work and to make the connections among committees clear, he said. Doing so would strengthen the model that is in place now. Professor Rockwell, returning to the example of housing, said that he feels that there should be a Housing Committee so that tenure-track colleagues, for whom the issue of affordable housing is the most pressing, have a venue to bring forward issues of concern to them and to have their voices heard. There can then be a filtering effect so that reasonable proposals or suggestions are developed. Professor Rockwell said that he would not favor eliminating the Housing Committee and simply folding its work into the work of the CPR, which is already burdened, but that he would support having the Housing Committee report to the CPR.

Professor Barbezat noted that many of the smaller specialized committees are charged with considering benefits. He commented that the model is basically one of co-determination that has been adopted by labor and management. Rather than a "special interest group," the Faculty, as labor, is asked to consider its working conditions and its own benefits by management, the administration. While the Faculty would be naive to think that it can continually advocate for more and more resources that would be granted, there is some benefit to providing workers, Professor Barbezat argued, a voice in considering the conditions of their work to both workers and management. In his view, the Faculty should have a considered way of voicing views via smaller, specialized committees which, in turn, report to broader-based committees, like the CPR. Other labor groups at the College should also have this sort of access. Professor Barbezat noted that the CPR, for example, should be a committee where many voices come together and needs are weighed and prioritized together. The President posed some questions: How should College committees be understood in relation to faculty committees? How can the College ensure that there is a broad sense of representation in its governance structures, so that different voices can be heard? Are there committees other than the CPR in which it would be beneficial to have a broader range of constituencies represented?

Amended December 9, 2009

Professor Barbezat noted that the current structure of the CPR made it impossible for that committee to do the work that was eventually undertaken by the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC), though the CPR largely shaped the recommendations of the ABC. He noted that it was the College that was facing budget constraints, not just the Faculty, and that the current membership structure of the CPR would have prevented staff from having a voice in considering how to reduce the budget and from making the perspectives of the staff known. President Marx suggested that the Faculty might be further empowered by broadening the membership of the CPR. The President commented that having the committee focus on a mix of agenda items and including staff on the committee had already resulted in arguments that had been influential. In response to the President's comment suggesting that the recent focus of the CPR on faculty benefits (e.g., parenting leave) would be more influential if examined more within a broader context, Professor Hall pointed out that the CPR is specifically charged in the *Faculty Handbook* with reviewing faculty compensation. The Dean noted that the CPR charge does describe effectively a committee with a broader purview. The Committee agreed that smaller more specialized committees should continue to exist because they play the valuable role of articulating views that need to be heard. However, the members agreed that having these committees feed into existing committee structures with broader charges, where questions would be weighed and addressed, would enhance the governance of the College.

The Committee came to the conclusion that developing a tree that outlines a clear structure for committees at the College, with reporting lines, would be helpful. The Dean noted that, when new groups are formed, such as ad hoc committees, task forces, or working groups, they should be incorporated into any structure that is developed. President Marx asked about the problem of committees that don't meet, leaving issues unaddressed. Professor Hall noted that at times there seems to be confusion about who should call a meeting if a committee does not have a chair. It was agreed that, at the least, there should be a convener of meetings designated for each committee. Professor Barbezat suggested that the Committee review the charges of committees to inform the creation of the committee tree. The Dean and the President agreed to provide the charges and to develop a proposal for the committee to review.

Discussion turned to the topic of the Class Scheduling Task Force. The members agreed that the task force should report to the CEP. Professor Ciepiela said that the task force should be sure to explore the use of the eighty-minute time slot by the humanities and the social sciences. The members then proposed colleagues who might serve on the task force. The goal of the group will be developing proposals to use more of the hours of the day when developing teaching schedules, and it was agreed that its members should consult widely.

President Marx asked the members if they could envision Amherst adopting a model in which each department might use all available time slots before doubling up on any one slot, as many other peer institutions do. Professor Rockwell noted that it might be problematic for foreign language departments to adopt this model, because they often offer classes at different levels in the same time slot so that students can move easily from one section to another, as they seek during the add/drop period a level that is commensurate with their level of proficiency. In this way, the rest of the student's schedule is not disrupted. Professor Barbezat noted that other departments, such as Mathematics and Economics, employ a similar structure. He wondered whether departments might be encouraged to use time slots more evenly when there is not a need to have overlapping courses or sections during a particular slot. President Marx noted that there is a significant College-wide interest in making better use of time slots, since the current bunching of courses has resulted in a curriculum that is more constrained than it otherwise would be, crowding at Valentine, and less efficient use of classrooms. Resources that might have to be

Amended December 9, 2009

used to solve these difficulties would not be available for other uses, such as supporting FTEs, the President said.

Professor Ciepiela expressed the view that an interdepartmental solution to the bunching issue is needed and that taking a departmental approach would not solve the problem. Professor Barbezat suggested that incentives might be employed to encourage departments to teach courses at particular times. Professor Rockwell suggested that there seems to be a widespread belief that classes are not viable in the early morning. He maintained that this is unfortunate for a number of reasons, but that it would take a shift in student culture to rectify the situation. President Marx agreed, noting that, by not scheduling more classes in early-morning time slots, a message is being sent to students that there is an expectation that they will stay up until the wee hours of the morning and sleep late. Professor Ciepiela noted that, if there is to be effective Five-College collaboration, consideration of the time slots that are best for traveling students is needed. Offering courses at the beginning and end of the day might be most effective, several members and the Dean agreed.

Returning briefly to the topic of the burden of committee service and the related issue of course release, Professor Hall suggested that one solution might be to give course release to members of the Committee of Six during years when there are a high number (the specific number should be stipulated) of tenure cases. If course release is out of the question, then separating the committee into a tenure and promotion committee and an executive committee should be considered, he said. Professor Hall noted that the reaccreditation visiting team and the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) had raised the issue of the workload of the Committee of Six in its reaccreditation reports, which had been provided by the Dean to the Committee. The members discussed whether some schedule and procedural changes might relieve some of the burden and/or time constraints on the Committee when considering tenure cases and agreed to return to this topic in the spring. The Dean agreed to provide the members with an account of the tenure cases that are anticipated each year for the period of the next five years.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 11, 2009

The tenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, November 30, 2009. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with the Dean proposing a number of dates for possible additional meetings of the Committee, and the members agreed to hold those dates.

The Committee next had an initial discussion as part of its review of the Amherst-Doshisha Faculty Exchange Program, which was renewed in its present form for a period of five years in 2004-2005. The Dean had provided the members with reports from past Amherst participants about their experiences at Doshisha and other documents relating to the exchange. The Committee wondered why only one faculty member from Doshisha has participated in the exchange, though the members were pleased to learn that another Doshisha colleague plans to come to Amherst as part of the exchange this year. Professor Rockwell noted that, a number of years ago, he had hosted a visiting Doshisha faculty member who was brought to Amherst for one year. He wondered why this model may have been abandoned for a short-term one of only three weeks, as he imagines that the shorter visit would hold less appeal for Doshisha faculty. Professor Ciepiela expressed concern that Amherst, according to Professor Morse, funds both the Amherst and Doshisha participants in the program in order for the College to have control over which Amherst faculty can be sent to Japan and which Doshisha faculty members are invited to come to Amherst. She wondered whether restricting which Doshisha faculty participate in the program is the best approach. Professor Morse had noted that, if it were up to Doshisha, the university would probably choose scholars from their faculty who are interested in English or American studies, and that Amherst prefers to invite Doshisha faculty who work in areas of Asian studies that are not covered at the College. Professor Morse had said that, on the Amherst side, the exchange is designed specifically to encourage Amherst faculty who might otherwise not go to Japan to experience the country, rather than for the purpose of sending faculty who work in Asian studies to Doshisha. Professor Hall, agreeing with Professor Ciepiela, wondered whether the current model of selecting Doshisha faculty to participate in the program by virtue of their academic interests serves the program well. He noted that each year the College hosts (at no cost to Amherst) a visiting faculty member from Sweden in the Fall semester through the STINT program, which is funded by the Swedish government. The four fellows who have come to the College have been hosted by four different departments, and the College community has benefited by having Swedish colleagues from a variety of fields come to the College. At the conclusion of the conversation, during which the members expressed support for the exchange program with Doshisha, Dean Call agreed to speak with Professor Morse about the issues that had been raised and to report back to the Committee.

The Committee next considered a letter from a faculty member who is concerned about possible violations of the College's Honor Code, which was first approved by the Faculty in December 2004. The Dean noted that, in May of 2008, the Faculty had renewed the Honor Code until September 2012 and had agreed that the Honor Code should be reviewed every four years. The members decided to forward the letter to the College Council, the body which proposes and reviews the Honor Code before it is brought to the Faculty for consideration. Professor Ciepiela wondered if the Department of Information Technology could be helpful in working with faculty who suspect that students might be cheating by using materials that they have found online. Professor Saxton noted that deans in the Dean of Students office have expertise in locating such online sources in suspected cases of cheating. Professor Barbezat suggested that faculty should be careful and specific in the way they design prompts for exams to make it more difficult for students to find materials from which they might plagiarize when responding.

Amended December 11, 2009

Turning to the topic of the retreat being organized by Five Colleges, Inc., in December, the Dean informed the members that, in response to his invitation to the Faculty to attend the event, he received responses from Professors Greenstein, L. McGeoch, Rogowski, and Zamperini, who have agreed to attend. He noted that the chairs of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR), Professors Dizard and Epstein, will also participate in the event.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Rockwell noted that the CPR minutes of September 16 refer to a CPR meeting planned for September 23 with the College Housing Committee to discuss changes to the ownership policy for faculty housing and asked what had transpired at that meeting. Dean Call reported that discussion at the meeting of the two committees had focused on the ownership program and possible changes to the rental program. The Dean noted that, in recent years, housing that has become available for purchase is often not attractive to recently tenured faculty members because the houses are often large and expensive, or in need of substantial renovation, or both. The Dean noted that the Housing Committee is considering these issues and has now met with the CPR twice. The Housing Committee has asked the Treasurer to do some research and provide the committees with information that might inform future proposals.

Dean Call noted that, last year, Professors Clotfelter, Friedman, Heim, Loinaz, Sawyer, and Shah had sent a letter (appended to the Committee of Six minutes of October 6, 2008) outlining concerns about the faculty housing policy to the Committee of Six, the CPR, and the College Housing Committee, and that it had been agreed that the College Housing Committee, in collaboration with the CPR, should consider the issues raised in the letter and make recommendations to the Committee of Six, the President, and the Dean. The Dean informed the members that one proposal made in the letter was to combat steep housing prices by adjusting the percentage of the appraisal value that the buyer pays from 80 percent to a lower percentage. He said that, since housing prices in Amherst are high, the best approach to assisting faculty might be for the College to explore ways to help colleagues financially with entering the housing market in the area, rather than, or in addition to, offering College housing for purchase. President Marx wondered if there might be something wrong structurally with the current ownership system, since the number of vacant houses is rising, but those who are eligible to purchase them are not eager to do so. Professor Hall asked who is eligible to purchase College housing. The Dean said that it is largely tenured faculty who are eligible, in addition to a small number of senior administrators. Professor Hall wondered if the option to purchase College housing should be broadened to include additional staff and, even, to the public at large. President Marx said that one of the primary purposes of the ownership policy is to encourage faculty to live close to campus. Professor Rockwell pointed out that the College has an interest in controlling the neighborhood immediately surrounding it. Professor Barbezat asked the Dean whether the Housing Committee is currently reviewing the policy and constructing proposals to submit to the CPR. The Dean responded that the Housing Committee is reviewing the policy, and that both committees would be consulting and considering various proposals.

The members next discussed articles that they had read by some scholars who are currently under consideration for the Simpson Lectureship and/or McCloy Professorship and once again discussed the criteria that might be used to select McCloy Professors and Simpson Lecturers. It was agreed that Simpson Lecturers and McCloy Professors should be individuals who are of significant stature. Another criterion for appointment should be that, through their teaching, Simpson Lecturers and McCloy Professors will expose and/or attract Amherst students to fields or approaches that the students might otherwise not have been inclined to explore and/or which are under-represented or under-enrolled within Amherst's curriculum. President Marx

Amended December 11, 2009

noted that these criteria are not mutually exclusive and that there may be additional criteria that could be used for selection.

The members reviewed a draft charge for the Class Scheduling Task Force. Dean Call noted that he had recently reviewed a draft of a report on Amherst's teaching and office space use that was prepared by consultants Shepley Bulfinch and that raises a number of issues that are interrelated with the issue of class "bunching." The firm was asked to evaluate Amherst's current use of academic and administrative space, including teaching space and offices, and the building conditions and re-use potential of campus spaces, as well as to assess the need for additional academic and administrative space. The impact of the Merrill project on available campus spaces for teaching and offices during the period when the project would be ongoing and after the project's completion were also considered in the report. Dean Call noted that Shepley Bulfinch would meet with the CPR and CEP on Wednesday. He said that he brought up the report because it raises issues beyond the utilization of teaching time slots (scheduling) that might be helpful to consider when the task force explores bunching; he suggested that the charge be broadened in its scope. The Dean said that the report notes that Amherst has one of the lowest average classroom utilization rates among its peers (the proportion of a room's scheduled times out of the total available hours), but the College also has a relatively long 41.5-hour class week. He maintained that the more useful statistic than utilization is the average number of hours an Amherst classroom is in use. When that number is compared to Amherst's peers, the College compares somewhat more favorably, but Amherst's numbers are still well below the average. The consultants have concluded that using teaching spaces more efficiently will offer more choices for students and support the open curriculum; increase the availability of quality teaching spaces on campus; and produce a better fit of course enrollments and classroom sizes. In addition, the consultants noted that a number of Amherst's classrooms are packed too tightly. Reconfiguring these rooms for the appropriate number of students would decrease the rooms' capacities, and thus it could affect their usability for the larger classes currently scheduled in them. The question of how classroom space is scheduled and assigned and who does so is also addressed in the report, and could be relevant to the work of the task force, the Dean said.

Professor Rockwell, noting that faculty consultation will be important and necessary, urged that the task force share its report, which he would hope would include a number of options to consider, with the CEP by the end of the Spring semester 2010 and that there be a Faculty Meeting to consider the report no later than the middle of the Fall semester 2010. Professor Hall agreed that having the CEP review the report would be important, and the members decided that the CPR could also be consulted about the report, if issues related to its charge emerge. Professor Rockwell noted that a vote of the Faculty would be required to alter the schedule for classes. The Dean agreed, while noting that at present he does grant a few exceptions each semester to the voted teaching times, upon request from members of the Faculty. Proposing how the schedule and locations for classes during the Merrill project may be adjusted in order to create the least disruption should be a focus of the task force, he said.

Continuing the conversation about the task force, President Marx noted that having classes scheduled during a very small number of time slots, as is the case now, creates a serious educational problem—constraining the curriculum that is available to students. He suggested that a goal of the task force's work should be reducing scheduling and other constraints that limit Amherst students' access to the full breadth of the College's curriculum. Professor Hall noted that faculty may have a variety of real constraints that determine when they can teach, such as childcare issues and the distance that they must travel to the College. He suggested that the charge to the task force focus primarily on exploring mechanisms to make better use of the time

Amended December 11, 2009

slots available for classes, while being broad enough to allow for consideration of the related issues mentioned by the Dean and in the consultants' report. Professor Goutte noted that there are also important curricular issues that influence course scheduling; for example, the science departments work together to generate a joint curriculum in which large courses that are prerequisites for advanced courses, and are also pre-med requirements, are not offered simultaneously, while courses that could not be taken simultaneously by any one student (for curricular reasons such as prerequisites) are intentionally "bunched."

Returning briefly to the topic of committees, President Marx said that he wondered what the distinctions might be between "College" committees and faculty committees and how such distinctions might have evolved, particularly in the cases of committees that focus on College-wide issues. Professor Hall noted that standing committees of the Faculty are named as such in the *Faculty Handbook*. The Faculty creates the language about these committees, owns the language, and has the authority to modify the language by faculty vote. The Faculty also charges these committees and receives reports from them. Dean Call noted that committees are listed under four categories in the *Faculty Handbook* (IV, S., 1., 2, 3., 4). They are committees of the Faculty (standing and ad hoc), committees of the Board of Trustees, committees of the College, and Five College committees. Under College committees, there are two—Diversity and Inclusion, and Archives, the Dean said.

President Marx asked about the meaning of the distinction between faculty and College committees, as raised in the CPR minutes. He wondered in particular if the CPR should be a faculty committee or whether, given the interest in broader representation (with the Faculty as a major stakeholder but not the only one) and the broader agenda of budget priorities, it should be a College committee—and what that would imply. He asked whether as a faculty committee the staff would necessarily be subordinated. Professor Saxton voiced some unease that the staff would be subordinate to the Faculty if the committee became a College committee. Professor Hall said that he rejects the view that the Faculty is merely one of several constituencies demanding representation on a committee charged with examining institutional priorities. The President asked whether the Faculty valued staff opinion and input, and Professor Hall answered with an emphatic *yes*. He said that he thought that examining the student role on certain faculty committees could be a guide as to the kind of role staff members might play on the CPR.

Professor Ciepiela pointed out that the Committee of Six has neither students nor staff on it, and that it might be instructive to consider why this is so. President Marx said that this is an interesting question, adding that it is clear that tenure cases should be handled by the Faculty. Since the time had come for a meeting with the members of FCAFA, the Committee agreed to return to these questions at a later date.

At 4:30 P.M. the Committee was joined by the members (Stanley Rabinowitz, Professor of Russian, Chair; Elias Aba Milki '10; Sandra Burkett, Associate Professor of Chemistry; Joe Paul Case, Director of Financial Aid; Katie Fretwell, Director of Admission; Ben Lieber, Dean of Students; Tom Parker, Dean of Admission and Financial Aid; Matthew Schulkind, Associate Professor of Psychology; Christopher Tullis '10E; Daniel Velleman, Professor of Mathematics; Tanika Vigil '10; and Christina Wong '11) of the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA). Dean Call thanked the FCAFA for meeting with the Committee of Six and for providing the members with a draft of the report that their committee had produced in response to the Committee of Six's charge (see minutes of September 28, 2009) to the FCAFA.

Professor Rabinowitz thanked the Committee of Six for the opportunity to receive the members' feedback on the draft. He noted that the FCAFA's extensive conversations about Amherst's underlying educational values had formed the basis of the committee's consideration

Amended December 11, 2009

of the issues at hand. Professor Rabinowitz informed the Committee that he would lead a discussion about the educational implications of various options for reducing the financial aid budget and that Dean Parker would discuss the financial implications. Professor Rabinowitz acknowledged his own realization of how interrelated, interdependent, and complex financial aid is and the impact that a change in one policy can have on many others. A goal driving the committee's discussion has been to arrive at a common understanding of what Amherst has been, is, and should be, he explained. The FCAFA operated under the assumption that Amherst will continue to be need blind at all stages of the admission process and will continue to meet the full demonstrated need of all admitted students. In addition, it was assumed that all previous commitments to students currently enrolled at Amherst and to those students admitted in the current admission cycle would be honored. The FCAFA then discussed two recommendations it had made in the report, as well as a set of unranked options it had developed, in response to the Committee of Six's charge. Professor Rabinowitz said that this conversation with the Committee of Six might be seen as a microcosm of the larger faculty discussion planned for December 15 at the Faculty Meeting.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Rabinowitz noted that one purpose of the committee's presentation at the December 15 meeting of the Faculty will be to help the Faculty to understand the complexities surrounding financial aid. Dean Parker then reviewed with the members the various scenarios that might be employed to meet or surpass the financial aid savings projections (totaling \$1,454,000 in FY10 through FY12) described on page thirteen of the report of the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC). Dean Parker said that any changes in policy or practice affecting the Class of 2015 must be made by February 1, 2010, so that there is enough time to revise admission publications and to inform prospective students about the changes.

Dean Parker noted that one policy that the FCAFA discussed last year and that has already been implemented was changing the amount of money that aided students are expected to save from summer earnings. This amount had not changed in more than ten years. The committee recommended increasing the summer earnings requirement from \$1,800 to \$2,000 for students in the upper three classes from middle-income (and higher-income) backgrounds and from \$950 to \$1,100 for those from lower-income backgrounds. This change has already been implemented and it is expected that it will yield total savings of approximately \$407,000 over the next three years (FY10-FY12). The committee also considered reducing the College's financial aid expenditures by modifying the criteria used in determining need for financial aid, but decided that any resulting savings would not justify various associated costs, particularly related to the College's commitment to its core values.

Dean Parker said that the FCAFA also considered a range of options in regard to the College's community college transfer program and decided to recommend that the program be scaled back by reducing the number of community college transfer students at Amherst by 50 percent. Dean Parker explained that, four years ago, the College received a grant from the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation to start a program to enroll a significant number of community college transfer students. While it was agreed that the program has been valuable on a variety of levels and successful, it has also been very expensive because these students generally require substantial financial aid, Dean Parker noted. He said that the original grant runs out at the end of the current fiscal year (June 2010 or FY10). Part of the grant has been used to fund two administrative positions (one in the Admission Office and one in the Dean of Students Office). These staff members recruit students for the program and provide support for students once they enroll at Amherst and are essential to the success of the program. Dean Parker said that continuing the program at the current level would require adding two new staff positions to the

Amended December 11, 2009

College budget, a step that did not seem appropriate given the need to reduce the budget and staffing at the College. The FCAFA made the recommendation to retain half the number of community college transfer students only if the administration authorizes funding for continuing one of the staff positions to serve the students' needs. The expectation is that reducing the program by half would produce savings totaling approximately \$700,000 by the end of FY12. Dean Parker noted that the program could be restored to its current level in the future if financial conditions improve. If it is eliminated completely, however, reinstating it would be much more difficult.

Dean Parker noted that following the recommendations he had outlined thus far would result in savings that would be equivalent to approximately three-quarters of the cumulative goal set by the ABC. The FCAFA has developed three (unranked) options for generating the remaining \$348,000 in savings that has been requested. The weight given to each of these moving parts could be adjusted, he said to meet the ABC goal. The first is reintroducing loans (using a sliding scale that would retain a no-loan policy for lower- and middle-income students), which he expects would result in savings of approximately \$334,000 in FY12. Dean Parker noted that the negative repercussions of taking this step include public relations and competitiveness with peer schools that have no-loan policies. If some of the other schools with no-loan policies adjust their policies, it would change the landscape and allow Amherst to do so with fewer repercussions, Dean Parker said. The second option is setting a target for a modest percentage reduction in the number of international students, while retaining need-blind admission for international students. A target of 8 percent (which corresponds to a reduction of 9 from the number in the Class of 2013, but corresponds to the current percentage of international students in all four classes), would save approximately \$200,000 in FY11 and \$400,000 in FY12. Professor Schulkind noted that this target of 8 percent represents an estimate that will depend on the applicant pool during a given year. The third option is making use of the financial aid reserve fund that was established to provide a cushion if budgeted financial aid expenditures were exceeded in given years and to give the College the flexibility to experiment with new financial aid policies (for example, eliminating loans for low-income students, as was done in 1999). Using the reserve fund at this time, Dean Parker said, is appealing because doing so would mean that other policies would not have to be changed. He explained that the proposal is for a one-time use of the fund during a very unusual time that would provide a much-needed influx of funds to the financial aid budget that would give the College time to see what happens with the economy. However, repeated use of the reserve fund in this way would not be sustainable, Dean Parker said.

The members discussed the fact that the three options would meet the ABC goal for cumulative savings in FY10 through FY12, but would have very different long-term financial consequences. Dean Call noted that the focus should be on full implementation and savings over the long term. In particular, special attention should be paid to the projected annual savings in FY12 and beyond. The ABC requested \$674,000 in financial aid savings in FY12, which is only \$58,000 more than the annual savings achieved by the already implemented summer earnings adjustment and the proposed 50 percent cut in the community college transfer program. Mr. Tullis remarked that changes made over the long term have far more significant implications than those made over a three-year period. Professor Rabinowitz noted that in developing these scenarios, the FCAFA has tried to consider the educational implications of making particular choices as well as cost implications. No choice was black and white, and some steps, if needed, would be painful. The committee noted that financial aid is a sensitive and emotional issue and that it is important to make every effort to keep it from becoming a divisive one. Dean Parker emphasized that the best approach is to make choices that enable the College to have the

Amended December 11, 2009

flexibility to re-introduce policies. If programs are completely eliminated rather than reduced, it becomes harder to reinstitute them. Professor Burkett noted that the options considered by the Committee fall into two categories—those that affect who is admitted to Amherst and those that concern the finances of those who come. While recommendations touched in both directions, it was particularly difficult to consider options that would affect who could come to Amherst. Framing the options in this way was helpful from a values perspective, however, Professor Burkett said.

Professor Barbezat asked if a regular increase in summer earnings would be part of budget planning in the years to come, a step that he suggested would avoid the current situation of not having adjusted the requirement for a decade, with the result that Amherst's expectation was much lower than those of peer institutions. Dean Parker said that the summer earnings expectation should be monitored on an annual bases, but that Amherst is now at the median for COFHE colleges and that any adjustments in upcoming years would be in very small increments, along the lines of \$50.00 to \$100.00. Thus they would not have much impact in a single year. Professor Barbezat also noted that he finds it troubling when expected increases in tuition are discussed with an emphasis on a resulting rise in the financial aid budget, since the College will still gain additional funds in an overall sense, as a result of raising tuition. He asked whether changes in the accounting of "costs" are being considered. President Marx said that various options are being considered for changing the budget calculations to reflect more accurately revenues and expenses, but that no decisions have been made yet. Professor Barbezat also asked what percentage of students who are given grants by the College actually do take out loans. Dean Case responded that, in the current year, there are 212 borrowers out of 977 grant recipients (21.7 percent).

Professor Rockwell expressed appreciation to the FCAFA for all of its excellent work. He asked why the committee had not considered in depth contingency plans should the economy worsen significantly. Dean Parker said that more drastic versions of the options that the committee had outlined could be implemented in the event of a major economic downturn that threatened the College's financial health. For example, the cap on international students could be reduced by 2, 3, or 4 percent. Loans could be re-introduced and raised to a level of as much as \$5,500 per year. The community college transfer program could be eliminated completely. Preference for low-income academic twos could be discontinued. The cost would be that Amherst as an institution would be fundamentally changed. One can think of each of these steps as a dial that can be moved gradually, radically, or not at all, he said. Professor Rabinowitz noted that having the best possible sense of the values of the institution will provide a vital underpinning for how these "dials" are used. Professor Burkett noted that Appendix C of the report essentially illustrates the dials turned all the way up. Professor Rockwell said that he found this explanation to be reassuring and persuasive and that making these sorts of statements in the report would be helpful for the faculty discussion. Professor Ciepiela expressed thanks for the committee's work and said that she feels that options have been clarified in helpful and nuanced ways.

President Marx said that it appears that the committee is recommending an approach that will allow the College to meet its financial targets, without making changes that represent lurches. Adjustments would be as gradual as possible, leaving open the possibility that they could be reversed if a change in the financial landscape permits. In this way, radical changes to the fabric of the College could be avoided and talented pools of prospective students would not be cut off. Dean Parker said that he could argue the pros and cons of any of the proposals, and that there is no right or wrong answer, only strategies for where to put the College at the least risk. Professor Barbezat said that there is clearly a tension between the long and short term; as

Amended December 11, 2009

the report showed, different responses have different cost savings over the long term. Focusing on the long term and coming up short would be problematic, he said. For this reason, perhaps the use of the reserve fund could provide a useful buffer. President Marx said that consideration of the budget over the short and long term will be the responsibility of the Board. Dean Fretwell stressed that decisions must be made by the Board at its January meeting if changes are to be incorporated into Admission publications in February.

Mr. Aba Milki commented that students have not felt involved or informed in the process of considering financial aid questions. Dean Call noted that having the opportunity to have a community discussion is very important. The committees agreed that it would be beneficial for the students and staff, as well as the Faculty, to learn more about the committee's consideration of financial aid policies and the rationales for their proposals and that the FCAFA should host a meeting on admission and financial aid for students on December 9. Dean Parker noted that, following the student meeting and the Faculty Meeting, and informed by those discussions, the FCAFA could develop a ranked list of options for consideration by the Board in January. The meeting concluded with the President expressing his thanks to the students on the FCAFA, who have been very involved in the committee's deliberations and who had participated in the drafting of its report. The Dean also thanked the members of the FCAFA for meeting with the Committee of Six.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 11, 2009

The eleventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, December 7, 2009. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Much of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters. At the conclusion of those discussions, President Marx shared with the members the CVs of possible candidates for the McCloy Professorship and/or Simpson Lectureship. The members agreed to review the CVs and to request more information if necessary, before discussing the nominees at an upcoming Committee of Six meeting.

The Committee reviewed a draft agenda for the Faculty Meeting of December 15, focusing first on possible formats for facilitating the Faculty's discussion of the December 2, 2009, Report of the Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) to the Committee of Six. The Committee considered the pros and cons of discussing the report in a Committee-of-the-Whole format, through bringing motions before the Faculty, and/or having a discussion of the report during the meeting. The members agreed that, whatever format was chosen, the Faculty would be asked to consider three scenarios put forward by the FCAFA as a means of meeting the target of financial aid savings (totaling \$1,454,000 in FY 10 through FY12) that was set by the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC). Adopting any of these three proposals would augment the savings (amounting to about three-quarters of the cumulative goal set by the ABC) that would be realized through raising the amount of money that aided students are expected to save from summer earnings, a policy that has already been adopted, and implementing the FCAFA's recommendation that the community college transfer program be scaled back by reducing the number of community college transfer students at Amherst by 50 percent. The goal of each of these three proposals would be to generate the remaining \$348,000 in savings that has been requested. The three options are reinstating loans, setting a target (8 percent) for a modest percentage reduction in the number of international students (while retaining need-blind admission for international students), and making use of the financial aid reserve fund. Any changes in the financial aid policies of the College that would affect the next admission cycle would have to be made by February 1, 2010, it was noted. President Marx noted that the faculty discussion, and any preferences for particular options that are expressed, would inform the Board's decision-making about this financial matter.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Rockwell said that having the Faculty vote on the options would be the best way to determine the Faculty's collective view. Professor Goutte commented that it will be important to explain to the Faculty why the FCAFA was asked to make these recommendations and what the Faculty is now being asked to do. President Marx agreed, noting that at the conclusion of the ABC process, one piece of the plan for meeting the target for savings was left unresolved, and it had been agreed that the FCAFA should be asked to make recommendations for how to generate the needed savings. The President agreed to provide the Faculty with background on the ABC process that led to the need for the FCAFA to consider the questions at hand. The members agreed that having a discussion of the report at the Faculty Meeting would be the best vehicle for the Faculty to consider the substance of the document.

Discussion turned to the motion put forward by the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) in its [letter of December 3, 2009](#) (appended via link) to expand its membership. Several Committee members asked the Dean if the CPR had consulted with the Advisory Committee on Personnel Policies (ACPP) and the Managers' Council when formulating the

Amended December 11, 2009

substance of the motion. The Dean said that the committee had consulted with both of these bodies on several occasions. Professor Hall suggested that, if the CPR is to grow and become a more central part of faculty governance, the current practice of having the Committee of Six nominate faculty members to serve on the CPR should, perhaps, be changed. He believes that it would be preferable, from a governance perspective, for the faculty members of the CPR to be elected through a Committee of Six-style election. Professor Hall noted that this might be a good moment to propose such a change, since other changes to the *Faculty Handbook* language about the CPR are being considered. Dean Call wondered if it might be informative to consider this issue in the context of the Committee's upcoming consideration of the structure of committees in an overall sense, particularly in regard to major committees such as the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and, perhaps, the FCAFA. Professor Hall agreed that a discussion about the process for selecting the memberships of these committees within a broader conversation about committees would be useful.

Turning specifically to the motion to broaden the CPR's membership, Professor Barbezat, who expressed strong support for the addition of staff members to the CPR, raised concern about the method that is being proposed by the CPR to select the three staff members who would be voting members of the committee. Rather than having the ACPP designate two staff members and the Managers' Council designate one of its members, he suggested that an election be held for the three staff slots on the CPR and that the entire staff of the College be asked to vote in a Committee of Six-style election. Professor Barbezat asked how many Trustee-appointed staff members are not managers, and the Dean responded that most Trustee-appointed staff have supervisory duties, even if they are not formally designated as managers. He estimated that about 22 percent of non-faculty employees at the College are designated as Trustee-appointees and that about 78 percent of non-faculty employees are designated as staff. The Managers' Council presently numbers about fifteen. The President and the Dean emphasized that, while the CPR's proposal for selecting the staff representatives to the committee might not be perfect, it does represent a step in the right direction toward more democratic representation of the College community on the CPR. Professor Barbezat responded by asking: What could be more democratic than a direct vote?

Professors Saxton and Hall expressed concern about the idea of adding a fourth faculty member to the CPR. President Marx asked whether the intention to be democratic and inclusive would be realized in the proposed structure. Professor Barbezat commented that this is an interesting moment to consider what the CPR should become.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Hall asked the Dean for some background about the Managers' Council. The Dean responded that, during the economic downturn last year, the heads of administrative departments (the Director of Information Technology, the Registrar, the Director of the Mead Art Museum, the Librarian of the College, and the Director of Athletics) who report to him proposed that they and other heads of administrative departments gather to consider budgets, policies, and procedures across the College. The group would be distinct from the Senior Staff (the senior administrators who report directly to the President), as the individuals on the Managers' Council report to members of the Senior Staff. The Dean noted that the Treasurer, the Director of Human Resources, and the Dean of the Faculty are ex officio members of the CPR. The Legal and Administrative Counsel is an invited guest. Professor Barbezat asked if any members of the Managers' Council are ex officio members of the CPR. The Dean said that the Director of the Budget is both an ex officio member of the CPR and a member of

Amended December 11, 2009

the Managers' Council. He noted that the CPR felt strongly that it would be valuable to have the expertise (in the form a voting member on the committee) of a member of the Managers' Council, which they viewed as distinct from the expertise of the senior staff who are ex officio members of the committee. For that reason, the committee structured the motion to include having a member of the Manager's Council as a voting member of the CPR. In addition, the Dean said, with its proposal for expanding its members, the CPR feels that it is responding to a concern that more conversation should be facilitated between levels of staff at the College. Professor Ciepiela said that addressing this concern seems outside the charge of the CPR.

In regard to bringing the motion before the Faculty, Professor Rockwell suggested that the CPR's motion could be placed on the agenda and then a member of the Committee, if he or she wished, could propose a substitute motion. In this way, the Faculty could consider several options for structuring the CPR. Professor Barbezat expressed concern that the CPR is proposing the mechanisms for adding particular staff without consulting broadly with the staff about this issue. The Dean emphasized that more consultation has been done to reach the point of generating this motion than has ever been done before. He reiterated the view that the motion before the Committee represents a step in the right direction, and that the CPR had given careful thought to its substance, and had devoted much time and effort to developing it. Professor Hall said that he was unwilling to take, at this time, a step that raises so many concerns.

The Committee considered whether to put both the CPR motion and an alternative motion from the Committee of Six on the agenda. The members decided that their discussion of this issue seemed rushed and would benefit from additional information with respect to the CPR's thinking. They decided by a vote of six to zero not to forward the CPR's motion to the Faculty at this time and asked the Dean to arrange a meeting between the Committee of Six and the CPR to discuss further the issue of broadening the membership of the CPR. The Committee then voted six to zero to forward the Faculty Meeting agenda (without the CPR motion) to the Faculty.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended January 25, 2010

The twelfth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, December 14, 2009. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with "Announcements from the President." President Marx noted that some students have expressed the desire to have student representation on the Class Scheduling Task Force, the final charge to which would be discussed later in today's meeting. The members agreed that a student, perhaps chosen by the student government, should be asked to serve.

The President informed the members that three members (Mount Holyoke, Smith, and the University of Massachusetts) of the Five College Consortium have agreed to changes in their academic calendars. These institutions have decided to start their spring semesters on the Tuesday after Martin Luther King Day. While there is no need for Amherst to adopt the exact same schedule as the other schools, President Marx said that starting any later than four class days after the post-Martin Luther King Day Tuesday would lead to Amherst being out of sync with the institutions that have changed their calendars, which would effectively make it impossible for students from the Five Colleges to take classes at Amherst or vice versa. Changing the calendar to stay within four class days of the calendars at those institutions may mean losing up to a week of Interterm during some years, while having little effect during others. Dean Call said that it would be important to review the calendar for the next seven years to get a sense of the effect any changes would have for a full calendar cycle. He noted that starting the semester earlier at Amherst could make it possible to extend the reading period by two days before exams in the spring, a step that has been previously requested by students. President Marx noted that, if there is agreement on calendars among the Five Colleges, it is hoped that the agreement will be for an extended period so that the decision does not have to be re-examined annually. President Marx said that Mount Holyoke and Smith are phasing out their Interterm programs, largely for economic reasons. The university has argued that its students have been at a disadvantage in the market for summer jobs because the spring semester ends so late in May. The President said that there is some concern that, if Interterm is decreased by four or five days at Amherst during some years, students writing honors theses will have to adjust when they do their research. President Marx then informed the Committee that he plans to ask the College Council to review the new schedule being adopted by the other schools and to formulate a proposal for Amherst's calendar to bring before the Faculty. The members agreed that this was the appropriate course.

President Marx next reported that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) had developed a process for departments to follow when requesting a target-of-opportunity hire, noting that the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) had recommended that two floating FTEs be allocated for this purpose. The process will be shared with the Committee and the Faculty, the Dean noted.

President Marx asked the Committee whether to consider reinstating the President's Initiative Fund (PIF) program and distributed to the members the procedures that had been used for the program when it was active. The President said that, the goal of reinstating the program would be to continue to encourage curricular innovation, as well as to offer the Faculty another set of opportunities to request visitors through the PIF, in this way helping to replenish funding for visitors that has been cut. He asked the members to review the procedures to see if they could be used in their present form or might be modified. Professor Goutte expressed some concern that, since funding has been cut for visitors that are requested, presumably to cover core

Amended January 25, 2010

areas of the curriculum, by departments, the message that might be conveyed by re-introducing the PIF is that core areas are not as important as curricular initiatives. President Marx responded that he has been trying to find as many ways as possible—such as using Croxton funds for visitors—to support departments' visitor requests, and that the PIF could provide an additional source of funding for bringing visiting faculty to the College. Professor Ciepiela asked why the PIF had been discontinued. President Marx said that, since one of the PIF's purposes had been to stimulate possibilities for curricular innovation at the College, and, by so doing, to inform the planning process of the CAP, once the recommendations of the CAP moved forward, the initiatives that had evolved through the PIF shifted into the next phase of consideration by the CEP and the Faculty as a whole. The need for additional resources to support the curriculum is what has prompted the President to ask whether using his discretionary funds for the PIF once again might be advisable. Professor Saxton, who had participated in a PIF project, said that the program was worthwhile and that she would welcome its re-introduction. Professor Hall said that he would be interested in receiving more information about the projects that had been funded by the PIF. President Marx asked Dean Tobin to provide a summary of the projects that had been supported to share with the members, and she agreed to do so. Professor Hall suggested that the PIF procedures be discussed by the CEP, and the Dean agreed to disseminate the procedures to the committee.

Under his announcements, Dean Call informed the members that, in response to the Committee's request that the Committee on International Education develop a charge for itself to explore the place of study abroad within Amherst students' academic programs, with a particular focus on advising and study abroad, the committee has provided such a charge. He suggested that the members review the charge this spring, since time would not permit doing so at today's meeting. President Marx said that it would be desirable, from an institutional perspective, to encourage more students to study abroad in the fall, if possible. At present, in most years, more students study abroad in the spring; bringing students' time away from Amherst into better balance would be helpful for meeting housing and other student needs, President Marx said. It is his hope that the Committee on International Education will continue to consider this question.

The Committee discussed briefly a letter ([appended via link](#)) that had been sent by the Committee on Education and Athletics to the CEP about the committee's proposal (which was attached) regarding the scheduling of academic commitments at the College. The Dean had shared the letter with the Committee of Six so as to inform the members' consideration of a charge to the soon-to-be-formed Class Scheduling Task Force. The Committee on Education and Athletics noted that it had made the proposal in May 2008, but no action had yet been taken by the CEP. This fall the committee decided to revisit the proposal, revised it, and has now asked that the CEP consider the proposal in light of the upcoming formation of the Class Scheduling Task Force. The Committee on Education and Athletics has proposed that weekday afternoons from 4:30 to 7:30 P.M. be kept as free as possible from required academic activity so that the late-afternoon time slot can be reserved for athletics and other co-curricular activities. In support of this goal, the committee has suggested that afternoon seminars that run longer than 150 minutes begin at 1:30 P.M. rather than 2:00 P.M. Many members expressed significant concern about this proposal. Professor Goutte expressed particular concern for the sciences, as three quarters of the class meeting times affected by the 4:30-7:30 time slot are science classes (according to the data accompanying the letter); she noted that none of the members of the Committee on Education and Athletics teach in science departments. The Dean said these issues will be considered by the CEP. The Committee then turned to personnel matters.

Amended January 25, 2010

The members discussed the work of a small number of individuals who might be considered for a McCloy Professorship or Simpson Lectureship. In some cases, one or more members asked to read some of the scholarly work of several of the scholars. At the conclusion of the conversation, the President thanked the members for their advice.

The Committee turned to a discussion of when to meet with the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) about the motion to expand the CPR's membership. The members asked the Dean to inquire if the two committees might meet at the beginning of the Spring semester, during one of the CPR's regular meeting times. He agreed to do so. The members then finalized a charge to the Class Scheduling Task Force, agreeing it should read as follows:

Charge to the Class Scheduling Task Force

The Committee of Six charges the Class Scheduling Task Force to explore mechanisms to increase Amherst students' access to the full breadth of the College's curriculum. The Committee of Six charges the task force with drawing up proposals, including new scheduling options, for consideration by the Faculty. The Committee asks that the task force consult broadly with the campus community, including the chairs of all academic departments; other members of the Faculty; students; members of the administration, Information Technology, and Registrar's staff; and those who oversee and schedule co-curricular activities. The Committee of Six asks that the task force report its findings and proposals to the Committee on Educational Policy by the end of the Spring semester 2010 and with the goal that proposals be brought to the Faculty for consideration at a Faculty Meeting no later than the middle of the Fall semester 2010.

The members then made suggestions to the Dean of colleagues who might serve on the committee or be a consultant to it. Dean Call thanked the members for their help.

The meeting ended with the Dean reporting back on his conversation with Professor Morse about the Doshisha Short-Term Faculty Exchange. During the Committee's preliminary conversation about the program, some questions had emerged. Dean Call said that Professor Morse had already had one conversation with Professor Morita, Doshisha's representative to Amherst, about the possibility of having more reciprocity as part of the exchange. Professor Morse said that Professor Morita had felt that it would probably be possible to modify slightly the exchange, with the result that Doshisha would be willing to assume responsibility for sending its faculty members to Amherst and to increase the profile of the exchange on the Doshisha campus. Professor Morse had explained to the Dean that one of the major reasons for Amherst having control (and the concurrent expense) for both sides of the exchange has been to ensure that any faculty from Doshisha who participate in the exchange are interested in contributing to the intellectual life of the College, and in particular the Asian studies program. Professor Morse said that Amherst had been careful to try to select fellows whose scholarly interests would fit in with the Doshisha curriculum. He told the Dean that the downside of the present system is that, because it is not an official Doshisha program, it is impossible to formally advertise the exchange in Japan; in addition, as Professor Morse learned only recently, sometimes Doshisha has difficulty finding faculty sponsors for Amherst faculty who participate in the exchange because their intellectual interests, despite the College's best efforts, do not match those of the Doshisha faculty. Professor Morita and Professor Morse discussed having the Amherst committee for the

Amended January 25, 2010

exchange rank the applications and share them with a comparable committee at Doshisha. The Doshisha committee would have an opportunity to rank the applications from Amherst as well and to indicate which they believed would be most appropriate. Under this new system, faculty from Doshisha would apply to the Doshisha committee, which would rank the applications and send them on to the Amherst committee for evaluation. Both institutions would have a say in who is selected, but the exchange to Amherst would be sponsored and administered by Doshisha. Professor Morse said that he believes that this change would address the concerns expressed by the Committee regarding cost and the lack of applicants from Doshisha. It should also make administering the exchange easier for Doshisha.

The Dean said that Professor Morse has also discussed with Professor Morita the Doshisha sabbatical system that allows Doshisha faculty to spend a year at Amherst. Amherst faculty may also spend their sabbaticals at Doshisha. Professor Morse noted that the short-term faculty exchange program emerged (in the early 1990s) out of a lack of participation by Amherst faculty in the year-long sabbatic leave program. That system was originally designed for Doshisha faculty under age forty-two or forty-three. According to Professor Morita, as the Japanese educational system has evolved to value publication more highly over the past few years, increasingly, junior faculty want to spend their sabbaticals at schools with graduate programs. Doshisha has now removed the age limit for this exchange, and Professor Morita believes that there will be more faculty applying in the future. He also believes that, if the College is willing to continue the policy that waives rent for Doshisha faculty using the one apartment the College sets aside for the Doshisha exchange, more Doshisha colleagues will be encouraged to apply to come to Amherst for a year. In exchange, Professor Morita had suggested proposing that Doshisha assume the cost of housing for Amherst faculty who want to spend their sabbaticals at Doshisha. Professor Morse told the Dean that he thinks that there would be interest, even among Amherst faculty who are not in Asian studies, in spending a semester or year at Doshisha under this system. Because Amherst can only house one Doshisha faculty member, this opportunity would have to be limited to one Amherst faculty member a year.

Professor Saxton said that she is very supportive of having Doshisha select who among its faculty will participate in the exchange with Amherst and for having greater reciprocity at all levels as part of the programs that the College has and/or develops with Doshisha. The other members agreed. The Committee requested that the Dean ask Professor Morse to pursue the suggestion that Doshisha take a greater role in selecting any short-term fellows who come to Amherst from Doshisha and that Doshisha provide the funding for these fellows, as well as opportunities for faculty exchanges of longer duration. The Dean noted that Professor Morse will be meeting with representatives from Doshisha in January.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

The thirteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, January 25, 2010. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with “Announcements from the President.” President Marx discussed a student disciplinary matter with the Committee. The President then offered a report of the meetings of the Board of Trustees, which had been held over the weekend of January 22 in Washington. He noted that those attending the Trustee meetings had also participated in a large and successful Alumni Association event as part of the weekend, and that the Trustees had met with the Folger Library’s Board of Governors. President Marx said that the Board’s consideration of various options for reducing the financial aid budget was informed by the collective view of the Faculty, as expressed during the Faculty’s discussion of the Report of the Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) to the Committee of Six (December 2, 2009) at the Faculty Meeting of December 15 and at an informal meeting of faculty members who had spoken at that meeting subsequently convened by the President, and by the suggestions of students expressed during the FCAFA’s open meeting with students, which was also held in December. The Board also considered different ways of structuring financial reporting internally, so as to make budget trends and the full budget picture clearer.

Continuing his report of the Trustee meetings, President Marx said that the Trustees were as delighted as he himself had been with the support that had been demonstrated by faculty and students for both the community college transfer program and international student recruitment at the College. The Trustees agreed to support these programs at the original target enrollments that had been affirmed by the Faculty—in particular the target of twenty-five community college students on campus, as originally approved by FCAFA, and of 8 percent international students, as proposed by the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) and endorsed by the Faculty. The President noted that, last year, the yield for both programs was slightly higher than anticipated. The Board agreed that, by maintaining the original targets set for these programs, together with the small increase in summer savings expectations for students on financial aid (which would generate more funds than originally thought), the Board recognized that the reductions of financial aid recommended by the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC) would likely be met. As a matter of budget-setting, the Trustees voted to reaffirm those original targets. President Marx commented that admissions yield is not an exact science, and that, if the College exceeds these targets because of the high quality of students, the financial aid reserve fund will be used to cover the difference. The President said that he is seeking funding from foundations to support a staff position to assist administratively with the community college program.

Continuing with his report, President Marx informed the members that the Board had also discussed the idea of re-instituting financial aid loans, considering carefully the arguments for doing so that had been expressed at the December 15 Faculty Meeting. The President said that the College now has preliminary evidence that the elimination of loans has had the intended effect of reducing the College’s under-representation among qualified students from the middle three income quintiles, and that since the elimination of loans was instituted, the number of students with top academic ratings has increased. Members of the Committee asked to see those data. The President shared a graph showing preliminary data and noted that Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research, is finalizing the numbers. He promised to share the information when available with the Committee, the FCAFA, and the Faculty. The no-loan policy has also reduced the financial burden on middle-class student families. After reviewing this information, the Trustees decided that it was not necessary to re-institute student loans to meet the ABC budget targets. Professor Rockwell noted that, while the ABC targets are being met in the short term, he wondered whether the no-loan policy had been considered in the

context of long-term budgetary targets. President Marx said that the Board had agreed that it would continue to monitor the situation. If, for example, aid programs for Amherst's most financially needy students were threatened or the College became unable to continue to support and invest in its Faculty and staff, the student loan policy would be re-visited. The President and the Dean said that, while it appears that the College is now on a course that suggests that ten-year projections will be met, it is impossible to predict what might happen with the economy and other outside factors. While the College has achieved a certain sense of stability at this time, the margin needed for maintaining stability if another serious economic downturn occurred has been significantly diminished.

President Marx said that the Board and he were pleased, as the entire College community should be, that Amherst was able to reduce budget expenditures, including cutting the projected per student cost over the next three years, while remaining true to its core values, while preserving the College's commitment to financial aid, without laying off staff, and while being able to build our Faculty with a high number of new appointments for next year.

President Marx next commented on the search for the Dean of Students and noted that, while it was regrettable that the search last semester did not result in an appointment from among the finalists, he was very pleased that Allen Hart, Dean of New Students and Professor of Psychology, has agreed to serve as Dean of Students for an interim term of three years beginning in this Spring semester. Professor Rockwell asked if a Dean of New Students had been chosen to work with Dean Hart, and Dean Call said that he and Dean Hart have been discussing this appointment and how best to structure work in the Dean of Students office, in particular, for this Spring. Dean Call noted that the Writing Center and the Quantitative Center will now report to the Dean of the Faculty rather than the Dean of Students office and will be overseen by Ben Lieber, Dean of Student Research and Academic Support, so there may be some room for reassigning some duties within the Dean of Students' office.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the members that he had received a request from Elias Aba Milki '10 to make an announcement at the next Faculty Meeting about fundraising for relief and development in Haiti. The members, noting that this seemed like a fine idea, asked the Dean to grant this request. The Dean discussed a personnel matter with the Committee. The Committee next discussed the procedure that would be used for selecting a member to rotate off the Committee at the end of this academic year. The terms of two members—Professors Barbezat and Hall—will expire, and one other member must be selected to rotate off, so that, in accordance with procedures outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* (IV, S., 1., a.), three new members of the Committee of Six can be elected by ballot this spring. The Committee noted that it has been customary for many years to draw straws to select the colleague who will leave the Committee, and they agreed to continue this discussion of procedure at their next meeting.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Hall asked a question relating to the disciplinary matter that the President had described earlier in the meeting. Continuing with his questions, Professor Hall noted that the University of Massachusetts had started classes on January 19, in accordance with the new calendar it had adopted. He wondered if the College Council has considered the proposed changes (Mount Holyoke, Smith, and the University of Massachusetts have agreed, in the future, to start their spring semesters on the Tuesday after Martin Luther King Day) to the Five-College calendar and formulated a proposal for Amherst's calendar. Dean Call said that the College Council has not yet taken up this issue. President Marx reiterated that, while there is no need for Amherst to adopt the exact same schedule as the other schools, starting any later than four class days after the post-Martin Luther King Day Tuesday would lead to Amherst being out of sync with the institutions that have changed their calendars and would make Five-College collaboration difficult, if not impossible. Changing the

calendar to stay within four class days of the calendars at those institutions may mean losing up to a week of Interterm during some years, while having little effect during others. The Committee asked Dean Call to check with the Registrar to see what the effects of UMass starting earlier have been during the registration period for the Spring semester. The Dean said that he would be pleased to do so and to report his findings to the Committee of Six, as well as to the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), which has also been discussing this issue.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Hall noted that, in preparation for the January Board meetings, President Marx had written to some members of the Faculty to get advice on how to present to the Trustees the concerns raised during the Faculty's discussion of financial aid at the December 15 Faculty Meeting. President Marx said that he had invited all of the faculty members who had spoken during the Faculty Meeting to meet with him informally in order to better understand the intentions of the Faculty. He had found these conversations helpful. President Marx said that he had organized these conversations to complement the discussions at the Faculty Meeting. Professor Hall suggested that the President should have convened the Committee of Six, as the elected representatives of the Faculty, if he felt additional faculty opinion was desirable. Some colleagues have expressed concern to him that the President's conversation could have had the effect of undermining the Faculty's resolution to end the no-loans policy, as voted at the December 15 meeting, he said, noting that this effect, even if achieved unintentionally, would circumvent principles of faculty and shared governance. He noted further that Professor Rockwell, himself a member of the Committee of Six, had spoken at the Faculty Meeting on the topic of financial aid, but had not been among those colleagues invited to meet with the President. President Marx said that he had drawn his list of faculty from a draft of the Faculty Meeting minutes. Professor Rockwell said that indeed his comments had not been recorded. The President noted that his talking to faculty was meant to increase faculty input, but that he could also have sought advice from the Committee of Six, since the members are the elected representatives of the Faculty, and would have, of course, done so if the Committee had then been meeting.

Professor Hall next asked about progress that has been made in the area of staffing at the College. President Marx noted that the voluntary retirement program and attrition resulted in close to seventy staff and administrative positions at the College (12 percent of non-faculty employees) that are or will be vacant by the end of the academic year. Department heads have now made requests to senior staff to fill vacant positions, and some requests have been made for new positions. The President said that, in late-December, after a great deal of consultation, he had authorized searches for ten positions in six departments. Those positions have now been advertised. The Dean noted that such searches can take some time. President Marx said that there were some areas that had not been addressed in the first round of authorized searches, for example no further searches had been approved in the Library so that the new Librarian, Bryn Geffert, would be a part in determining the Library's needs. President Marx said that he anticipates that a second group of new searches of around the same size will be authorized this spring to address needs in the Library and other vacancies that have or will arise as a result of retirements and further attrition. Professor Hall asked if some positions are being combined or restructured. The President and the Dean noted that each position is being examined deliberately, in consultation with staff, and within the context of the open positions and College needs as a whole. In some cases, positions are being restructured. The Dean noted that the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) has tasked itself with assessing the impact of staff reductions on departments as part of its regular budget assessment process. He understands that it is the CPR's hope to forward a report on this subject to the Faculty and to the Board.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Rockwell expressed concern that other institutions within the Five Colleges may try to take advantage of Amherst's

resources as a means of making up for budget reductions at their own institutions. He said that the number of Five-College students enrolling in his classes seems to have increased this year, and perhaps in other Amherst classes, and he wonders whether reduced instructional budgets at the other schools might be at the root of any increase in enrollments at Amherst by students from the Five Colleges. He also expressed concern that the UMass library may develop ways to pass some of its acquisition costs on to the Amherst library, knowing that Amherst has a more generous acquisitions budget. The President and the Dean said that they are aware of the potential for such problems and will continue to gather data on Five-College trends and to monitor the situation.

Professor Hall next asked the President if there were topics of interest other than financial aid that had been discussed at the Board meeting. Dean Call said that the former, current, and future chairs of the Board's Instruction Committee met with Professor Dizard, Chair of the CEP, and him to discuss plans for the March meeting, which will be Instruction Weekend. The President noted that the Board expressed interest in exploring additional ways to use technology, including further connecting alumni with the campus. In terms of the budget, the Trustees discussed metrics for measuring the cost per student, in addition to considering decisions around financial aid. The Board also received updates on the Merrill Science Center and Lord Jeffery Inn projects and was given a report on the record number of early decision applications and progress that is being made toward the targets set by the ABC.

Professor Hall next followed up on a conversation begun last semester about the lighting in the Merrill Science Center, and the signs directing people to the Quantitative Center. He expressed great concern about the lack of lighting in the third-floor lobby of Merrill and the lack of working clocks in the building. He noted that the building had recently become dark and unwelcoming through an aggressive removal of light bulbs, and that students and faculty should not have to learn and work under the increasingly cave-like conditions that currently exist. He noted that, while there is now a small laminated paper sign indicating the location of the Quantitative Center, the center is still inadequately marked. The President and the Dean said that they would look into this matter.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Ciepiela asked the Dean how many visiting faculty positions have been authorized for 2010-2011. The Dean said that the number of positions that will be allocated is not yet finalized, but that he would report back to the Committee once this information is available. President Marx noted that he has made efforts to supplement the visitors budget through the use of Croxton funds, and that it is his hope to revive the President's Initiative Fund (PIF) to also support visiting faculty. The CEP is currently reviewing the proposal to use the PIF for this purpose.

Discussion turned to the Committee's upcoming meeting (Wednesday, January 27) with the CPR to discuss the committee's proposal to expand its membership. The Committee continued to raise concerns about the method being proposed by the CPR to select the three staff members who would be voting members of the committee. Professor Barbezat said that, rather than having the Advisory Committee on Personnel Policies (ACPP) designate two staff members and the Managers' Council designate one of its members, as the CPR has proposed, he feels that, in the interest of direct access and with the goal of full representation, it would be best to have an election, with the entire staff of the College being asked to vote. Professor Barbezat expressed concern that the staff has not been consulted sufficiently about the process that would be used to choose its representatives. Dean Call asked the Committee to keep in mind that colleagues on the CPR have consulted with the ACPP several times and had many conversations with other colleagues before developing their proposal. Professor Rockwell said that he looks forward to hearing the CPR members' rationale for their proposals at the meeting between the two committees. Professor Barbezat reiterated that he does not understand why the CPR believes that

it is necessary to add a member of the Managers' Council to the committee, given that the CPR already has so many administrators as ex officio members or guests.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Hall expressed ambivalence about putting staff on the CPR with vote, since it might not be the best way for staff voices to be heard at all levels within the administration, although he did not necessarily have a concrete counterproposal in mind. President Marx asked why Professor Hall felt that this might be the case. Professor Hall noted that issues of direct representation are important with some kind of democratic administrative structure; but the Faculty and staff typically inhabit different roles within the institution, and Amherst is decidedly not run as a democracy. While he valued staff opinion, he said, he was not yet convinced that this was the right step with respect to faculty governance. Professor Rockwell said that staff might feel vulnerable and inhibited about speaking during CPR meetings. Professors Rockwell and Barbezat stressed, and the other members agreed, that it will be critical for staff to be able to speak freely and to express themselves without fear of retribution. The President and the Dean agreed. Dean Call added that this proposal, while imperfect, represents progress toward including staff voices in conversations that are central to the College.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Barbezat reiterated his concern about the CPR's proposal to add a fourth faculty member to the committee. If the purpose is to ensure that the faculty voice on the committee remains strong, this step seems unnecessary, he said, since the committee will continue to have a faculty chair. He wondered whether the proposal might also represent a calculation to gain faculty support for adding staff to the CPR. Professor Hall agreed that the addition of the fourth faculty member had the appearance of compensating for staff participation on the committee, and he felt this worked at odds to any salutary effect of including staff members on the committee. He emphasized that the CPR is a faculty committee and that academic issues are often a preeminent part of its deliberations, and expressed the view that there are ways that information from the staff could be transmitted to the CPR without necessarily giving staff votes on the committee, e.g., most simply as non-voting members. Dean Call commented that it was particularly helpful to have staff voices around the table during the deliberations of the ABC and noted that the CPR rarely votes on issues, but rather strives to arrive at consensus through discussion. Another structure could perhaps be created for the purpose of having all constituencies of the College participate, Dean Call noted, but he wondered whether doing so might have the effect of diluting the effectiveness of the CPR and the Faculty's voice. He reiterated his view that decision-making will be improved by having the additional perspectives that are provided by the staff. Professor Barbezat agreed, noting that it is best when labor groups come together when deciding on budgets.

Professor Ciepiela raised the issue of workplace governance and faculty governance being different and the possible threat to academic freedom of muddying the two. However, she also noted the importance of having faculty structures that have legitimacy in the eyes of the community and of pursuing governance in a fair-minded way. For this reason she supports shared governance in the case of the CPR. President Marx asked how adding staff members to the CPR might be a threat to academic freedom. Professor Ciepiela responded that, for example, the committee plays a role in deciding what academic programs and positions are funded. Professor Barbezat stressed that the work of the CPR, unlike other faculty committees, affects all workers at Amherst. He does not understand the perceived threat of adding staff members to a committee that is consultative, providing information to the Faculty and administration. Professor Ciepiela noted that all faculty committees are consultative. She asked whether the issues considered by the CPR are divorced from the curriculum. Professor Barbezat replied that consideration of the curriculum is, of course, central to any advice given on the budget of the College; however, since the budget affects all aspects of the College, consideration of any one

element should be at least mindful of others. After all, in a comprehensive budget, everything that is considered affects everything else. The Dean reiterated the practical argument that the influence of the CPR, and thus the voices of the Faculty, would be enhanced, for example in conversations that the committee has with the Board, by including staff and viewing the committee as a campus entity. Professor Hall wondered whether, having added staff to the voting membership of the committee, the next step for greater inclusion would be to add alumni and Trustees to the CPR, noting that both were included on the ABC. Professor Hall also said that he agrees with Professor Ciepiela that this proposal muddies principles of faculty governance, pointing out that the present discussion had already subtly shifted to viewing the CPR as a committee to facilitate labor relations. He said that he is unhappy with the characterization of faculty as labor or employees, and noted in particular that the students who serve as voting members on the committee do not represent labor. Rather, the current voting membership is symbolic of the priority of academic concerns; and the proposal could fundamentally alter this priority, Professor Hall said. Dean Call noted that the primary purpose of the CPR is to review budget and staffing issues. He pointed out that it is a recent, and welcome, innovation that proposals for new programs and their budgets have been shared with the committee. Dean Call said that, while he would not support having staff members on other faculty committees, including the CEP or the Committee of Six, because the charges of these committees are focused purely on academic and faculty functions, the CPR plays a different role. He suggested, however, that subsets of different constituencies could, perhaps meet together during particular conversations. The members agreed to discuss their concerns with the CPR and to listen carefully to the CPR's views on these issues, with the hope that the proposal will be revised.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

The fourteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, February 1, 2010. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with “Announcements from the President.” In response to Professor Rockwell’s question about possible increases in Five-College enrollments at the College, President Marx distributed data provided by the Registrar, while noting that information on the Spring semester would not be available until the end of the add/drop period. He said that he would share that information with the Committee at that time. While the trends are not pronounced, the President noted, they indicate a small increase in the number of Amherst students who are taking courses at other Five-College institutions and a small decrease in the number of Five-College students who are taking courses at Amherst. Professor Goutte asked if this slight increase was coincident with the increase in the size of the Amherst student body. President Marx replied that student body size had not been taken into account for these calculations, but should be.

President Marx informed the members that Dean Call and he had requested that the problems with lighting and signs in Merrill Science Center that were brought to their attention by Professor Hall at the last Committee of Six meeting be rectified. Professor Hall said that there are now both lights and signs, and he thanked the President and the Dean for helping to make this rapid response possible. President Marx next provided an update on the student disciplinary matter that he first addressed with the members at the last Committee of Six meeting.

Discussion turned to the recent announcement that Williams has decided to reinstitute student loans. President Marx said that he had consulted with the Trustees, who feel that Amherst made its decision to continue its no-loan policy based on its merits. The Board remains comfortable with the decision. It continues to be the Board’s view that, since the College was able to meet the budget goals recommended by the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC) without having to reduce the community college transfer and international student enrollment targets established by the Faculty, Amherst could maintain the no-loans policy and might benefit from doing so in terms of the College’s ability to increase representation among the middle-income quintiles and to enroll top academic students. The Trustees feel that Amherst can afford to wait and see the effects of its policy. President Marx said that he has asked Tom Parker, Dean of Admission and Financial Aid, to assess whether the College is experiencing success in these areas as a result of the policy and has requested to meet with the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) with Dean Call to discuss options and review evidence as to what the results of Amherst’s policy have been and are likely to be in light of the shifting competitive environment. If the financial situation should change dramatically, the College would re-visit the policy and will, in any case, assess the results over the next years.

Under “Announcements from the Dean,” Dean Call noted that, in response to the request from the Advisory Committee on Personnel Policies (ACPP) to meet with the Committee of Six about the proposal to include staff on the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) as voting members, he has been trying to schedule the meeting at the first available opportunity (the meeting was later set for February 15). Professor Barbezat proposed that, in addition to meeting with the ACPP, he would be in favor of some or all members of the Committee of Six meeting with the entire staff, perhaps in an open-meeting format, to consider this issue. Since the Committee will vote on the substance of the CPR motion and whether to forward it to the Faculty, it would be helpful to have an array of staff views on how its representatives to the CPR

might be selected, Professor Barbezat said. The Committee, the members, the President, and the Dean agreed that hearing the views on this question from as many staff colleagues as possible would be informative for gaining the best sense of staff opinion about ways to conduct this process, both for staff, who would have the opportunity to gather together to hear all views, and for the Committee and the Faculty.

Continuing with his announcements, the Dean noted that the first meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) had been very productive. The CEP members had agreed that a new advising tool, known informally as the advising matrix, developed by the Department of Information Technology in collaboration with the CEP, should go live this week. The tool will provide advisors and students with a visual guide to students' course-taking patterns, one goal of which would be to encourage students to take advantage of the full breadth of Amherst's curriculum. The tool was constructed based on keywords (which had been developed by the CEP) assigned by some faculty to their courses. The Dean noted that the CEP had also discussed the President's proposal, which had also been reviewed by the Committee of Six, to revive the President's Initiative Fund (PIF) program. The CEP is in favor of doing so, the Dean noted. President Marx had suggested using the PIF as one of several ways of augmenting the budget for visiting faculty. Dean Call said that he would distribute updated PIF procedures and solicit proposals from the Faculty as soon as possible. Continuing his report of CEP discussions, the Dean noted that the committee had endorsed the proposal (approved previously by the Committee of Six) to provide the Faculty with their individual grade distributions, and for purposes of comparison, the aggregated averages of their department(s), traditional divisions, and the College as a whole should move forward. The Dean noted that the Faculty would be given five years worth of data. Professor Hall asked what the mechanism of delivery would be for this information and when it would be provided to the Faculty. The Dean said that he would report back to the Committee when he had the answers to these questions. He noted that it would take some time to gather this information.

Continuing the conversation about providing the Faculty with grade distributions, Professor Goutte asked if anyone at the College would be analyzing these data, and the President and the Dean said that each faculty member could analyze the data for themselves and that questions could be posed. Dean Call noted that information about the grade distribution of departments without departments' names attached had been provided to members of the Grading Working Group that had been exploring grade inflation, and that this information would offer a sense of the spread of grades among departments and whether there were departments that were significant outliers in their grading patterns. The Committee talked briefly about ways that grade inflation might be addressed. President Marx noted that another option adopted elsewhere was to add the distribution of grades within courses to the student's transcript for informational purposes. Professor Rockwell commented that the College has developed some mechanisms that promote grade inflation. He noted that there have been fewer failing grades given since the freshman drop policy was instituted. Several years ago, as much as 25 percent of the first-year class was awarded a freshman drop. Not only does this have the effect of erasing potential "F"s from first-year students' transcripts, but also allows each student to perform better in her or his remaining courses. Professor Rockwell also pointed out that greater efforts are now made to help students with the transition to the College during the first year, and that the number of freshman drops has been going down, possibly as a result. He expected that at most institutions the greater portion of the institution's lower grades are received by first-year students. Amherst's policy, while humane, could be thought to cause the campus's GPA to float up.

Concluding his announcements, the Dean noted that he would meet with the members of the College Council on Wednesday to begin their deliberations about the Five College calendar.

The Dean reported back on the question of what the practice has been for determining which Committee of Six member(s) rotate off the Committee when fewer than three members leave the Committee because of expiring terms or leaves. The Dean noted that the *Faculty Handbook* states that, "At least three members of the Committee of Six are elected in the Spring of each year by direct Faculty ballot." There is no language in the current *Faculty Handbook* (or *Faculty Handbooks* as far back as 1971) to describe the procedure used to determine which members rotate off the Committee when fewer than three members rotate off due to expiring terms or leaves. Dean Call reported that, from 1989-1990 to the present, the Committee of Six had drawn straws on at least four different occasions to determine which members would rotate off. During this period, it can be verified through Committee of Six minutes that drawing straws has been customary and normal procedure. Since the minutes are not indexed prior to 1979-1980, the procedure followed prior to that time cannot be easily verified. There have been rare occasions when Committee of Six members have rotated off the Committee because of serious illness and not because of an expiring term or leave. In those cases, a special election was held to replace the individual for the remainder of the member's term. The Dean noted that, when President Gibbs died in February 1983, Armour Craig (who was on the Committee of Six at that time) was appointed Acting President. A special election was held to replace Professor Craig on the Committee of Six, and Professor Beals was elected to serve only the remainder of that Spring semester. The Dean noted the more recent circumstance of Professor Hilborn, who retired from the College at the end of December 2006. A special election was held in November 2006 to elect a new Committee of Six member to serve for a term of one-and-one-half years, beginning in January 2007.

In response to the information provided by the Dean, Professor Barbezat asked whether, in the event that members needed to rotate off the Committee to meet the regulation that at least three new members must be elected each year, and as an alternative to drawing straws, those members who were not rotating off the Committee because of leaves or expiring terms might be asked whether they wanted to continue to serve. Dean Call expressed the view that, if such a procedure were followed, the Committee members would in effect themselves be determining which member would continue to serve, taking away the Faculty's prerogative to do so. He noted that everyone who is elected bears equally the responsibility to serve. Professor Ciepiela agreed. Professor Rockwell suggested that the issue of which procedure might be best to follow under such circumstances should be brought before the Faculty for consideration. He expressed the view that the rationale for the current procedure should, perhaps, be re-visited and that the Faculty as a whole should weigh in on the procedure, since it has an impact on the Committee of Six election. The Dean said that, except in the case of a member stepping down under extraordinary circumstances, the choice of which members should rotate off the Committee is best left to a random process that ensures an equal chance that any eligible member could rotate off; in this way, the Faculty's voice is best heard through the election. Professor Hall agreed, noting that a random procedure does not inquire into motivations or consequences in its decision-making; these characteristics represent the value of the procedure, he argued. Professor Barbezat expressed the view that it would be valuable to have whatever procedures are used, including drawing straws, described in the *Faculty Handbook*. He suggested that the Committee of Six put forward a motion that would articulate the procedure so that the Faculty could consider the issue and be clear about whatever process was chosen. Dean Call noted that not all procedures are

described in the *Faculty Handbook*, and that past practice should serve as the guide in this circumstance. Professor Ciepiela posed the question of whether Professor Barbezat had an alternative to drawing straws in mind. He replied that, other than asking members if they wished to continue to serve, he didn't have an alternative to drawing straws at this time, though he felt that articulating current practice would also be valuable. Moreover, since this affected a faculty committee, he felt that it should be discussed by the Faculty. Professor Goutte expressed the view that, while this matter was useful to discuss, there should be an alternative proposed to the current procedure if the Committee wished to bring forward a motion. After a lengthy discussion, Professor Barbezat did not forward a motion, and the members proceeded to draw straws. Professor Goutte drew the short straw. She, along with Professors Barbezat and Hall, whose terms will expire at the end of this academic year, will rotate off the Committee.

In response to the Committee's request that the President and the Dean consider granting course release to the members in years with a very high number of tenure cases, the Dean reviewed the history of how many tenure cases have been considered each year and the number of tenure cases that will likely be under consideration in the immediate future. The highest number of tenure cases considered in any given year is fourteen, the Dean noted, and that was the only year in which Committee of Six members were granted course release. It is not expected that there will be that many tenure cases in one year in the immediate future. Professor Barbezat noted that, in his experience, while the quality of the Committee's review has not been affected when there are a high number of cases, the Committee members have a tremendous workload and the members' teaching and research may be affected. It was noted that this is particularly true when Committee of Six members are chairing departments at the same time that they are serving. Professor Goutte suggested that department chairs be removed from the Committee of Six ballot. The Dean said that he would be reluctant to do so because it would remove choice from the Faculty. An alternative under such circumstances might be to rotate chair duties to another department member if a colleague is elected to the Committee of Six. Professor Goutte noted that this might be difficult to accomplish because of leave schedules and other departmental matters. Professor Barbezat asked the Dean and President to consider seriously allowing members' course relief, as was discussed last year, when the number of cases are eight or above.

Dean Call next informed the members that, as part of the Teaching and Advising Program (TAP) lunch series, Professor Cheney would be leading a discussion on teaching evaluations for tenured faculty on February 15 and 16. He noted that, it has now been about two-and-a-half years since the Faculty voted that each tenured faculty member (other than those on phased retirement) would evaluate his or her teaching in one course each year by means of her or his choice. Dean Call said that the purpose of the lunches, which will be attended by department chairs or other departmental representatives, will be to share information to see how this new initiative is going and whether there might be ways that it can be supported further.

The Dean asked the members if they wished to have additional discussion about the motion to expand the membership of the CPR. Professor Ciepiela suggested that, since the Committee had just met with the CPR and had asked the committee to revise its motion, it might be best to wait until after the Committee of Six's meeting with the ACPP to discuss this issue. The other members agreed.

Dean Call next noted that he had distributed to the members for their information and comment the target-of-opportunity hiring procedures that have been under discussion by the CEP last year and this year. Professor Rockwell asked whether the procedures would allow a

department to take advantage of a sudden hiring opportunity if the department hadn't demonstrated a history of thinking about diversifying the department, as called for by the procedures. He expressed the view that it might be important for the College to be able to move swiftly to make a hire if an attractive candidate emerges. Dean Call said that having a diversity plan in place was intended as one criterion for consideration and that the absence of one factor would not mean that a proposal would not be supported. However, the CEPs thinking about a proposal might be influenced by whether a department had been making efforts to increase diversity. Professor Barbezat asked what was being targeted. The members discussed the forms of diversity that would be encompassed by the procedures. Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel, joined the meeting to answer the members' questions. He noted that the "targets" in question encompass many forms of diversity, which is defined in the broadest possible terms, and that setting aside several FTEs for target-of-opportunity hires is meant to provide an incentive for departments to consider carefully the diversity of the Faculty as part of their ongoing hiring plans.

The Committee next discussed the procedure that is used when a candidate for tenure is from the same department as a member of the Committee, as outlined in *Faculty Handbook*, III, 4.,e., which reads as follows:

e. Committee of Six Responsibilities in Tenure Recommendations. The Committee of Six annually reviews its procedures for the consideration of tenure cases. It then reviews each tenure case individually, all members of the Committee reading the documents submitted in each case. Its role in tenure cases is to make recommendations to the President. When a candidate for tenure is from the same department as a member of the Committee, that member shall, though remaining present, neither participate in the Committee's discussion of, nor vote in the case. Abstentions or abstentions because of conflict of interest or other conscientious reasons are always acceptable when the vote is taken (Voted by the Faculty, October 1986).

Some members noted that it can be particularly difficult for Committee of Six members if their departments are asked to meet with the Committee to discuss a tenure case. The Committee of Six member may sit with his or her department during the discussion and participates as a member of the department. However, since the member has been present during the Committee of Six's discussion of the case, he or she has information that other department members do not, and that information must be held in confidence. Some members were troubled by the asymmetry and awkwardness of this situation and thought that this procedure should, perhaps, be reconsidered moving forward. The suggestion was made that the Committee of Six/department member would leave the room during the Committee's discussion of his or her colleague's case. The Dean pointed out that there is a shared responsibility to treat all the cases equally. Professor Rockwell suggested that it would be helpful to know the rationale behind this procedure and asked the Dean to research this topic in the Committee of Six and/or Faculty Meeting minutes. He agreed to do so. Continuing with the discussion of tenure procedures, the Committee discussed whether the members were satisfied with the quality and amount of information that was provided through teaching evaluations. The members agreed that, while the volume of evaluations is high and it can be laborious for all members to read them, the evaluations provide

valuable information about tenure candidates' teaching. The Committee agreed that often the retrospective letters provide the fullest and most carefully considered evaluations. However, it was also noted that themes and patterns often emerge as a result of reading the entirety of the semester-end evaluations of the candidate's teaching over his or her career at Amherst. While Committee members must sift through a great deal of "noise" when reading so many evaluations, some of which are done in a superficial manner by students, it was felt that the procedure should be retained. The Committee discussed whether it was necessary for all members to read all the evaluations, and it was agreed that, while divvying up the evaluations would save time, it is important to have each member offer his or her interpretation of the entire set of evaluations. Professor Rockwell suggested that departments should be encouraged to develop semester-end evaluation forms that would generate thoughtful and full evaluations by students. Professor Barbezat agreed, noting that workshops could perhaps be designed for this purpose. He suggested that it might be useful to research how peer institutions conduct their reviews. The Dean said that he believed that the Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate Faculty Procedures Concerning Reappointment, Tenure, and Untenured Faculty Development had surveyed other institutions to inform its 1998 report, though, of course, this could be done again, he said. In order to decrease the volume of work for Committee members during the academic year, the Committee considered whether members might review the reappointment dossiers of tenure candidates over the summer. The Dean said that doing so might be possible. Returning to the topic of teaching evaluations, Professor Hall lamented that faculty who are experimenting with new ideas and innovative teaching techniques might be discouraged from doing so under the current system of in-class evaluations. He noted that students sometimes do not respond well when being challenged and might produce negative evaluations if a teacher was pushing them to their limits, even though this could be an effective teaching technique. Some members noted that, when students write retrospective letters, time has passed and they often see the value of teaching techniques—including being pushed to their limits—that they might not have appreciated at the time that they took a class. It was agreed that having students do semester-end evaluations online may improve the quality of the evaluations. The members agreed that, when possible, it is desirable to have students do online evaluations during class in a computer lab.

Professor Rockwell asked the Dean if he had made appointments to the Class Scheduling Task Force. The Dean said that he had not yet completed these appointments.

The Dean then reported that Professor Morse had met with Doshisha colleagues in Japan and had offered a preliminary report to him of the results. Doshisha has agreed to the proposal that the university will make a housing unit available at no cost to an Amherst faculty who is in Kyoto to do research. Doshisha Dean Kuroki has also agreed in principle to Amherst's proposal for the Short-Term Faculty Exchange. It will take a bit of time to get the details of the funding worked out, but Professor Morse believes that, by the time Amherst is ready for its next visitor in February of 2011, Doshisha will be able to take over responsibility for both recruitment and funding on the Japanese side.

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended March 1, 2010

The fifteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, February 15, 2010. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with “Announcements from the President.” President Marx informed the members that he had been apprised of concerns about faculty governance, which he sees as robust and important at Amherst. Underscoring his respect for the Faculty and its governance processes, the President said that he had not and would not take actions that would threaten or undermine the Faculty’s designated authority or governance structures. If faculty have concerns about him asking (at a Committee of Six meeting) what the distinctions are between College and faculty committees, they should know that he had asked for a definition of terms simply because he was unaware of what the formal distinctions are. He reiterated that he believes that the Faculty should determine its own committee structures and membership according to its own rules. President Marx noted that his stated support for seeking the advice of the students, administration, and staff about the College in regard to the budget should in no way suggest that he views the Faculty as just one of a number of constituencies on campus; the Faculty has a unique role in governance. He explained that as a faculty member, Trustee, and administrator, he is in a unique position in regard to these constituencies. He asked for the members’ advice on how to make his views about faculty governance clearer.

Continuing the conversation, Dean Call noted that the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) is not yet ready to bring forward a motion on the expansion of its membership and is continuing to have discussions about this governance question. It is possible that the motion will not be completed in time for a March 2 Faculty Meeting, since the agenda for that meeting would need to be set by the Committee of Six at its February 22 meeting. President Marx pointed out that, without actionable business, the preference in the past has been that a Faculty Meeting should not be held; he expressed some concern that the Faculty has not met, or had a chance for collective discussion, since last semester. Dean Call noted that if a meeting is not held on March 2 because of spring break, there would not be another opportunity for a Faculty meeting until April 6. Professor Rockwell responded that, while it can be frustrating when issues are not moving forward at an efficient rate, taking care and time in the deliberative process is an important part of faculty governance, and it would be best not to have a meeting until an actionable item comes forward. Professor Hall asked whether there might be other business to consider apart from the CPR motion, noting that he believes that the Committee had charged the CPR and the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA) with particular tasks and had asked that they report back at a Faculty Meeting this spring. Dean Call noted that, in December, when the FCAFA shared a number of proposals at a special meeting for students and at a Faculty Meeting, the committee had considered both parts of the Committee of Six’s charge. He informed the members that the CPR is now occupied with examining all areas of Amherst’s budget. The committee is meeting twice a week, rather than its typical once a week, during February in order to meet with most non-academic department heads to discuss their preliminary budgets for 2010-2011. In preparation for and to inform these conversations, the committee has sent to all non-academic departments a questionnaire that solicits information about the impact of the ABC’s recommendations. In February, the CPR will also be gathering information about the effects of the ABC recommendations from all academic departments and from students. It is the CPR’s expectation to forward a report to the Board. Professor Barbezat reiterated the view that the CPR should be allowed to deliberate at its own pace, pointing out that colleagues on that committee are being responsive to the Committee of Six’s request that they consider this issue carefully and respond to specific concerns.

Amended March 1, 2010

Returning to the topic of the distinctions between a College and faculty committee, Professor Rockwell noted that he had consulted the *Faculty Handbook* (IV., S., 3) and had found the following definition of Committees of the College:

3. Committees of the College

There are several advisory committees composed of members of the Faculty, Administration, Staff and student body, appointed by the President or other members of the Administration to communicate with different constituencies of the College and to formulate recommendations about policies and procedures to the President and other members of the Administration.

The President said that this *Faculty Handbook* language seems to apply to very few committees. Professor Rockwell said that it seems important to have clarity about what defines a college versus a faculty committee, otherwise the President's question in regard to the CPR might be misunderstood. For example, he said, ambiguity about the terminology could result in readers of the Committee of Six minutes coming to the conclusion that the President is in favor of taking away the Faculty/Committee of Six's power to make appointments to the CPR by converting it into a College committee, to which the administration would make appointments. President Marx said that he has no interest or intention in separating the CPR from the faculty appointment process.

Returning to a question related to that of whether a Faculty Meeting should be held without actionable business on the agenda, Professor Hall noted that this problem had come up in miniature the preceding week, during which the regularly scheduled Committee of Six meeting was canceled due to insufficient business. He requested that the default be to hold such meetings anyway, since much of the weekly discussion typically involves announcements from the President and Dean, as well as questions from Committee members. He also pointed out that considerable business was transacted that week via email that might best have been dealt with in a meeting in any event. He concluded by saying that he would rather have a short meeting rather than no meeting if there seems to be little business to discuss. Professor Barbezat asked whether the Dean had always set the agenda for the meeting and reminded members that they could place something on the agenda by contacting the Dean. The Dean responded that he and his staff review possible agenda items for the Committee of Six each week, and that it is rare that there is insufficient business to make up a full agenda. As he did last week, he will continue, under such circumstances, to check with the members about whether they wish to meet, based on possible agenda items; he will try to do so as early as possible in the week. It should be recognized, however, that agenda items sometimes emerge as the week progresses. In regard to the Faculty Meeting agenda, it was noted that the Faculty is entitled to request that the Committee of Six place items on the agenda. The Committee ended the discussion of whether to have a Faculty Meeting on March 2 by noting that it is important the CPR is examining the issue of its membership with great attention.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call reported his meeting with the College Council, during which he conveyed the Five-College Deans' discussions about their institutions' calendars. Dean Call noted that the University of Massachusetts will not consider a change to its new timing (on the Tuesday after Martin Luther King Day for five out of seven years and on Monday for the two years out of seven when Martin Luther King Day falls as early as possible) for beginning the Spring semester. The Dean reported that Mount Holyoke has

Amended March 1, 2010

agreed to switch to this schedule, perhaps as early as next year. Smith is still discussing the schedule, and Hampshire would find it challenging on a number of fronts to match the UMass schedule, but has indicated its intention to try to get as close as possible. The College Council will now look at the different possibilities for Amherst. Dean Call said that it was noted that Interterm is a crucial time for thesis writers. He noted that students on the College Council spoke persuasively to this issue. Professor Barbezat commented that Interterm is also a time when students do internships. President Marx said that College funding for most such internships was eliminated to reduce the budget. It seems likely that students benefit more from summer internships, which provide more time for a fuller experience, the President noted. Continuing his announcements, the Dean informed the members that that Professor Ringer has been nominated by the Lecture Committee to deliver the Max and Etta Lazerowitz Lectureship this spring.

At 3:30 P.M. the Committee was joined by members (Irene Berwick, Dee Brace, Kevin Gladu, Karen Lovely-Leach, Bilal Muhammad, Barbara St. Onge, Renae Terry, and Ryan Willey, who is the chair) of the Advisory Committee on Personnel Policies (ACPP). The Dean welcomed the ACPP members on the Committee's behalf and, following introductions all around, asked what the ACPP wished to discuss, since the committee had requested the meeting. Mr. Willey responded that the ACPP was most interested in having a conversation about staff representation on the CPR. Mr. Gladu noted that the staff of the College would see adding staff to the CPR, with vote, as a big step forward toward having their voices heard. He explained that he himself was new to College governance and that he was serving his first year on the ACPP and has also been attending CPR meetings as a guest, by invitation. Noting that he had thought at first that he would be too intimidated to speak at meetings, he realized quickly that many of the issues discussed by the CPR have an impact on staff, and that he often had something to contribute to the conversations. Once he began to engage fully, he saw the importance of offering his voice. At the same time, Mr. Gladu commented, he felt at a disadvantage as a guest, since he lacked the authority of the voting members and was present at the meeting in a capacity that was unlike the others in the room. He pointed out that, following the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC) process and the economic downturn, the College is at a turning point. Staff morale is low as a result of significant staffing reductions and the additional burdens being placed on remaining staff members. Taking the step of adding staff to the CPR as voting members would send an important signal of value and inclusion to the staff, he argued.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Rockwell noted that deciding how the process to select staff members to serve on the CPR should be developed is an important issue. Two possible procedures—choosing a representative from the ACPP or having direct elections—both present difficulties. Mr. Gladu responded that he sees big advantages to having a member of the ACPP serve on the CPR in terms of continuity and the ability to facilitate communication. Alluding to Professor Barbezat's concerns raised at the recent meeting between the CPR and Committee of Six about the legitimacy of the ACPP as a representative entity, Mr. Gladu suggested that having members of the ACPP serve on the CPR would strengthen the ACPP and give it additional weight on campus. Ms. Brace commented that a possible procedure being considered for choosing the staff representatives on the CPR is having a direct election with a slate drawn from the current ACPP membership. President Marx asked if the ACPP had considered the question of Trustee Appointee (TA) representation. Ms. Brace noted that Trustee Appointees have indicated in the past that they do not want to be classified as staff or be represented by the ACPP. The ACPP has been considering the possibility of forming a staff council that could be more inclusive, representing staff and administrators, and serving as a source of representatives to the CPR.

Amended March 1, 2010

Mr. Muhammad commented that some staff are opposed to having TAs serve on the ACPP. For the moment, he anticipates that the process for selecting the CPR representatives will be to appoint two ACPP members and to have one TA elected by the TAs. He sees the formation of a more encompassing staff council as being further down the road. Mr. Muhammad echoed Mr. Gladu's earlier comments about the significance of this moment in the College's history. He reiterated that the staff feels that it has borne the brunt of the effects of the economic downturn. Adding staff representation to the CPR would be a signal that staff are an important part of the College, Mr. Muhammad said. Professor Rockwell stressed the importance of ensuring that staff representatives on the CPR not feel in any way inhibited in the expression of their views. He asked whether hierarchical relationships (a staff member and supervisor serving with one another) within the ACPP have prevented members from speaking freely. Several members of the ACPP noted that, because there is only one representative from all but one area of the College, this situation had not arisen. President Marx noted that, when the ABC recommended that structures for involving staff in decision-making at the College be strengthened (recommending as a first step that two staff members be added to the CPR as voting members), the ABC recognized and discussed the awkwardness of how these structures might be developed. He noted that it is essential that the process for selecting any staff for the CPR, if approved by the Faculty, not reinforce divides among constituencies. The President said that he appreciates the Faculty's consultation and deliberation on this issue. Ms. Lovely-Leach agreed and said that this is the time to move forward with giving staff a voice within College governance structures. She noted that the ACPP was interested in hearing the suggestions of the Committee of Six about a process for adding staff to the CPR. Mr. Muhammad noted that, while the librarians would be open to serving on the ACPP, some staff fear that power struggles and hierarchical behavior might ensue. He commented that the ACPP was created to be a "safe space." Mr. Muhammad agreed that it may be time for a change in terms of the make-up of the ACPP. Mr. Gladu noted that personal conflict between staff and supervisors does not belong at the ACPP.

Mr. Willey reiterated that it would be interesting to learn faculty views from the Committee of Six. Professor Rockwell noted that he could not speak for the Faculty and that the Faculty only "speaks" through its votes. When considering the possibility of CPR restructuring, he noted, some faculty have expressed concern, for a variety of reasons, that the ACPP does not, in fact, "represent" all the staff. If that is the case, then faculty members might question whether it would be the best practice for staff representatives to the CPR to be drawn from the ACPP membership and might prefer direct elections. Professor Rockwell suggested that it might be advantageous for the ACPP, in its efforts to advocate for the idea that the ACPP should be the committee from which the CPR representatives are drawn, to provide the Faculty with a document (which could be appended to the Committee's minutes) that describes the ACPP's mission and also how the ACPP representatives are currently elected. With a better understanding of how the ACPP represents the staff, more faculty might be inclined to support the election process put forward by the ACPP, though there are never any guarantees, Professor Rockwell noted. Responding to Mr Gladu, Professor Barbezat reiterated his view that, if staff members are added to the CPR, the process that determines their selection should be chosen by the staff. His concern with the ACPP serving this role was not about that Committee's legitimacy; rather, his concern was that the ACPP was specified in the original proposal from the CPR. He prefers to see the staff sort out the process, should staff members be included on the CPR. He also suggested that the document described by Professor Rockwell would be most effective if it were to focus on the issue of adding members to the CPR, rather than providing a broad statement about staff inclusion at the College. He advised the ACPP members to articulate

Amended March 1, 2010

the specific advantages of adding staff to the CPR and what the College as a whole would gain from taking this step. As a member of the ABC, he said that the committee had seen how staff participation in its deliberations had enriched conversations concerning the budget and contributed to the consideration of the issues at hand.

Mr. Willey noted that today's meeting had already been helpful in generating ideas for selecting staff representatives to the CPR; he commented on the historic nature of the Committee of Six and the ACPP sitting down together to have a discussion. Mr. Willey expressed the view that broader representation on the CPR would benefit everyone. Mr. Gladu said that staff were pleased that the ABC had recommended that staff be added to the CPR, and that it would be very disappointing if this step does not occur. Staff would feel that their voices and views were not valued. He noted that many staff members at Amherst serve for decades, are dedicated to the College in ways that mirror the devotion of the Faculty, and that staff take pride in their role in providing an Amherst College experience of which everyone can be proud. Professor Hall acknowledged the dedication of the staff, while expressing concern about adding staff as voting members of the CPR. He would worry, he said, about the potential for hierarchical repercussions if a staff voice were added into faculty deliberations. He noted that the Faculty is one locus of power and that another is represented by the Board of Trustees. Professor Hall wondered why the staff feel that membership on the CPR is the most effective stage for making their concerns known. Conceding his naivete, he asked in particular why the existing administrative hierarchies are not making it possible for staff concerns to percolate upwards to the administration and thence to the Trustees, as he imagined they would in a well-managed institution. Several ACPP members noted that staff want to feel included. Mr. Muhammad commented that students, not just faculty, serve on the CPR and have a vote. He feels that it is important for all three constituencies—faculty, staff, and students—to serve on the committee that sets the priorities and allocates resources for the College. The staff, he said, currently feels shut out of this process. Mr. Muhammad noted that the students on the CPR support the movement to add staff to the committee. As a point of information, Professor Rockwell pointed out that the CPR does not set policies; it makes recommendations. Continuing the conversation, Mr. Muhammad expressed the view that the ACPP is also advisory and brings forward to the Department of Human Resources issues of concern to the staff. He said that the committee has conveyed to the Trustees that issues and concerns are not “bubbling up” when they are brought forward to supervisors and administrators.

Continuing the conversation about restructuring the CPR, Mr. Gladu pointed out that the need to form the ABC arose at the time of the economic downturn because there was no committee in place that represented campus-wide constituencies. Mr. Willey commented that, if staff serve on the CPR, they would not engage in discussions about issues that are purely the Faculty's domain. He feels that serving side-by-side would help faculty and staff get to know each other, and that staff voices would be heard along with everyone else's. Professor Hall thanked the staff members for their helpful comments and opinions and said that, while he remains ambivalent about aspects of the changes, he would probably support adding staff to the CPR. Returning to the discussion about the possible effect of hierarchies on the deliberations of a broadened ACPP and/or the CPR, a concern raised by the ABC as well, Ms. Berwick noted that she has felt free to speak her mind as an ACPP member, since she is speaking for her constituents not for herself. Professor Rockwell expressed worry that a supervisor might pressure a staff member serving on either committee to vote in a particular way. He commented that it would be a disservice to the College if such a situation were allowed to occur. President Marx agreed and said that, if such a situation were brought to his attention, he would make sure that it would be addressed. Mr. Gladu stressed that the best practice would be for the CPR

Amended March 1, 2010

members to debate until consensus was reached. Serious issues among the constituencies would need to be raised and made known. Mr. Gladu noted that the intention of the proposal is to enrich the entire governance system and not to encroach on the authority of the Faculty or administration. The members of both committees expressed thanks for the meeting, and the members of the ACPP departed at 4:30 P.M.

Professor Hall said that he had been thinking about the vexed issue of TA representation, and he had wondered whether the fact that some members of the Managers' Council attend Faculty Meetings and had voice in that venue would make it unnecessary for this constituency to have representation on the CPR. The Dean noted that a number of members of the Managers' Council do not have the right to attend Faculty Meetings. Members of the Managers' Council who have the right to attend Faculty Meetings are Elizabeth Barker, Director and Chief Curator of the Mead Art Museum; Bryn Geffert, Librarian of the College; Suzanne Coffey, Director of Physical Education and Athletics; Katie Fretwell, Director of Admission and Senior Associate Dean of Admission; Kathleen Goff, Registrar; Allyson Moore, Associate Dean of Students and Director of the Career Center; and Peter Rooney, Director of Public Affairs; and Peter Schilling, Director of Information Technology. Other members of the Managers' Council who attend Faculty meetings on occasion as guests are Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services; Kathryn Bryne, Director of Human Resources; and Molly Mead, Director of the Center for Community Engagement. Katie O'Hara Edwards, Director of Advancement Operations; Shannon Gurek, Associate Treasurer and Director of the Budget; Stephen Nigro, Comptroller; and Charles Thompson, Director of Dining Services, do not attend Faculty Meetings.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Barbezat asked if the Committee could be provided with data about whether the no-loans policy has led a greater number of students from the middle-income quintiles to choose to attend Amherst. President Marx said that he would be happy to provide the members with this information once it has been gathered. Professor Barbezat asked if the policy also correlates with an increase in the number of Academic 1s and 2s. President Marx said that he would provide this information as well, while preliminary review suggests that that the policy may be having this effect. Professor Hall asked what is meant by the statement that the College wants to continue with the policy. President Marx said that it means keeping the policy in place for the next several years, following the recommendations of the ABC for the next three-year period, and then assessing the benefits in terms of middle-income enrollment.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Rockwell inquired about staffing in the Dean of Students office. He expressed concern that there will be only three deans this semester and that Dean Hart will be shouldering a tremendous amount of work, serving both as the Dean of Students and Dean of New Students this term. Professor Rockwell noted that the late-spring often brings a surge of activity both with student discipline cases and emotional problems, and he worried that the office might become overwhelmed. President Marx said that he had discussed staffing in the Dean of Students office with Dean Hart, as had Dean Call. If a Dean of New Students is named this semester, that person could be invited to begin learning about the duties of the position this term. Dean Call said that he and Dean Hart have had several conversations about candidates for that position. Dean Hart now has a full-time administrative assistant to support his work, rather than a part-time one, as he felt that additional administrative assistance would be needed. Professor Rockwell next asked about the status of the Class Scheduling Task Force. The Dean said that the task force is almost fully staffed but that he is waiting to hear from one more colleague. Depending on when the task force is fully

Amended March 1, 2010

staffed, it may become necessary to re-consider the time by which the task force should report back to the Committee, since the current timing of the end of the semester may not be possible.

The Committee turned to personnel matters. The members next returned briefly to their discussion of the procedure that is used when a candidate for tenure is from the same department as a member of the Committee. The conversation was informed by the minutes of previous faculty and Committee of Six conversation over the years that had focused on this issue. It was agreed that the practice, while not perfect, does address many of the dilemmas posed by this complex set of circumstances.

The voting faculty members of the Committee and the Dean then reviewed proposals for Senior Sabbatical Fellowships. The Dean noted that the review process should yield feedback when necessary. He said that his office would work with colleagues to respond to any recommendations that might be offered and to make all proposals viable for funding. The members stressed that they were very impressed with the quality of the proposals and suggested that summaries of these proposed scholarly endeavors, which are typically posted on the Dean's Web site, also be shared with the Trustees, since the Board had voted for 100 percent sabbaticals for the Faculty. The Committee discussed the review procedure for the proposals and agreed that having all members of the Committee of Six read all of the proposals prior to the Committee's discussion was the best course. Any concerns could then be shared, and the Dean could convey feedback to colleagues at the Committee's request. Several members commented on how much they enjoyed reading the proposals.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended March 1, 2010

The sixteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, February 22, 2010. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with “Announcements from the Dean.” Dean Call reported that the Class Scheduling Task Force is not yet fully constituted, but that he anticipates that it will be soon. The Dean distributed to the members a letter ([appended via link](#)) that he had just received from the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) in which the committee described the need to revise the course numbering system at the College and the CEP’s proposal that the College abandon the new shortened add/drop period and return to a two-week add/drop period. Noting that a number of faculty colleagues have expressed to him a desire to have a Faculty Meeting before April, and that, since the Faculty has not met since December and there is a need to provide a forum for questions, Dean Call asked the members to consider a draft Faculty Meeting agenda for March 2, 2010. The Dean noted that the next available date for a Faculty Meeting would be Tuesday, April 6, because of spring break. While the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR)’s motion to revise its membership is not ready to be put on the agenda, there is a need to approve course proposals and degree cases, the Dean said. In light of the CEP’s letter, Professor Hall suggested that the Committee discuss the CEP’s proposals first, since they could have an impact on the decision about whether to have a Faculty Meeting on March 2. The members agreed that this course made sense.

Professor Rockwell expressed disappointment that the CEP has proposed giving up the shortened add/drop period so quickly after the new system was implemented. He pointed out that the new time period has not yet been implemented with the anticipated new online registration period. Professor Rockwell said that he is adamant in his view that the CEP should not rush to judgment and should explore fully possible problems associated with the shortened period before abandoning it. Dean Call noted that the faculty and students on the CEP hold the strong view that the shortened period had not worked well, and the Registrar and her staff agree. Some of the strongest voices on the CEP for returning to the old system are those who had put the new one forward. The Dean said that he has been told that UMass’s shift to an earlier start during the Spring semester has exacerbated problems with the shortened period, particularly because Amherst faculty have the right to control who will remain in their classes; students often do not find out if they will be able to remain in a class for some time after classes start. If they are not allowed to remain in a class, they often must scurry to find a replacement.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Rockwell said that would be in favor of having the CEP provide a rationale for wanting to return to the longer add/drop period. He noted that, during the two-week add/drop, students would often register for French classes two weeks after classes started and would find it very difficult to catch up on what they had missed. The Dean noted that a few students were not “settled” into their classes until the fourth week of the semester. He said that he himself would prefer a one-week add/drop period for this reason, but that he respects the CEP’s recommendation. Professor Rockwell said that he is not sympathetic to student complaints about the shortened period, as they seem to prefer to “shop” for as long as they are permitted to do so. He feels that problems with add/drop are also a byproduct of the rules governing limited enrollment classes. Some students find out far too late in the add/drop period that they have been disenrolled from a class. As an aside, he noted that he is generally opposed as a matter of principle to faculty having the right to choose their own students. The

Amended March 1, 2010

current procedures for disenrolling students, he thought, could very well lie at the root of many of the problems described in the CEP's letter. Professor Barbezat agreed. Dean Call said that, if the Faculty wants to retain control of which students are in their classes without causing difficulties during the add-drop period and beyond, faculty members should provide in advance a rationale for how they will select students so that it can be implemented by the Registrar's office. If rationales are not provided, there are direct consequences for students and for other faculty members, who are faced with accepting students into their classes days or weeks after the semester starts. Professor Ciepiela agreed, noting that, because so many students miss a number of class meetings at the beginning of the semester, she has been forced to adjust her syllabus to accommodate them.

Agreeing with Professor Rockwell, Professor Hall voiced concern that the CEP is proposing to reverse a faculty vote too quickly and without researching sufficiently the underlying causes of the problems that are being experienced. Dean Call reminded the members that the CEP had proposed returning to the two-week add-drop period after the Fall term-experiment with the new timing. The Committee of Six had recommended giving the new time period another chance for the Spring term, and the CEP had agreed. In the committee's eyes, that experiment has now demonstrated that the shortened period is highly problematic, the Dean said. Professor Hall expressed concern that the CEP had already seemed to be predisposed to revert back to the old system after trying the new one for only one semester. He also feels that anecdotal evidence of problems is not a sufficient reason for changing the policy, since the anecdotal evidence is at least mixed. While some students and faculty may have found the shortened add-drop period to be problematic, Professor Hall said that he and his advisees had found that it had worked fine.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Hall suggested that the CEP put in place some way of quantifying the problems with the new time period. Professor Barbezat agreed. Professor Rockwell concurred and said that the CEP should examine numerical data that demonstrate that the phenomenon described is not simply anecdotal. The Dean responded that doing so might mean asking the Registrar's office to gather a good deal of data that it may not have. He noted that there is significant testimony from staff in the Registrar's office that the shortened add/drop period made registration very difficult. Professor Barbezat suggested that the Registrar should be able to provide information on how many students finished registration after Wednesday. Professor Rockwell noted that registration went very smoothly for him and his twenty-eight advisees. Professor Hall expressed the view that other systemic problems with registration may be at the core of the problems that have been experienced, and that the culprit may not be the shortened add/drop period. He offered the aforementioned example of how courses are closed and how long they are kept open as possible causal factors. Professor Ciepiela wondered whether a deadline might be set by which faculty would close their courses to students. Professor Goutte suggested that the Faculty be asked to prioritize; the question might be posed as to whether faculty would rather have the advantage of choosing who is in their classes or whether they would rather have class rosters set earlier via deadline for closing courses, so that they would not be in the position of having students join their classes a few weeks into the semester who then need to catch up.

Professor Barbezat suggested that, while the Committee of Six members may have concerns about the CEP proposal, perhaps it would be best to forward it to the Faculty. Professor Hall was similarly inclined, but said that he remains somewhat baffled by the CEP's

Amended March 1, 2010

reversal after such a short trial. The Committee agreed that, since there is not a great sense of urgency about this matter, it seems best to ask the CEP to explore the possible underlying causes of the problems that have occurred during the shortened add/drop period; to offer data, including information about students whose course selection lasted until the third week of class and who encountered other difficulties registering during the shortened add/drop period; and to provide a rationale for its proposal to return to the two-week period.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Goutte reiterated that, once the problem with add/drop has been properly identified (with some proof of an existing problem, not just anecdotes from some frustrated people), possible solutions for the problem could be explored. She wondered if the CEP could determine whether the current problem is the same problem that the shortened add/drop has been trying to address. If not, this would suggest there is now a new problem that might warrant new solutions, rather than going backward to the previous problem, she said. However, if the problem has not changed, then it becomes clear, Professor Goutte noted, that the shortened add/drop has not fixed the original problem and alternative solutions should be explored. Professor Barbezat agreed, noting that one solution would be to make clear the procedures for choosing enrollment permissions in the course descriptions. Some faculty might set enrollment caps for their classes, allowing students to enroll on a first-come, first-serve basis, and for students who do not register in time to get into a class to be informed early that they cannot be in the class. For faculty members who want to retain control of their specific enrollments, they would articulate their rules for determining enrollment procedures in their course descriptions so students would be aware of them at registration. In that way, the faculty member's control would be made clear. Professor Hall expressed concern that the Committee was trying to do the CEP's job and said that it might be best for the Committee to meet with the CEP if the Committee has questions. He noted that he found it further perplexing that the CEP did not put forward a formal motion with its rationale on this matter for the Committee of Six (and the Faculty) to consider.

Professor Rockwell, noted that he would support the other idea brought forward by the CEP, that the course numbering system be changed from a two-digit system to a three-digit system. Dean Call noted that the CEP had met with the Registrar and had agreed that there were good reasons—articulated in the committee's letter—for moving to a three-digit system. He asked for the Committee of Six's advice on whether a vote of the Faculty would be needed to make this change. The CEP did not think a vote would be necessary. Dean Call noted that, under a new three-digit system, departments would be asked to implement the new criteria for course numbering described by the CEP as they saw fit, re-numbering their own courses and providing the numbers to the Registrar. Professor Barbezat expressed the view that, while a vote was, perhaps, not required, it would be best to consult with the Faculty since all departments would be asked to make course-numbering changes under this new rubric. Professor Rockwell noted that the CEP could have polled the department chairs on their views about this issue to get a sense of the Faculty's opinion about it. Professor Barbezat said that, since the matter is now before the Committee of Six, the members should consider how to move forward.

President Marx, who noted that he is mindful of working through proper governance structures, commented that anyone could bring forward a motion on this topic. He informed the members that re-numbering of courses is a necessary step for moving to online registration, which has already been delayed. He expressed concern that, if course re-numbering does not move forward expeditiously, the implementation of online registration will be delayed for

Amended March 1, 2010

another year. If courses are re-numbered, the plan is to move to online registration beginning with the April 2011 pre-registration for Fall 2011 courses. President Marx noted that online registration has been being promised for years at the College, and that virtually all of Amherst's peer institutions run registration this way. The members agreed that the relationship between the launch of online registration and the re-numbering of courses was a strong argument for moving ahead as quickly as possible with re-numbering. The Committee agreed that the discussion of course re-numbering and the rationale for it should be put on the Faculty Meeting agenda and that a Faculty Meeting should be held on March 2. It was agreed that a vote does not appear to be needed for the re-numbering issue. The Committee decided that the agenda item would read as follows:

Discussion of the move to three-digit course numbers and online registration led by the Committee on Educational Policy.

The Committee then voted six to zero to forward the Faculty Meeting Agenda to the Faculty.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Rockwell asked if the position of Director of International Experience, which is currently held by Janna Behrens, would be moved from the Career Center within the Dean of Students office to the Dean of the Faculty's office. The Dean noted that there have been only a couple of very preliminary conversations about the possibility of moving forward with this step. Professor Rockwell commented that this topic had come up at a previous Committee of Six meeting and that it might be useful to discuss it before the end of this year. He noted that colleagues in the foreign language and culture departments, in particular, view study abroad as a curricular issue that should fall under the administrative structure of the Dean of the Faculty. President Marx asked for confirmation that structural/organizational reporting issues of this sort are made at the discretion of the administration. The Committee agreed that this is the case. The President noted that the Board has asked to explore the general topic of study abroad, as well that of information technology, at upcoming Trustee meetings.

Continuing with "Questions to the Administration," Professor Barbezat asked if the Committee feels that it would be necessary to meet with the staff, as had previously been suggested, to discuss the issue of staff representation on the CPR. The Committee agreed that the members' meeting with the ACPP had been very productive and informative, and that the staff seem well on their way to developing a process. As a result, there seems to be no need for the Committee to have a meeting with the staff at this time. The members next reviewed proposals for new courses and voted six to zero to forward them to the Faculty. The Committee then turned to personnel matters.

Following the personnel discussion, the members considered a note ([appended](#)) from Professor Staller, who expressed concern about the plan to revive the President's Initiative Fund (PIF) program. The President noted that it his intention to make PIF support available primarily to augment funding for visiting faculty, which had to be reduced as a result of the economic downturn. He has also made funding for visitors available through McCloy, Simpson, and Croxton funds for this purpose. These efforts are meant to prevent the curriculum from being diminished and to support further the scholarly, creative, and pedagogical efforts of the Faculty. Professor Hall was prompted by the President's response to Professor Staller's letter to wonder why it was that the President did not simply convey the PIF funds to the Dean to handle as the

Amended March 1, 2010

Dean would for regular visitors, rather than granting them as part of a process that, in practice, would fund visitors as only one part of its diverse curricular contributions. The President noted that faculty could apply for visitors through the PIF and the Croxton Fund, or nominate Simpson Lecturers or McCloy Professors. All of these requests would come to the Committee of Six, including the Dean, in accordance with the processes upon which the Faculty has agreed.

Professor Ciepiela next noted, in reflecting upon Professor Staller's letter, that she has found that she has had to adjust her syllabus so that high copyright fees are not passed on to students, since the College's licensing agreements do not cover most of her class readings. The Dean responded that students do not have to pay any fees above \$125, and that the Dean's office provides support for any copyright costs above this amount. Students on financial aid have their fees covered. Professor Ciepiela said that she had been unaware that funds are available to help students pay permissions costs, and believes there is a good deal of confusion about the new permissions policy among faculty and Academic Department Coordinators (ADCs). The Dean noted that he had sent information about the new copyright policy to the Faculty and ADCs, but would be happy to do so again to clear up any misconceptions that may have developed. The Committee suggested that the Dean assess the cost savings and impact of the new policy, and he responded that this assessment process is currently under way.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

February 22, 2010

Dear Committee of Six, Dean Call and President Marx

I see no reason to bring back the Presidential Initiative Fund. First: it's not necessary. At Amherst before and after PiF, as at colleges and research institutions around the world, people who want to get together for interdisciplinary work do so, because they're interested, not because they're getting paid. Second: money is needed in so many other domains. Economic constraints have resulted in anxiety over replacements for colleagues on leave, staff being fired, royalties not being paid for reprints in multiliths (which will go to vital organs of my courses), and a pressure for greater Five College cooperation for which, to me at least, Amherst stands to lose a lot more than it will gain.

Respectfully yours,
Natasha Staller

Amended March 31, 2010

The seventeenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, March 1, 2010. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with “Announcements from the Dean.” The Dean informed the members that he had received a request from Elias Aba Milki '10 to set up a table outside Cole Assembly Room with information about Haitian relief efforts, so that these materials would be available to Faculty at the conclusion of the March 2 Faculty Meeting. The members supported this request. Professor Rockwell noted that, while the Committee was granting permission in this instance, permission for student groups to set up tables outside Faculty Meetings should be sought from the Committee of Six on an individual basis. The Dean noted that this has been and will continue to be the practice.

Continuing with his announcements, the Dean informed the members that he had hired Marie Fowler, who is currently the receptionist in the Registrar's office, to be his secretary and the office manager of the Dean's office. He noted that he would work with Registrar Kathleen Goff on the transition in her office that will follow when Ms. Fowler joins his office on March 8. The Dean said that he was pleased to be able to promote from within to fill this position. Dean Call next reported to the members that a memorial service for Gerry Mager, former Registrar at the College, will be held on Saturday, March 6, at 2 P.M. in Johnson Chapel. The service will be followed by a reception at the Alumni House. Mr. Mager died on January 16. The Dean next noted that he had extended several invitations to colleagues to serve on the Class Scheduling Task Force but has not yet received an affirmative response, largely because of the leave schedules of the nominees.

Turning to the topic of the Faculty Meeting of March 2, Professor Rockwell asked if, as part of the Faculty's discussion about the move to a three-digit course numbering system, Professor Dizard, as chair of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), or Ms. Goff could provide further information (some of this information is included in the CEP's letter of February 17, 2010, to the Committee of Six) about the criteria that departments could use for assigning levels to courses to ensure that courses are assigned the appropriate corresponding number in the new numbering system. He noted, for example, that the CEP has suggested that introductory courses might be courses that require no prerequisites and should be given a number ranging from 100 to 199. Professor Goutte commented that departments might have different views of what constitutes an introductory or advanced course, for example, and she wondered if any effort is going to be made to coordinate this process, particularly among departments with shared curricula. She commented that it is clear that it will be important for the science departments, for example, to coordinate their re-numbering and course-sequencing efforts. The Committee agreed that the process of assigning levels/numbers to courses should be left to individual faculty and departments, and that departments should coordinate with one another as they deem necessary. The Committee noted that, as part of the Faculty Meeting discussion, it will be important to make colleagues aware of the urgency of completing the course re-numbering project.

Continuing the discussion of the agenda for the Faculty Meeting, President Marx noted that Tom Parker, Dean of Admission and Financial Aid, and he plan to discuss preliminary evidence about the effects of the elimination of loans on the College's representation among qualified students from the middle three income quintiles, and on the number of students with

Amended March 31, 2010

top academic ratings. The President said that the Dean and he had shared this information with the Faculty Committee on Financial Aid (FCFA) when they met with the committee on February 24. Professor Hall asked whether the data assembled so far indicate that the no-loan policy has had the effect of increasing the number of students from these groups. The President said that, because there are many factors at play, it is difficult to be sure how many of the changes that are evident in the economic quintile distribution of the student body and in the distribution of Academic Ones are the result of the no-loan policy, but that there does seem to be a strong correlation and some causation. He said that the FCFA will take the lead on continuing to examine these questions.

Professor Rockwell asked the Dean if he had been provided with updated Five-College cross-enrollment data that includes figures for this spring. While the Dean did not have the data with him at the meeting, soon afterward he received this information from the Registrar and provided it to the Committee via email. (The Dean then noted a modest increase this spring in incoming Five-College students over recent springs, as Professor Rockwell had conjectured.) The Dean next distributed to the members a letter ([appended via link](#)) from Professor A. Dole, Chair of the Committee on Education and Athletics, that responds to Professor Goutte's concern regarding the committee's proposal to move the starting time of afternoon seminars that run for longer than 150 minutes. The Committee agreed not to discuss the substance of the letter at this time, since the Class Scheduling Task Force would be focusing on questions surrounding class scheduling and could address this specific issue.

The Committee turned next to proposals for new courses. Prompted by seeing some faculty names that were unfamiliar to him on some proposals, Professor Hall asked the Dean for the names and departments of the faculty members who had been hired. The Dean noted that five tenure-line positions (in Biology, Chemistry, Classics, English, and Theater and Dance) have been filled; several offers (for positions in Women's and Gender Studies and Medieval History, the latter of which will be shared with Mount Holyoke) are outstanding; two departments (Geology and Music) are reviewing their candidates and will soon put their choices forward to the Dean and the President, and that two searches (in Economics and Psychology) were unsuccessful and will be re-done next year. In addition, the Dean said, two post-doc positions (in Psychology and Philosophy) and the Visiting Writer position have also been filled. Dean Call expects that all offers to tenure-track candidates will be made before spring break. Professor Hall said that he was still curious about the names of his new colleagues.

The members reviewed proposals for new courses and raised a question about one course. The Dean agreed to convey the Committee's concern to the department chair. The members then voted six to zero to forward the other course proposals before them to the Faculty.

The members discussed briefly how the Committee could improve its communication with other committees. It was agreed that it would be helpful—including in those cases in which the Dean, by virtue of his membership on both committees, is seen as an intermediary between them—for the Committee of Six to provide a written summary of its concerns, questions, and/or requests. In this way, clarity on all sides would be enhanced. The Dean said that he would be very grateful if such documents could be provided to him to share with other committees.

The members next reviewed the thesis and transcript of a student in the Class of 2010E who was recommended by the student's department for a summa cum laude degree and who has an overall grade point average in the top 25 percent of the graduating class. After a discussion of

Amended March 31, 2010

the thesis and the departmental statement, the members voted unanimously to forward the department's recommendation to the Faculty. The members then turned to personnel matters.

Discussion turned to the proposal by the CEP that the College abandon the new shortened add/drop period and return to a two-week add/drop period. Some members felt that the committee's description (in its letter of February 17 to the Committee of Six) of the frustration experienced during the shortened period by students who were locked out of classes seems no different than what had been experienced during the two-week drop period. The Committee agreed that it would be helpful for the members to articulate their views in writing for the Dean to convey to the CEP. Professor Rockwell wondered if the shortened period could be kept in place until the online system is launched, as many of the problems described in the letter might lessen or be solved. Professor Barbezat expressed the view that some of the current frustration might be mitigated if faculty members provided in advance a rationale for how they will select students so that it can be implemented by the Registrar's office. Professor Goutte asked what percentage of classes are capped. The Dean noted that the CEP had recently been exploring questions about enrollment caps. He said that this spring fewer than half of all courses had enrollment caps, and that more than two-thirds of the courses that cap enrollment at twenty-five or fewer fall short of the cap. He recalled that there are approximately 150 courses with enrollment caps this semester and that about sixty courses reached their caps. So, overall, more than one third of capped courses reached or exceeded their cap this spring. He expects that over two semesters, there will be about 250 courses with enrollment caps next year, not including first-year seminars. Professor Rockwell asked, for those courses with enrollments above their caps, how far above the caps enrollments were. The Dean said that he believes that caps were typically exceeded by only two or three students.

Discussion returned to the CEP's proposal that the new shortened add/drop period be abandoned in favor of the two-week period it had been designed to replace. The Committee asked that the Dean convey to the CEP the members' request that, in order to clarify the issues for the Faculty and to inform a possible future motion, the CEP define the problems that have been associated with the shortened add/drop period; offer data, including information about the number of students whose course selection lasted until the third week of class and who encountered other difficulties registering during the shortened add/drop period; and provide a rationale for its proposal to return to the two-week period. The Dean agreed to convey the Committee's views and suggestions to the CEP, as articulated.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty



AMHERST COLLEGE
Department of Religion

February 25, 2010

Dear Colleagues on the Committee of Six,

At its meeting on December 14, 2010, the Committee of Six discussed a letter submitted to the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) by the Education and Athletics Committee (EAC) in November 2009 regarding the scheduling of academic courses. As noted in the minutes of the meeting, the EAC's letter recommends moving the starting time of afternoon seminars that run for longer than 150 minutes to 1:30 PM rather than the 2:00, as is currently the case. The purpose of this recommendation is to keep the 4:30-7:30 PM time slot as free as possible for co-curricular and extra-curricular commitments, including athletic practices and contests.

The minutes note an expression of concern by Professor Goutte regarding this proposal. Professor Goutte noted that a large proportion of scheduled classes that run past 4:30 PM are science courses, and also noted that none of the members of the EAC teach in science departments.

In response to Professor Goutte's concern: the EAC's letter of November 2009 revises an earlier proposal regarding scheduling, originally submitted to the CEP in May of 2008. The earlier proposal recommended that the CEP keep the 4:30-7:30 PM time slot free of required academic activities to the extent this is feasible. The revised proposal is more specific: it recommends that seminars (not science labs) be moved earlier when they would otherwise run into the time slot in question. The original proposal implicitly recommended moving science labs outside the 4:30-7:30 PM time slot along with other kinds of courses; the revised proposal effectively retracts this recommendation. The Committee's rationale for this revision is also described in the letter.

I hope this observation constitutes a useful response to any worries about the impact of the EAC's proposal on the scheduling of science labs. Please feel free to contact me or the Education and Athletics Committee if there are further questions regarding the proposal.

Sincerely,

Andrew Dole
Chair, Education and Athletics Committee

Amended April 6, 2010

The eighteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, March 8, 2010. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with “Announcements from the President.” The President noted that a Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) recruiter would soon be coming to campus. He informed the members that Professor Umphrey would be leading a discussion about the U.S. military’s “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy, the Pentagon’s policy that prevents openly gay or bisexual individuals from serving in the military, for faculty and students on March 9.

Under “Announcements from the Dean,” Dean Call discussed a personnel matter with the members. Following that conversation, the Dean informed the members that the Faculty Computer Committee is having discussions about whether to delay moving completely away from Blackboard, a step that was originally planned for this spring. The College still anticipates changing to a new system in the near term, but more time may be needed before proceeding, Dean Call said. He noted that the Faculty Computer Committee, along with the Trustees, will attend a presentation, which will be part of the March 25-27 meetings of the Board, about the current state of technology at the College. The Dean updated the members on the progress of inviting colleagues to serve on the Class Scheduling Task Force, noting that the task force is not yet fully staffed. Professor Hall said that it will be important that the faculty serving on the task force represent a range of disciplines and that the approach to the solutions for class scheduling challenges not be too formulaic. Instead, the relevant issues should be examined from a broad perspective, taking into account the multiplicity of factors and concerns at play, he said. The Dean next asked Professor Rockwell if he wanted to discuss the additional Five-College cross-enrollment data that was provided to the Committee and that includes figures for this spring. These data indicated a modest increase this spring in incoming Five-College students over recent springs, as Professor Rockwell had conjectured. Professor Rockwell said that he did not see the need to discuss this issue further, but asked that the President and the Dean continue to monitor these enrollments. They agreed to do so.

Continuing with his announcements, the Dean said that he has been examining data about average class size and the number of courses being taught at the College, and that he has some preliminary observations about this information. Economic conditions forced him to reduce dramatically the budget for visiting faculty for 2009-2010 in order to meet Advisory Budget Committee (ABC) budget goals, he noted. In addition, the number of regular faculty taking sabbatical leave in 2009-2010 is unusually high, perhaps owing to 2009-2010 being the first year in which all tenured faculty members on sabbatical are guaranteed 100 percent of their College salaries upon the submission of a viable research proposal to the Committee of Six. With a substantial cohort of new tenure-track hires joining the Faculty, a typical number of tenure-line faculty on leave, and with additional support being provided for visitors through the Croxton, President’s Initiative, McCloy, and Simpson Funds in 2010-2011, the next academic year should see a significant improvement in instruction staffing levels and in the number of courses that can be offered. The Dean said that this year, the number of courses offered at the College is down by fifty-one in comparison to 2008-2009, a seven percent reduction and a roll back to the 2006-2007 level. Over the last decade, the number of courses offered at the College has grown monotonically each year, he noted. The average class size has gone from twenty-one ten years ago to sixteen last year. Dean Call said that he plans to continue to analyze data that are relevant to these issues and that he would share his findings with the Committee. Professor Goutte asked if an increase in the number of colleagues who are choosing to enter phased retirement is having an effect on the number of visitors and/or new hires that are needed. The Dean responded that

Amended April 6, 2010

the time varies in terms of when colleagues on phased retirement are replaced with a new FTE or a visitor, based on a variety of factors.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Barbezat asked the Dean if the Advisory Committee on Personnel Policies (ACPP) had sent him the document that had been requested by the Committee of Six at the members’ meeting with the ACPP, which had focused on the ACPP’s desire to have staff added to the membership of the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR). It had been agreed that the document would include information about the mission and structure of the ACPP, the rationale of adding staff specifically to the CPR, and a proposal for how staff might be selected for membership on the CPR. The Dean said that he would check on the status of the document, which he believed was in the process of being written.

Referencing the presentation of preliminary evidence about the effects of the elimination of loans on the College’s representation among qualified students from the middle three income quintiles, and on the number of students with top academic ratings, that took place at the March 2 Faculty Meeting, Professor Hall asked whether the data assembled so far indicate that the no-loan policy has had the effect of increasing the number of students with reader ratings other than one in these groups. He noted that the presentation suggested that the number of ones has increased, and he wondered about the number of twos, threes, fours, and fives within these quintiles. The Dean said that it appears that the proportion of ones and twos combined has increased as well, and that the proportion of threes is down. President Marx noted that the presentation had focused on academic ones by quintile as a first step because of the Faculty’s stated interest in top academic quality. He agreed that it would be informative to examine additional reader ratings and said that he will ask that this work be done.

Professor Hall asked the President for further information about the recent incident involving the Psi Upsilon fraternity. He wondered what procedures had been followed to determine the consequences for the individual student and to the fraternity as a result of their behavior. He also asked how the student had been disciplined and whether consideration had been given as to whether any criminal activity had taken place. President Marx said that he would research these questions and would report back to the Committee at the next meeting.

The members returned briefly to questions about a course proposal that they had chosen not to forward to the Faculty after raising some concerns. The Dean had shared these concerns with the department in which the course would be taught. Professor Hall expressed the view that the Committee of Six should not be doing the job of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). The other members agreed and asked the Dean to convey the Committee of Six’s concerns about the course to the CEP and to request that the CEP share its views on the matter with the Committee. The Dean agreed to do so. The members turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 7, 2010

The nineteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, March 22, 2010. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with the President providing the information requested by Professor Hall regarding the recent incident involving the Psi Upsilon fraternity. The President noted that most of the behavior involved in this incident had occurred off campus, in a location outside the stated jurisdiction of the Honor Code. When behavior that occurs off campus poses “a threat to the College community,” jurisdiction can be extended, but this behavior did not rise to that level, he said. The behavior for which a disciplinary penalty was imposed occurred on campus. He noted the following relevant language from the *Student Handbook*:

Amherst students are expected to adhere to the Honor Code whether they are on the campus, in the town of Amherst, attending classes or functions at Smith College, Mt. Holyoke College and Hampshire College and the University of Massachusetts, traveling on a Five College bus, or participating in College activities wherever these are held.

If conduct which is or would be a violation of the Honor Code occurs in situations or locations other than those specifically named in this section or to persons other than those covered in this section, the Dean for Student Conduct may petition the Committee on Discipline to accept a complaint. In determining to do so, the Committee will follow the general guideline that jurisdiction will only be extended where the alleged violation appears to be of sufficient gravity to pose a threat to the College community or its members.

In this case, President Marx said, the penalty was imposed by the Dean of Student Conduct and was appealed to the President by the student. On appeal, the President upheld the penalty. In answer to Professor Hall’s question about procedures, more generally, President Marx noted that class deans can impose penalties themselves (usually in consultation with the Dean of Student Conduct) below the level of a one-semester suspension. The Dean of Student Conduct can impose a penalty up to and including a one-semester suspension if there is an undisputed violation of the Honor Code. More serious or repeated offenses go to the Committee on Discipline for adjudication if there is a dispute about the material facts, or if there is no dispute about the material facts but the violation could result in a penalty greater than a one-semester suspension from the College. All appeals are made to the President. The President said that it is his understanding that John Carter, Chief of Public Safety, consults with the District Attorney if he thinks an offense rises to the level of a crime, which it did not in this case. Finally, the President noted that this incident prompted the College Council, as a consequence of the fraternity’s collective violation of the College policy on fraternities, to recommend that Amherst students no longer be members of Psi Upsilon.

Under “Announcements from the Dean,” Dean Call said that he was pleased to report that the Task Scheduling Task Force is now fully staffed. The members are Professors Catherine McGeoch and Sanderson, Registrar Kathleen Goff, and Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) member Rose Lenehan ’11. Since the original time frame (by the end of this semester) for the

Amended April 7, 2010

task force to report back now seems overly ambitious, Dean Call suggested that the task force be asked to report back by November 1, 2010, and that it be suggested that the Faculty would discuss any of the group's recommendations in December or February. Professor Barbezat asked whether, with this new time frame, any changes to the schedule could be implemented in time to have an impact on the schedule during 2010-2011. That would not be possible, the Dean replied. Any changes that would be made would be implemented in 2011-2012. The members agreed that the task force should be asked to report back in November and that the charge to the group should be revised to read as follows:

The Committee of Six charges the Class Scheduling Task Force to explore mechanisms to increase Amherst students' access to the full breadth of the College's curriculum. The Committee of Six charges the task force with drawing up proposals, including new scheduling options, for consideration by the Faculty. The Committee asks that the task force consult broadly with the campus community, including the chairs of all academic departments, other members of the Faculty, students, members of the administration, Information Technology and Registrar's staff, and those who oversee and schedule co-curricular activities. The Committee of Six asks that the task force report its findings and proposals to the Committee on Educational Policy by November 1, 2010, and with the goal that proposals be brought to the Faculty for consideration at a Faculty Meeting no later than February 2011.

The Dean next informed the members that an individual who was originally nominated as a Simpson Lecturer would be considered for a Croxton Lectureship instead, because there are no more Simpson slots available for next year. The Dean next informed the members that the President would be traveling for the College on April 12, when the Committee would ordinarily meet, and he asked the Committee to set an alternative date for a meeting, should it become necessary to meet during the week of April 12. The members agreed to hold April 14, from 8 A.M. to 10 A.M. for this meeting.

The Dean next informed the members of the names, positions, and departments of the new tenure-track hires who will join the Faculty (following approval by the Trustees) in July, information that had been requested by Professor Hall. They are Ron Bashford, Assistant Professor of Theater and Dance; Ethan Graf, Assistant Professor of Biology; David Jones, Assistant Professor of Geology; Cindy Kan, Assistant Professor of Chemistry; Ingrid Nelson, Assistant Professor of English; Jason Robinson, Assistant Professor of Music; Krupa Shandilya, Assistant Professor of Women's and Gender Studies (WAGS); Teresa Shawcross, Five College Assistant Professor of History; and Christopher van den Berg, Assistant Professor of Classics. Dean Call also noted a number of other new hires, Amity Gaige, Visiting Writer; Jessica Salvatore, Five College Mellon Postdoctoral Fellow in Psychology; and Ekaterina Vavova, Keiter-Mellon Postdoctoral Fellow. Noting the shared nature of Professor Shawcross's position, who will be based at Amherst but who will be shared equally by Amherst and Mount Holyoke, Professor Goutte asked if the College had many appointments of this kind. The Dean replied the History position is the second shared tenure-line appointment, noting that Sujani Reddy, Five

Amended April 7, 2010

College Assistant Professor of Asian Pacific American Studies, is based at Amherst and teaches half of her courses here. The other half of her position is shared by the other Five College institutions. Dean Call noted that there are other Five College shared positions at the Lecturer rank and for Mellon post-doctoral positions. The Committee noted the hiring of Professor Shandilya as the first full tenure-track FTE in WAGS. The Dean said that an external review team had recommended that this position be established and, under regular procedures, the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) had also recommended it to the Dean and the President.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Hall noted that he had re-read the Committee of Six minutes about the procedures for appointing McCloy Professors and Simpson Lecturers and then asked the President what he had envisioned the level of consultation should be with relevant departments about these appointments. President Marx responded that he has been, and remains, open to nominations from individual faculty and/or departments for these positions. He said he had also received responses from scholars to an ad that he had placed (in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*), at the suggestion of the Faculty, for these positions. The procedure for considering these appointments has been to share the CVs of candidates with the Committee of Six and to ask for the members' recommendation as to whether to offer individuals these positions. President Marx said that Simpson Lecturers and McCloy Professors could be, but need not be, affiliated with departments. The President said that, after discussion with the Faculty, it had been agreed that he could invite a small number of highly distinguished scholars to be appointed as Simpson Lecturers or McCloy Professors to teach at the College for a period of up to three years. It had been agreed that there would be a total of no more than three Simpson Lecturers and only one McCloy Professor at any given time. Professor Hall asked if the President would be comfortable appointing Simpson Lecturers or McCloy Professors to a department even if the department had expressed reservations about receiving them. The President said that he would not and could not impose any visitors on any department. President Marx noted that Andrew Bacevich will be a McCloy Professor in the fall of 2010 and that Robert Kagan will be a McCloy Professor in the spring of 2011. In addition to Dick Goldsby, who remains a Simpson Lecturer and member of the Faculty, the other Simpson Lecturers for 2010-2011 are Richard Wilbur and Fulvio Melia. Professor Rockwell asked if the President intended for individuals appointed to these positions to have all of the rights and privileges of department members. Would they, for example, be entitled to vote in tenure cases, he asked. President Marx and Dean Call said that McCloy Professors and Simpson Lecturers, like other visiting faculty, would not vote in tenure cases because they will not be tenured members of the Faculty. They should be treated in the same way as other visitors by departments, they said. Professor Rockwell said that it is helpful to be explicit about this issue to avoid any misunderstanding.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Saxton expressed concern that some student-athletes have been requesting to be excused from her class because they must leave for athletic competitions as early as 11:00 A.M. The Dean noted that the College's control of athletic schedules is lost during post-season play. In addition, as a cost-saving measure, buses during the regular season now leave at the same time for men's and women's teams, while in the past, buses may have left at different times to accommodate actual game times. Leaving at the same time has reduced the number of buses that are needed. Dean Call said that he understands that the New England Small College Athletic Conference (NESCAC) has chosen to schedule men's and women's competitions back to back. President

Amended April 7, 2010

Marx noted that the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) has recommended that multiple buses be re-instated so that student-athletes will be able to avoid, as fully as is possible, missing classes for games. He informed the members that he has asked that research be done to see how much the cost-saving measure ended up saving the College, and the President said that it is his hope to provide funding for more buses in order to reduce the number of missed classes.

Professor Barbezat next asked the Dean and the President if assignments to faculty committees could be considered earlier than they have been in the past. He noted that, during his time on the Committee, the consideration of committee assignments has come at an overwhelming time in the semester. He said that he would also like to discuss how the process of assigning colleagues might be done more efficiently and expeditiously. President Marx suggested that the Committee be provided, as soon after the Committee of Six election as possible, with a list of expected vacancies on committees and of faculty who will be available to serve on those committees. The Dean agreed, noting that an issue had arisen that will delay the Committee of Six election slightly, but that he would provide the Committee with the requested information soon after the election is complete. He said that he would also be happy to discuss the process for making appointments to committees. The Dean noted that very few of the administration's recommendations of colleagues who might serve on particular committees were not changed by the Committee of Six last year.

The Committee next reviewed two additional proposals for Senior Sabbatical Fellowships and recommended that they be approved. Discussion then turned to personnel matters.

The Committee turned next to the CPR's letter of March 12, 2010 ([appended via link](#)), which describes its members' discussions about the future make-up of the committee, including a number of possibilities for expansion, but does not include a recommendation of a particular structure. The Dean noted that the CPR worked diligently on the letter, which describes its deliberations well. Professor Ciepiela agreed that the committee has presented its views and the issues clearly. Dean Call informed the members that, if the Committee of Six wishes to draft motions on the issue of the expansion of the CPR for a Faculty Meeting that would be held on April 6, they would have to be done in time to approve the Faculty Meeting agenda by the early part of the week of March 29. The Committee agreed that it should put a proposal before the Faculty. Professor Rockwell suggested that a series of motions would be the best approach and that such a structure might avoid the need to have multiple amendments, a situation that might arise if a single motion was put forward. For example, there could be one motion to add staff to the CPR and others that focus on whether staff should be added with or without vote to the committee. The members noted the complexity of creating a single motion, and even a series of motions, that would enable the Faculty to vote on the different facets of the questions at hand. They decided that the approach of a series of motions that function as a "tree," would be best.

Noting that the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC) had recommended broader staff representation throughout the College, Professor Hall asked what governance changes within the administration were taking place or being contemplated to this effect. President Marx commented that the Advisory Committee on Personnel Policies (ACPP) is taking a leadership role in determining whether a proposal might be brought forward to create a Staff Council, which would include all non-faculty employees. The members noted that the ACPP has also, in its letter to the Committee ([appended via link](#)), made a recommendation of the process by which staff members might be added to the CPR. The members discussed further the structure and substance of motions that might be put before the Faculty. The Committee agreed that the first

Amended April 7, 2010

motion should focus on the question of whether staff should be added to the CPR. If the Faculty votes “yes” on this question, subsequent motions that would focus on further details of the proposals could be considered by the Faculty. It was agreed that subsequent motions should address the question of the make-up of the CPR and whether staff members should be added to the committee with or without vote. The Committee decided that, informed by the CPR’s letter, it would propose that, if staff members are added with vote, the CPR should be made up of four faculty members, two student members, a third non-voting student member, and two staff members.

The members asked that the Dean prepare motions for discussion at the next Committee of Six meeting. Dean Call agreed to create draft language for the Committee to consider.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 12, 2010

The twentieth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, March 29, 2010. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with President Marx informing the members that Pat O'Hara, Amanda and Lisa Cross Professor of Chemistry, has agreed to be the Dean of New Students for a term of three years, beginning on July 1, 2010. The members expressed great enthusiasm for Professor O'Hara's appointment. The President said that he would inquire as to whether Professor O'Hara might be able to start some work in the Dean of Students' office during the busy end of the Spring semester and noted that he would be pleased to provide additional resources to facilitate this if they are needed. He informed the Committee that members of the residential life staff had been asked to consider assuming some additional duties during the period that the office was without a Dean of New Students. Professor Goutte asked if Professor O'Hara would be teaching in 2010-2011. Dean Call said that, to support Professor O'Hara and her department, he has approved a three-year postdoctoral fellowship in Chemistry for the period of her deanship. This new postdoctoral fellow will work to fill out Professor O'Hara's normal teaching schedule in the department, primarily by teaching labs, and will also work with her and her students in her research lab.

Under "Announcements from the Dean, Dean Call informed the members that the Committee of Six election would get under way this week.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Saxton noted that she had received an email communication from Professor Yarbrough in which Professor Yarbrough expressed concern that, last year, the Committee of Six was not able to provide sufficient oversight during the process of making committee assignments because important assignments were made very late. The Dean, noting once again that very few of the administration's recommendations of colleagues who might serve on particular committees were not changed by the Committee of Six last year, said that, as soon after the Committee of Six election is complete, he would be pleased to provide the Committee with a list of expected vacancies on committees and of faculty who will be available to serve on those committees. As soon as the Committee's recommendations for committee assignments are made, the Dean said that he would begin the process of inviting colleagues to serve on committees.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Goutte asked the President and the Dean if they had considered the question of release time for members of the Committee of Six when the number of tenure cases that would be reviewed in a single year was more than eight. She noted that Professor Hall had asked this question in November and that Professor Barbezat had raised it in February. She commented that, in its 2008 report, the reaccreditation evaluation team had expressed concern over the workload of the Committee of Six. Noting that, during the period of tenure review she had spent as much as twelve hours a week reviewing cases, Professor Goutte pointed out that release time is standard practice for members of similar committees at other institutions, offering the example of Williams. Professor Barbezat noted that, while the Faculty clearly cannot set its own working conditions, it could express its recommendation to the administration and Board that release time be offered under the circumstances described by Professor Goutte. President Marx said that he is still considering the question of release time under these circumstances. Turning to a review of proposals for new courses, Professor Barbezat complimented Professor Saxton on the clarity of her procedures for

Amended April 12, 2010

selecting students for one of her classes and for stating them up front. She requires students to fill out a questionnaire and to come to see her before she considers them for inclusion in her class that takes place in the Hampshire County Jail. The members agreed that they would continue their review of course proposals over the next day and that they would then vote by email on whether to forward them to the Faculty.

The members next spent considerable time discussing the procedural challenges that were inherent in the development and presentation of motions on the question of whether to add staff to the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) and whether staff colleagues should be added with or without vote. In addition, the members considered how to put forward for the Faculty's consideration the question of whether to add an additional faculty member to the committee (bringing the number up to four) and whether to reduce the number of students with vote by one (bringing the number of voting students to two). The Dean noted that the CPR has requested that links to the committee's minutes of January 27, 2010; February 5, 2010; and February 12, 2010, which include discussions relevant to the possibility of expanding the membership of the CPR, be included on the agenda. The members agreed that such links should be provided.

In the process of drafting the motions on the question of the make-up of the CPR, the members agreed that, while the Advisory Committee on Personnel Policies (ACPP) may one day be replaced as the representative body for non-faculty employees of the College, if it is necessary to reference a representative body of the staff in the motions at hand, that body should be the ACPP. In that case, the Committee noted that, if a new Staff Council is created in the future, new language that references this new body can be brought before the Faculty for a vote at that time.

The members agreed that there should be a series of motions. The first, they decided, should read as follows:

Motion 1:

It is the sense of the Faculty that two staff members should be added to the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR), effective immediately.

The members voted six in favor and zero opposed on the content of this motion and six in favor and zero opposed to forward the motion to the Faculty. If the Faculty approves Motion 1, the members agreed that a second motion, Motion 2, should be put before the Faculty. That motion would be to amend the *Faculty Handbook* to indicate that two staff members will serve on the CPR without vote, effective immediately. After this motion is made and seconded, the Committee agreed that a substitute motion, Substitute Motion 2, should be put before the Faculty. That motion would be to amend the *Faculty Handbook* to indicate that two staff members will serve on the CPR, with vote, and to change the number of voting faculty and student members to four and two, respectively, effective immediately. Once the two motions are on the floor, they could be debated. The members voted one in favor (Professor Hall) and five opposed on the content of Motion 2, and six in favor and zero opposed to forward it to the Faculty. The members voted five in favor and one opposed (Professor Hall) on the content of Substitute Motion 2, and six in favor and zero opposed to forward it to the Faculty. The Committee then voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the Faculty Meeting agenda to

Amended April 12, 2010

the Faculty, contingent on their approval of new course proposals the next day.

Discussion turned to proposals for funding through the President's Initiative Fund (PIF), and the President asked for the members' advice. Following a conversation that focused largely on the use of the PIF to support visitors, the President thanked the Committee and said that he would consider the requests after reviewing the budget for available funding. The Committee then turned to personnel matters.

The Dean reported back on a question raised earlier about how corrections are made to the Faculty Meeting minutes. Dean Call noted that, since 1990, corrections to these minutes (except on one occasion when the minutes of the meeting in which an error occurred were revised by request) are not made in the minutes of the meeting in which an error occurs, but are noted in the next meeting's minutes. After some discussion, the members agreed that to safeguard the historical record, it is best to continue to note corrections in the minutes that follow the meeting in which an error is noted. They decided that, now that minutes are posted online, a reference to the minutes in which the correction is noted should be included in the minutes of the meeting in which the error occurred.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 15, 2010

The twenty-first meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, April 5, 2010. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with President Marx informing the members that he plans to grant each member of next year's Committee of Six one course release in fall 2010, due to the large number of tenure cases that will be reviewed by the Committee. The President said that this decision is contingent on the approval of the Trustees. President Marx noted that the Trustees also would like to continue the conversation with the Committee of Six that began during the Board meetings in March, and he said that Trustees Howard Gardner and Diana Chapman Walsh have told him that they would like to meet with the members of next year's Committee of Six sometime after Commencement for this purpose. The members expressed their thanks to the President for considering the possibility of granting course release because of the large number of tenure cases, and for granting their request.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the members that he had received a request from Professor Sanchez-Eppler that one of her students be permitted to attend the April 20 Faculty Meeting. The student is writing a thesis on the custodial and dining service staff at Amherst and wants to learn more about the issue of adding staff members to the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR). While the student's thesis is due before the Faculty Meeting, the student is still interested in observing the meeting. Dean Call asked the members whether they would advise the President to invite the student to the Faculty Meeting. Professor Barbezat asked the Dean whether student members of faculty committees receive Faculty Meeting minutes and whether they are allowed to attend Faculty Meetings. Student members of some Faculty Committees (the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), the College Council, the CPR, the Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (CAFA), the Committee on Discipline, and the Library Committee, as well as the four executive officers of the student governing body) have the right to attend Faculty Meetings and receive Faculty Meeting minutes, Dean Call said. The Editor-in-Chief and Publisher of the *Amherst Student* also have the right to attend Faculty Meetings and to receive minutes. Professor Barbezat expressed some concern about having as a guest someone writing about College staff issues, even though the student's thesis would already have been turned in. He hoped this would not inhibit faculty from expressing their full views.

Continuing with his announcements, Dean Call asked if the staff members (HVAC Technician Kevin Gladu and Custodial Supervisor Heidi Kellogg), who have been guests at the CPR meetings, should be invited, as guests, to the April 20 Faculty meeting, during which proposals to add staff members to the CPR would be considered. Professor Rockwell said that he sees value in having Ms. Kellogg and Mr. Gladu attend the meeting and that it would be particularly helpful for these staff members to be available to answer questions. Professor Hall asked, if staff are added to the CPR, whether they would have the right to attend Faculty Meetings on a regular basis. The Dean said that this question had not been raised. The Committee agreed that, since student members of the CPR have the right to attend Faculty Meetings, it would make sense, if staff members are added to the membership of the CPR, for them to be able to attend as well.

The Dean then shared another request. He noted that the *Olio*, the College's yearbook, is currently in the process of updating its catalog of faculty photos. Students have been taking as

Amended April 15, 2010

many individual faculty photos and departmental group photos as possible at department meetings, but requested permission to take faculty photos after the Commencement Faculty Meeting on May 20, in order to catch faculty whom they have missed. Professor Hall asked why this request was coming before the Committee. The Dean responded that the Committee of Six considers all requests associated with Faculty Meetings. The members agreed that the *Olio* should be allowed to take photos after the Faculty Meeting on May 20.

In response to some queries made at a previous Committee of Six meeting about the procedures used for promotion to full professor, the Dean distributed to the members the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion (2006).

Under “Questions from Committee members,” Professor Barbezat asked the President for a report of the March meetings of the Board of Trustees. President Marx noted that members of the Department of Information Technology (IT) had given a substantive, two and a half hour-long presentation to the Trustees that had focused on the current state of technology at the College, and which had included time for questions and conversation, in addition to a smaller follow-up session with a subset of the Board. Faculty and members of the Faculty Computer Committee were also present. The presentation highlighted three course-related projects (on the topics of building medieval cathedrals, the environment of the Quabbin reservoir, and the evolution and future of Tokyo neighborhoods) that involved faculty working with IT to develop innovative technological tools that are enhancing teaching and learning. The presentation also made clear that significant progress has been made in the area of building platforms and systems for virtual networking of students and alumni. President Marx noted that an area of focus should now also be on how these platforms are filled with content. Faculty, students, and alumni need to be made aware of the possibilities that exist, and additional resources, as is noted in the report of the CPR, may be needed, he said. President Marx informed the members that plans are under way to post the presentation on the Amherst Web site for the College community, to inform future conversations about information technology with the Faculty and the Board.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Rockwell asked if the Trustees were impressed with the presentation that they had seen. President Marx responded that the Board recognized that progress is being made and became more fully informed as a result of the presentation, and that the Trustees are considering forming a task force on information technology. The Trustees recognize the importance of this area moving forward, President Marx noted. The President said that, during the Board discussions, he made clear that it is his view that Amherst should use technology in ways that are consistent with the College’s strengths and values, and that Amherst should not try to compete with institutions such as MIT, which has been sharing faculty lecture classes on the Web. Since Amherst’s focus is on personalized and interactive education, he believes that Web-related outreach efforts should focus on ways to highlight these characteristics. The Dean pointed out the success of the College’s efforts in the area of search engine-optimization, noting that information about the College is often near the top of the Web pages that come up when conducting Internet searches. President Marx noted that the Board had also been given updates on progress being made on the Merrill Science Building and Lord Jeffery Inn projects, and had been informed of the next steps on the horizon for both.

Prompted by the discussion of new spaces on campus and off, Professor Saxton asked if campus planning efforts call for the Department of History to remain in Chapin for the immediate future. President Marx said that consideration is being given to the possibility of moving Human Resources and Public Affairs to the Fiber Arts Building, which would open up

Amended April 15, 2010

space in Converse for additional faculty offices. The President said that the Department of Economics needed more space, and that he and the Dean had met with members of the Department of History to ask if colleagues might be interested in moving their offices to Converse. Members of the department will be invited to take a tour of the spaces that may become available. The President also noted that the CEP had met with the Board.

Discussion turned to the draft agenda for the Faculty Meeting of April 20. President Marx said that he agreed that the meeting originally scheduled for April 6 could not happen due to lack of sufficient notice, but regretted that some faculty might find it difficult to attend the meeting now that it will be held during the vacation week for the public schools, and that some colleagues might wonder why the meeting had been delayed. Professor Ciepiela commented that the Committee of Six had made every effort to get the materials ready in time but was not able to do so by Wednesday, in accordance with Romer's Rule. The Committee then discussed earlier drafts of the motions they had created for the agenda and revised them slightly to make them more explicit about the voting status of members of CPR, under different scenarios. The Committee then voted six to zero in favor of forwarding the Faculty Meeting Agenda to the Faculty and reiterated their votes for Motion Two and substitute Motion Two. Motion One remained as it was originally drafted.

Discussion turned to the CPR's Report on the Implementation of the Recommendations of the Advisory Budget Committee ([appended via link](#)). The Dean said that, following the Committee of Six's discussion of the report, he planned to post the document on the Web site for the Faculty. The President and the Dean then reported on progress that has already been made on some of the recommendations of the report and plans to address others. Referring back to the IT discussion at the Board meeting, they agreed that further investments in this area were likely to be needed. They also noted that they would be pleased to support the creation of a task force to address the issues of copyright permission fees, e-reserves, and the printing costs of class materials and noted that this recommendation could be implemented at the time the Committee considered committee assignments. The members agreed to devote its next meeting, which would take place either on Monday or Wednesday of the next week, to committee assignments.

The Committee discussed the CPR's recommendation that the food and hours of Valentine be enhanced. President Marx noted that a consultant who had been hired by the College to review Dining Services had presented three options for improving dining services that ranged in cost from \$285,000 to more than \$8 million. He said that the College plans to improve the quality of the food at Valentine, is taking the initial step of creating an additional position in Dining Services in support of this goal, and agrees with the CPR that the lowest-cost option should be implemented. President Marx said that making changes in class scheduling would go a long way toward alleviating over-crowding problems in Valentine and that doing so could eliminate the need to spend millions on a renovation of the dining hall. It was agreed that the Class Scheduling Task Force should be asked to explore possibilities in this regard, including a staggered schedule of class meeting times. Turning to the recommendation that additional buses be provided for athletic teams to ensure that student-athletes miss fewer Friday classes, the President said that he has offered to restore funds for additional buses, while noting that the state of affairs that prompted the change in the bus policy—the need to have separate buses for men's and women's teams to attend away games that are taking place at the same institution at different times—only occurs in fall and winter. The Dean will discuss this issue with the Department of Athletics.

Amended April 15, 2010

Continuing the conversation of the CPR's recommendations, the Dean noted that, through the work of the College's attorneys, it has become possible to use a restricted endowed fund at the College more broadly than had previously been possible. The fund will now be used, in part, to improve staffing at the Mead Art Museum by supporting a new FTE, which has already been approved. Professor Hall next asked about a reference in the report on page three (that "computer hacks" had "compromised a wide range of key campus educational systems, as well as the College's infrastructure") that he had found to be both cryptic and alarming. The Dean responded that the language in the report makes the situation sound more extreme than it was. In actuality, the reference is to network attacks that had been averted. Constant vigilance on this front is necessary, he said. Professor Rockwell suggested that thanks should be extended to the members of the CPR for their excellent work on the report, and the other members, the President, and the Dean agreed.

Professor Hall next asked if external reviews of non-academic areas of the College are conducted on a regular basis. The President said that such reviews are done when needs arise, noting that in recent years outside reviews have been done of the counseling center, the Mead, the quantitative center, the Department of Athletics, and the library, for example. The Committee then discussed a proposal to the President's Initiative Fund (PIF), reaffirming their preference for those funds to go for visitors teaching in the curriculum, rather than for other activities. Following that conversation, the members turned to consideration of the proposal for a new interdisciplinary major in biochemistry/biophysics ([appended via link](#)). The Committee was impressed with the proposal's synthesis from a range of existing science courses and expertise on campus, and its effectiveness at organizing such an interdisciplinary scientific program. Professor Rockwell said that he would be interested in learning more about those students who, according to the CEP's letter of endorsement ([appended via link](#)), have pursued the major in the past via the Interdisciplinary Major option. He wondered how these students compared with students who pursued a similar course at universities that offer similar programs and how well they performed in terms of graduate school acceptance rates, and, later, in graduate programs. Professor Rockwell expressed some concern that there would be sixteen courses required for the major and wondered if having three electives was necessary. Would it be possible to require only two electives at the same time as building an understanding of the major's disciplines, he asked, or would graduate schools be more favorably inclined toward candidates who had completed three? He said that he would be pleased to vote to forward the major to the Faculty and to have his questions answered in introductory remarks, at the time the major was brought before the Faculty. The Dean noted that a goal of the requirements for the proposed major is to distinguish its requirements from those of majors in biology and chemistry, as well as from the pre-medical requirements. Professor Hall noted that there would be a need for majors to acquire a foundation in multiple disciplines and that this would require a significant number of courses. Professor Saxton said that she does not see the large number of required courses as a drawback to the proposed major. The Committee noted that nineteen courses would be required if students completed a thesis.

Continuing their review of the proposal for the new major, the members discussed whether the major, in its proposed form, would effectively be accessible only to those students who had had the advantage of excellent preparation in math and science in high school. Professor Goutte said that very motivated students who were less well prepared could complete the major if they took some courses over the summer. Professor Hall said that he does not

Amended April 15, 2010

believe that every part of the Amherst curriculum can be effectively open to all students, despite one's best efforts to support each student's ambitions. He said that sometimes it is necessary, albeit extremely difficult, to direct a student away from an academic area, if he or she has demonstrated that success in the particular course of study is not likely and that continuing failure may jeopardize other life and career goals. Under the proposed format, it was his belief that only the strongest and most motivated students would be successful biochemistry/biophysics majors, he continued. Dean Call said that, while he shares the aspiration that all majors are accessible to all students at the College, this may not always be the case. Professor Rockwell expressed the view that good faith efforts and accommodations should be made to make every major as accessible as possible to all students, since, in his view, this promise is inherent in admission to the College.

Professor Goutte wondered if the proposed major could be sustained now that Professor O'Hara, who would be critical to the new major's success, has become the Dean of New Students. With the demands of this position, and a reduced teaching load, she thought that Professor O'Hara might need to be less involved in the major than had originally been envisioned. The Committee wondered whether it would be feasible to offer the major without additional staffing. Professor Barbezat expressed concern that visitors would likely be needed and about the impact that the new major might have on the budget over time. The President agreed that new programs often do come with costs and that they can generate further demands, which may be more difficult to meet now than in the past. Dean Call noted that there had been a biophysics major in the past and that he believed that that this major had fallen away when the neuroscience major was created. Professor Hall noted that, when a senior faculty member in Physics who had played a critical role in the previous biophysics major left the College, the major was no longer sustainable at the time.

Continuing with the discussion about the new major, Professor Goutte noted that most of the courses for the major are already taught, but that two new advanced courses would need to be taught every year. One of these courses is being developed by Professors O'Hara and Williamson, but she was unsure who would teach the other senior seminar course, and how this course might be sustained on a regular basis. The Dean noted that it will be important to identify staffing needs for the major over the next several years to assess the impact on the major and the budget. The Committee agreed that it would not be in the best interest of students if the major relied on visiting faculty to teach integrative courses and/or to oversee capstone experiences. The Committee commented that the proposal for the major notes that evidence of successful completion of advanced coursework in secondary school (scores of five on AP exams) would enable students to satisfy the prerequisites for the major and advanced classes, but that Amherst College credit would not be granted for these courses or their equivalents. Students placing out of foundational science courses would be expected to take additional elective courses or to complete a thesis in biochemistry and biophysics. The Committee discussed whether students are typically successful in more advanced science and math courses at Amherst when they place out of foundational science and math courses offered by the College. The Dean noted that success is mixed in math, particularly when these students take the math comprehensive exam. Professor Goutte said that an informal survey that she had conducted of students who placed out of foundational courses, and of those who could have placed out, but didn't, had mixed results. In both cases, half of the students reported that they were satisfied with their decision and half said that they weren't. Professor Hall said that student performance has been mixed in physics

Amended April 15, 2010

under these circumstances, and that students often lack the lab experience necessary for any course beyond the first course in the sequence for the major. The Committee noted that students in the pre-medical track take the same number of courses that would be required for the new major. Professor Hall commented that the letter from Professor Dizard on behalf of the CEP does not mention how many students have completed this major using the Interdisciplinary Major option, the courses that they took, and whether they completed a thesis. Dean Call said that his sense of the CEP conversation was that only a relatively small number of students would pursue the new major in the future because of the many required courses. Professor Rockwell reiterated that he would be happy to support forwarding the proposal for the new major to the Faculty, as long as the Committee's questions are answered at some point. Professor Barbezat said that he would prefer having answers, particularly to questions surrounding the budgetary implication of the major, before the proposal is brought before the Faculty. Professor Hall agreed, noting that it would be helpful to have responses to the questions in writing from those who are proposing the major. The Dean agreed to request such a document, and the members agreed to wait to see the responses before voting to bring the proposal before the Faculty.

The members turned to a proposal for a Five College Certificate in Ethnomusicology ([appended via link](#)), which has been endorsed by the CEP ([the CEP's March 17 letter of endorsement is appended via link](#)). The Dean noted that Professor Engelhardt would play a central role in the program, as would Professor Robinson, who was recently hired into a tenure-track position in the Department of Music at Amherst. Professor Robinson has had a visiting position in the department for the past two years. The Dean informed the members that the CEP had discussed the potential for anthropologists to teach in the program, as well. Professor Engelhardt had said that, while it would be possible to have anthropologists teach courses within the program, most scholars in the field were housed within music departments. The members agreed that the new certificate program would be helpful for students and would encourage them to add a new dimension to their studies, and that it would also encourage and facilitate Five-College cooperation among faculty members. The members voted four in favor (Professors Ciepiela, Goutte, Rockwell, and Saxton), zero opposed, with two abstentions (Professors Barbezat and Hall) on the substance of the proposal for the Five College Certificate in Ethnomusicology and six in favor and zero opposed to forward the proposal to the Faculty. The members also voted to add consideration of the proposal to the Faculty Meeting Agenda, which they had already approved, for the April 20 meeting. The Committee wondered where on the College Web site information about the certificate programs appears. The Dean noted that currently this information is listed on the site under "Academics" at <https://www.amherst.edu/academiclife/fivecollege>, but that it is not included under the listing of majors under Areas of Study at <https://www.amherst.edu/academiclife/departments>. The members suggested that a link to Five College certificate programs be added to the Areas of Study Web page, and the Dean agreed to request that this be done.

The Committee turned to the College Council's proposal for the Amherst College calendar ([April 2 letter from the College Council](#) and [proposed calendar](#) appended via link), which was prompted by the decision by the University of Massachusetts to change its calendar so that, in most years, it would begin its spring semesters on the Tuesday after Martin Luther King Day and by indications that Mount Holyoke and Smith would likely follow suit. The Dean noted that the College Council was concerned that starting spring classes at Amherst any later than four class days after the post-Martin Luther King Day Tuesday would lead the College to be

Amended April 15, 2010

out of sync with the university and the other colleges in the consortium. The College Council noted that, if the start of classes for the Five Colleges for the spring semesters, in particular, differed significantly, students would not be able to register for classes across the campuses, and the future of the consortium could be in jeopardy. The College Council developed a set of guiding principles to create future calendars and focused only on the Spring Semester.

Professor Goutte said that she was unclear as to how the university had changed the calendar. Dean Call responded that, in most years, the change is that the university has moved up its start in the Spring Semester by about one week. This change would have the effect of having the university, and now at least two of the other colleges, starting between six and as many as thirteen days before Amherst traditionally would. In the past, the Five College Consortium schools started their semesters during the same week, typically within two days of each other. The proposal would be for Amherst to start the Spring Semester one week after Martin Luther King Day every year, which in some years would be one week earlier than Amherst's recent calendars have implied, and, in other years, would be the same as recent practice.

Turning to the College Council proposal, the Dean noted that one of the College Council's goals is to preserve Interterm, but that, under the proposal, the time between the end of the fall break and the beginning of Interterm would be shortened by a few days in some years. President Marx noted that the beginning of Interterm is defined by when residence halls open, though students may not arrive on campus until a number of days later. It was agreed that one result of the proposal would be that, in some years, senior honors students would have fewer days to work on their theses on campus during January, but that all students would retain the possibility of Five-College classes throughout their four years. Professor Barbezat noted that, during some years, the university's commencement would fall during the Amherst exam period. He expressed some concern about how this schedule will affect students from the university who take Amherst courses. Professor Rockwell noted that universities often place less emphasis on having all courses completed by the time of commencement, as the actual diploma is not given to the student at that event, but is often mailed to them after commencement. The members agreed that it will be up to seniors at the university to plan their courses at Amherst with the UMass Commencement schedule in mind.

Continuing the conversation about the calendar, Professor Hall noted that he and other faculty plan their courses so that they have a certain rhythm, based on when the spring break is scheduled. Courses would take on a different cadence if the timing of spring break is changed, he noted. The Dean agreed that, if the break is changed, faculty might have to re-imagine the timing of some assignments and exams, perhaps. He noted that, with a few exceptions, spring break has traditionally occurred after seven weeks of classes during the fourteen-week Spring Semester. The Fall Semester is thirteen weeks. The members expressed concern that, since the university has not determined when its spring breaks will occur, Amherst is unsure of how to respond. Professor Hall expressed frustration with the university's lack of consultation and poor spirit of cooperation. The Dean and the President noted that the Amherst Faculty has approved the calendar through 2012 and that a vote on the 2013 calendar will come before the Faculty as it normally would, next year. Professor Rockwell asked the Dean to ask the College Council what its rationale is for adopting a return to a two-week add-drop period as one of its guiding principles. The Dean agreed to do so, noting that the CEP has been discussing this issue at the Committee of Six's request. The Dean said that the key, in terms of the calendar, will be to

Amended April 15, 2010

ensure, through cooperative efforts, that the start of the spring semester at all Five-College institutions is kept within four class days of one another.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 16, 2010

The twenty-second meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by Dean Call in the President's office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, April 12, 2010. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The President, who was traveling for the College, was absent.

The Committee reviewed four proposals for new courses and voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward them to the Faculty.

In preparation for the Faculty meeting on April 20, Dean Call discussed with the members a procedural issue.

Professor Goutte next asked about a recent email ([appended via link](#)) to the Faculty from the three faculty members of the CPR. She wondered whether this letter represented an unusual practice. The members agreed that the letter was a departure from the usual practice. However, the consensus of the Committee was that the faculty members of the CPR were entitled to share their views with the rest of the Faculty.

Before turning to a consideration of committee assignments, the Dean noted that he would be pleased to discuss the suggestion that had been made by several members of the Committee that the structures of four faculty committees (Amherst-Doshisha, Health Professions, Faculty Housing, and Health and Safety), be brought into alignment with their charges in the *Faculty Handbook*, following changes in practice involving the committees that had occurred in recent years, based on recommendations made by previous Committees of Six. In addition, he said that it was his hope to discuss questions that some members had expressed about Associate Deans of the Faculty regularly attending committee meetings as liaisons to his office, as has been the practice on the First-Year Seminar Committee and the Faculty Computer Committee. Dean Call said that his goal for having the associate deans work with particular faculty committees has been to facilitate the work of the Faculty. Dean Call continued that he would be glad to listen to the thoughts and advice of the Committee about approaches that might be taken to working with committees. The Committee agreed that, when considering committee assignments for next year, the members would make appointments for each committee that would be faithful to the membership structure described in the *Faculty Handbook* charge for that committee. As each standing committee of the Faculty was discussed, it was agreed that, if any changes to committee structure were favored, motions to revise the relevant *Faculty Handbook* language would later be drafted and brought before the Faculty. During the discussion, it was noted that, while there were guidelines for the membership of the Faculty Research Awards Committee, which reviews Faculty Research Award Program (FRAP) proposals, this committee does not appear in the listing of standing committees of the Faculty in the *Faculty Handbook*. The members agreed to draft a charge for the committee and to make a motion that the committee and its charge be added to the *Faculty Handbook*. The Committee also agreed that

Amended April 16, 2010

faculty committees that have regular invited guests, including those whose meetings are attended regularly by an Associate Dean of the Faculty, should be asked whether they would like to modify their charges, either to add guests as regular or ex officio members or to change the way in which individuals work with these committees. The Dean agreed to draft the motions to reflect the Committee's proposals for the members' review. The remainder of the meeting was spent on committee assignments.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 16, 2010

The twenty-third meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 9:15 A.M. on Thursday, April 15, 2010. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

In preparation for the Faculty Meeting on April 20, the members met to clarify and confirm the Committee's views on some faculty governance questions that had emerged and discuss procedural issues relating to the Faculty Meeting. Professor Hall said that he was not in favor of deviating from the Committee's regular meeting schedule for either purpose. Professors Saxton and Goutte expressed the view that this is a significant and sensitive moment in terms of the governance of the College, and that it would be useful for the Committee to have this brief meeting.

In response to the recent email that had been sent to the Faculty from the three faculty members of the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR), and responses that it had elicited from some members of the community ([including a note, attached via link, from Professor Cobham-Sander](#)), the members reiterated their collective view that, while the email represented a departure from the usual practice, the faculty members of the CPR were entitled to share their views with the rest of the Faculty.

Turning to how the motions should be introduced at the Faculty Meeting, the Committee agreed that it would be helpful to the Faculty, as part of the introduction to Motion One, to provide the chronology of how the issue of adding staff members to the CPR had emerged, including the Committee of Six's active role in bringing motions on this governance issue before the Faculty.

The members also began a discussion about the role of the Committee of Six moving forward. It was agreed to continue this conversation at a future meeting with the President and the Dean, and, ultimately, with Trustees Howard Gardner and Diana Chapman Walsh.

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 28, 2010

The twenty-fourth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, April 19, 2010. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Robyn Piggott, Recorder.

The meeting began with "Announcements from the President." President Marx thanked the Committee for its advice on proposals received for the President's Initiative Fund (PIF), and said that he will fund all five requests for visiting faculty through the fund. He noted that he will notify faculty members of the outcome of their proposals in the coming week.

Dean Call reported that he had received a question from two members of the Faculty who wish to introduce an additional motion at the upcoming Faculty Meeting (April 20), and are seeking advice on the appropriate procedure for doing so. The Committee noted that such motions are normally introduced under "New Business." Dean Call explained that the faculty members would like to introduce their motion prior to the Committee of Six's motions regarding the composition of the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR). He said that he had consulted with the College's Parliamentarian, Professor L. McGeoch, who noted that any member of the Faculty could rise at any point during a Faculty Meeting and propose a suspension of the agenda. Should two thirds of the Faculty vote for such a suspension, a motion could be introduced prior to "New Business." The new motion read as follows:

The Faculty finds current arrangements for staff participation in those areas of College business that most affect Staff to be seriously lacking and wishes to express with this Motion our support for a mechanism of effective staff voice, governance, and input at the College. We hereby recommend that the Administration act immediately, in conjunction with the Staff, to remedy this deficiency. Specifically, new institutional structures should provide:

(1) a pathway through which representatives of the Staff can communicate directly and regularly with senior Administration;

(2) access for staff representatives to relevant data and clerical support for their work;

and

(3) a mechanism for regular and direct communication between representatives of the Staff and the Managers' Council.

Professor Barbezat asked whether the faculty members could wait until the Committee of Six's first motion was introduced, and then make a motion to substitute. The members were unclear as to whether any new motion could be substituted for any motion on the agenda, or whether a motion to substitute must represent a revision of the motion it proposed to replace. Dean Call said that he would consult further with the Parliamentarian on this point. The Dean also reported that the Parliamentarian had expressed some concern about the first motion that the Committee of Six plans to introduce, since Motion One requires the Faculty to vote on the question of staff membership of the CPR before details of such membership are known.

Amended April 28, 2010

Professor Rockwell wondered why the proposed new motion to affirm the Faculty's support for the College's staff needed to be introduced earlier in the meeting than "New Business." He speculated that these faculty members might wish to substitute this new motion for the Committee of Six's entire group of motions. Professor Saxton said she thought the faculty members probably wished to begin the Faculty's discussion of the composition of the CPR on a positive note. President Marx wondered whether "Romer's Rule" applies to the new motion; Dean Call said that he understood Romer's Rule to apply only to motions introduced by the Committee of Six. Noting that the Parliamentarian had suggested that a member of the Committee of Six move to suspend the agenda and allow the motion to be introduced, President Marx said that it was his understanding that the Committee of Six could not propose to change the agenda of the Faculty Meeting, since the timeframe for their bringing motions before the Faculty is constrained by "Romer's Rule." Professor Hall said that the Parliamentarian had not ruled on whether or not a Faculty Meeting agenda could be changed at the meeting, and noted that suspending the rules of a Faculty Meeting did effectively change the agenda. The question then arose as to whether "Romer's Rule" applies to the Faculty Meeting agenda, since this was a motion passed by the Committee of Six. Professor Hall said that he would like the Parliamentarian to rule on that question; Dean Call said that he will refer it to Professor L. McGeoch.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Barbezat said that although he shares the concerns about staff representation and voice expressed by the two faculty members, he believes that they should bring forward their motion in whatever way they think is best. Professor Rockwell suggested that Dean Call share the options with the faculty members in question, and allow them to decide how they wish to proceed; the Committee concurred, and Dean Call said that he would contact the faculty members. Professor Barbezat asked Dean Call also to convey the Committee's support for the motion that they intended to introduce. Professor Goutte asked whether the Committee should note that initiatives are already under way to address the issues raised in the new motion that the two faculty members plan to introduce. President Marx said that Legal and Administrative Counsel Paul Murphy could speak to those initiatives if the question arises.

Turning to Motion Two, Dean Call said that he discussed with the Parliamentarian whether it must be brought forward regardless of the outcome of the vote on Motion One, because it was included on the agenda. Robert's Rules of Order were somewhat vague on the procedure to be followed in such a case, Dean Call said, noting that the Parliamentarian suggested that, should Motion One fail, a member of the Committee of Six could rise and state that in light of the Faculty's vote, the Committee would not bring forward Motion Two. The Committee noted that any member of the Faculty could nonetheless rise and bring forward Motion Two. Professor Ciepiela asked whether members of the Committee of Six are regarded as Committee members in a Faculty Meeting, or whether they are also considered individual members of the Faculty. Dean Call said that he thought Committee of Six members could act either as Committee members or individual faculty members during a Faculty Meeting. Thus a member could bring forward Motion Two as an individual if the Committee of Six did not bring forward the motion.

Professor Saxton next outlined the remarks she intends to make to introduce Motion One at the upcoming Faculty Meeting. The members agreed that providing some brief history of how the Committee arrived at its position would be helpful background information for members of

Amended April 28, 2010

the Faculty. Professor Hall and Professor Barbezat also strongly encouraged the President and Dean to review the CPR minutes of December 3, 2008, and January 28, 2009, prior to the Faculty Meeting, since these minutes capture some of the President's expressed views on the subject.

Dean Call noted that President Marx will be out of town on Monday, April 26, 2010, a meeting at which the Committee will likely discuss committee assignments and personnel matters. President Marx suggested that the Committee should meet as planned in his absence; the Committee agreed that it will meet on April 26, 2010. (The President's plans later changed, and he did attend the meeting.)

Dean Call reported that he had a preliminary conversation with Professor O'Hara regarding the proposal to create a Biochemistry/Biophysics major, but has yet to forward to her the Committee's questions about the proposal. Professor Ciepiela then asked how many writing intensive courses are currently being taught at Amherst, and in which departments. Dean Call said that he would research the question and include the answer in the minutes. (He later learned that five writing intensive courses will be taught in 2010-2011, one each in the Departments of Classics and Music, and three in the Department of English. This year there were three writing intensive courses taught, all in the Department of English.) The Dean also suggested that it would be helpful to include in the minutes the definitions (see below) of Writing Attentive and Writing Intensive courses that were developed by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP).

Writing Attentive:

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

Writing Intensive:

Designed specifically to meet the needs of students whose secondary education did not adequately prepare them for writing at Amherst College. Students who take these courses will be taught the fundamentals of academic writing: thesis development, the use and citation of secondary sources, cogent argumentation, effective organization, the construction of coherent and unified paragraphs, and the crafting of complex yet clear sentences whose grammatical structure accurately mirrors the logical relations between the ideas they express. Though a significant amount of class time will be devoted to writing instruction, these courses are based

Amended April 28, 2010

squarely within a particular discipline and may count toward the major in the department in which they are taught.

Professor Barbezat asked when the Committee will be provided with honors theses to review; Dean Call said that the theses will be provided when classes end, after departments make their recommendations as to the level of honors students should be awarded.

The Committee then turned to committee assignments, and also discussed the composition of a new task force on copyright issues. Professor Barbezat asked that the Committee be provided with a charge for the new task force. Dean Call agreed to bring forward a draft charge for the Committee's review and revision. In considering potential members of the Health and Safety Committee, Professor Goutte suggested that the Chemical Hygiene Officer, who works daily with faculty and students on issues of chemical hazards, might be an appropriate person to have on the committee. Professor Barbezat recommended that the committee's charge be revised to include appropriate staff and that this revised charge be forwarded to the Faculty for its consideration.

Dean Call reported that the Faculty Computer Committee has recommended that a new task force be convened to assess the College's use of Blackboard, the role that the Content Management System (CMS) can play, and other possible solutions. The Faculty Computer Committee has also recommended that the College continue to license Blackboard while the task force does its work. Dean Call noted that the College's Blackboard license will be retained for the coming academic year. The Committee recommended that the Faculty Computer Committee and the CEP should each select colleagues from among their membership to join such a task force; Dean Call said that he will communicate this to the chair of each committee. Professor Hall asked why the Radiation Safety Committee is not included on the list of committees for which the Committee of Six should recommend colleagues for service. On reflection, Professor Hall recalled that the Radiation Safety Committee is chaired by Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services, and thus is an administrative, and not a standing committee of the Faculty.

Dean Call asked whether the Committee of Six thought it would be helpful to revive the Dean's Task Force on Academic Support, noting that this group had not been convened since it submitted its last report. The Committee of Six reviewed the previous membership of the task force and noted that, if it were to be reconvened, the same individuals would likely be called to serve.

The Committee next reviewed proposals to clarify the language in the *Faculty Handbook* regarding the charge of the Faculty Computer Committee and to add the Faculty Committee on Research Awards to the *Faculty Handbook*. Professor Barbezat noted that the proposed new language made explicit that administrative colleagues were members "ex officio without vote," and suggested that this language should be standardized throughout the *Faculty Handbook*. Professor Hall thought that it would be impractical to revise the charge of all faculty committees to reflect this longstanding practice at the College that *ex officio* members do not vote. Professor Barbezat then asked whether including such language in these revised charges would inadvertently create confusion, and might even suggest that *ex officio* members of other committees do have a vote. Most members agreed that making this practice explicit in the charges of only two committees is likely to cause confusion. Dean Call then suggested that it might be helpful to include in the *Faculty Handbook* a general statement that, unless otherwise

Amended April 28, 2010

specified, *ex officio* members of standing faculty committees did not have a vote; the members concurred. The Committee then voted six in favor and zero opposed on a motion to forward the new and revised charges to the Faculty for a vote at a future Faculty Meeting, and six in favor and zero opposed on the substance of the motion, which appear below, with proposed changes in bold caps:

To add the following new language to the *Faculty Handbook* at IV., S.,1., t. and to change the current language at IV., S., 1., j.:

t. *The Faculty Committee on Research Awards.* The Faculty Committee on Research Awards is composed of three members of the Faculty, one each from the three traditional divisions of the Faculty, appointed by the Committee of Six for two-year terms; the Dean of the Faculty, *ex officio*; and an Associate Dean of the Faculty *ex officio*, who assists the Dean with the administrative work of the committee. The committee is responsible for the administration of application and award procedures for the Faculty Research Awards Program (FRAP), which provides support for the research activities of all regular full- and part-time, tenured, and tenure-track Amherst College faculty members. Members of the Faculty Committee on Research Awards may not apply for awards during their term of service, but do retain their entitlement to funds previously awarded.

j. *The Faculty Computer Committee.* The Faculty Computer Committee consists of three faculty members appointed by the Committee of Six for two-year terms and one student member elected by the student government. In addition, the Director of Information Technology (IT), the Director of Academic Technology Services (ATS), **AN ASSOCIATE DEAN OF THE FACULTY (WHO SERVES AS A LIAISON TO THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY'S OFFICE)**, and the Librarian of the College are *ex officio* members without vote. One of the faculty members serves as chair. The committee advises the Director of IT and the Director of ATS on topics related to the use of computer technology in support of research and instruction and on other IT issues affecting the academic life of the College. One member of the committee serves as a faculty representative to the College's Internet Strategy Group. (Voted by the Faculty, November 2007)

The Committee next reviewed the nomination from the Department of Physical Education and Athletics for the Edward Hitchcock Fellowship, and voted six in favor and zero opposed for the nominee.

Discussion turned to the further information ([appended via link](#)) the Committee of Six received from the CEP in support of its proposal that the College revert to a two-week add/drop period. Professor Barbezat noted that it is challenging to obtain hard data about difficulties students encounter with the add/drop period, but also said that his reading of the information provided does not indicate that there is a trend of increasing problems since the add/drop period was reduced, nor of any consistent problem with the length of the period. Professor Ciepiela

Amended April 28, 2010

added that, although students raised issues about the add/drop period, few of the problems they encounter seem to be due to the length of the period. Professor Rockwell said that he is disappointed that the CEP did not offer any alternative solutions that might address some of the issues students raised, such as problems arising from capped courses. He suggested that next year the CEP should examine the effect of capping enrollments on registration. Professor Rockwell said that there is not sufficient evidence presented to support an informed conversation on the floor of the Faculty about the proposed change. Professor Barbezat said that there is evidence that students want a longer add/drop period, but not sufficient evidence that the ten-day add/drop period causes problems. Dean Call suggested that the Committee of Six might engage in a conversation with the CEP about the proposal in the fall. President Marx suggested that if the Committee wishes to review additional data about the add/drop period, it should charge the administration to provide the data to inform further conversations. Professor Barbezat noted that it is challenging to define the right question about the add/drop period and to ascertain what data will be helpful in answering that question.

The Committee briefly reviewed the items of business that might be included on the agenda of a future Faculty Meeting, and the meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

April 6, 2010

Dear Colleagues,

We respectfully request that a motion be put before the Faculty at a meeting this semester to revert to a two week add/drop period. We appreciate your desire for "hard data." But "hard data" is hard to come by. For example, late registrations arise for a number of reasons having nothing to do with the length of add/drop: some students have difficulties with arranging payment of tuition; others have outstanding grades from the previous semester; late fees are also not robust evidence—late fees are often waived for good reason. To sort all this out would take an inordinate amount of staff time and would, at the end of the day, not give us data more useful than the anecdotal data gathered from students and the Registrar (summarized below). From our perspective, the most robust data on this issue will be generated by a debate on the floor of a Faculty Meeting and a subsequent vote. Our colleagues as instructors and advisors have had to deal with students seeking a forth course with the shortened deadline looming.

That said, the anecdotal evidence, collected by the Association of Amherst Students, corroborates what the Registrar's Office has reported to us, and point to a stress that ill serves us. The AAS asked students to report on their experiences with the spring semester drop/add period. They received 127 responses distributed as follows:

- Scheduling overlaps prevented me from taking courses I was interested in 80
- Scheduling conflicts prevented me from visiting classes 75
- I did not find out that I could not get into a class until add/drop was almost over and had difficulty finding another course 38
- I was unable to find four courses that interested me 30
- I was dropped during add/drop from a course I had pre-registered for without an explanation 25
- I did not have an opportunity to visit a 5 College course I was interested in 16
- I was unable to get into classes because of 5 College pre-registration 14

It goes without saying that this sampling is not a proper sample, though it should be noted that 26 of the student respondents (20%) indicated a positive response to the shorter add/drop period and 38% expressed neither positive nor negative response to the short add/drop. Still, 42% were clearly unhappy with the short add/drop period. While it still may be the case that the aggrieved were most likely to respond, and thus exaggerate the dissatisfaction, it still has to be noted that there are a significant number of our students who feel ill-served by the shortened add/drop period. We are appending herewith a sampling of the comments our

students offered in response to the AAS request for reactions to the shortened add/drop period. We also want to call attention to the recent AAS unanimous resolution asking that the add/drop period be returned to two weeks.

In the context of our “open curriculum,” which is a prominent feature of what we say about ourselves, making it hard for students to actually avail themselves of this openness seems embarrassing, if not disingenuous. An “open curriculum” that features a large number of courses with capped enrollments, and large number of courses that are offered in “prime time,” effectively makes the open curriculum a fiction for many of our students. Shortening the add/drop period makes matters worse.

As you know, we are slowly moving toward working out a proposal to distribute our courses more widely across the day so that students will find it easier to avail themselves of our open curriculum. But until that more “perfect world” obtains, the evidence that we have before us, as imperfect as it is, suggests that we need to give our students a full two weeks during which they can explore our/their open curriculum.

Sincerely,

Jan E. Dizard
Chair, Committee on Educational Policy

Comments from Students on Student Survey of Add/drop

In the student s' comments from the AAS add/drop survey, several complaints came up repeatedly:

--Students weren't told that they would be dropped from classes until add/drop was almost over, and they had trouble finding replacement classes on such short notice.

--The Monday schedule on the first day of classes (a Tuesday) during the fall semester means that T/Th classes meet only twice before forms are due, (which is particularly bad since so many classes meet from 10-11:20 and 2-3:20 on T/Th).

--If we're going to advertise add/drop to the extent that we do, we need to do a better job of delivering.

Other comments:

This is frustrating every single semester, especially because professors expect you to be present for a class for which you'd enrolled, yet you cannot have a chance at another class if you aren't present. Sometimes, this struggle results in a student being dropped from both a pre-enrolled class and a waiting list for another potential class.

There just wasn't enough time to visit two classes that were in the same time period. You had to pick the class beforehand and just stick with your choice. Also most classes seemed to close within a day or two into the semester which pretty much defeated the purpose of add/drop.

The way the start of classes was designed, we had a Mon schedule, followed by Wed, and then Thursday. Most Monday classes also meet on Wednesday, so it felt like a waste of the add/drop period to not get to go to T/Th classes until the 3rd day (and have a repeat of Mon/Wed classes 2 days in a row). It would have been better to start on a Tuesday schedule and continue from there.

I was dropped from 2 classes for which I was pre-registered. I then had a very hard time finding 2 replacements that were not already overenrolled, that interested me, and that did not conflict with the other classes in my schedule. Also, many professors were not signing new students into their classes, or would not sign in students who were not pre-registered and/or did not come to the first class. This especially posed a problem for me, because, on the first day of classes, I attended the classes for which I was pre-registered (and then subsequently got dropped from)

The English Department, for both semesters, told students whether or not their theses (i.e. English Senior Tutorial) proposals were approved *on the last day of Add/Drop.* This meant that a student had to find four classes that she really liked in the unlikely event that on the last day of Add/Drop, she would be stuck with too few classes. This is a ridiculous policy that I think the shortened Add/Drop period has only exacerbated. I

believe after four years at Amherst, I don't deserve to have my choices suddenly limited or skewed because of a shortened Add/Drop period. I came to Amherst partly *because* of Add/Drop, and the ability we have to correct class choices over a somewhat more leisurely time period. I think it's unfair to suddenly change the two-week policy without mass student approval. And the reason I don't think students would overwhelmingly approve to change Add/Drop to 1.5 weeks is exactly because it has created so many problems and so many horror stories that could easily have been avoided. Not a fun way to start the semester.

Last semester was particularly messed up, because we started halfway through the week, had two M/W/F classes in a row, and then only one T/Th class before the weekend. I thought my classes were set, and when I was finally able to go to my T/Th class, I realized that it wasn't the class for me. So I was left scrambling over the weekend, knowing I only had a few more days to find a class. With so many classes meeting at the same time, and only a subset of those classes that fit with my schedule being something I find interesting, I had very few options. I emailed a few professors, and thankfully they were open to having me come in, but I know that others would not be. And by that time, I could only realistically go to one class, so my decision had to be made before I could even try the class out. In particular, the one I ended up taking did not meet on Tuesday because the professor was ill, so I had to take a leap of faith that the class would work out okay, because my other options were not palatable. I also know psych majors have a particularly hard time getting into all of their classes, with even juniors being dropped out of two or three classes they need for their major. In previous semesters, I have also been dropped from classes that I was sure I was going to take on the first day; with a shorter period, I know I would have had a much harder time finding a replacement.

I had a course dropped because of exigent circumstances 2 weeks before add/drop, which then negatively impacted the entire department. PSYC-20 dropped pre-registered sophomore majors but allowed in sophomores who "intended" to major. No student should be PENALIZED for responsibly taking courses in their declared major. This is what, in effect, occurred. Students were eventually let into the course, so it worked out. HOWEVER, we were not informed whether we would be in or not until a week into add/drop. It is incredibly stressful to do work for 6+ classes when you don't know if you will be in a course or not (as occurred with another class I was shopping). There isn't time to obtain readings, complete them, and do the assignments that some classes have to scare students off. Papers should not be due during add/drop. Professors should post syllabi online visible to EVERYONE before add/drop. Since there are so many scheduling conflicts, people should be able to see syllabi and get an idea of the course before attending. Also, professors should make cuts within the first two classes if the class is overenrolled at pre-registration. They should not allow it to go on for a week. They should post with class descriptions how they plan on letting students into the course (seniority, major, etc.) so people have a better sense of what classes they can get into. Pre-registration is the biggest reason add/drop is a mess. It is a game- you pre-register

for the classes you might want to take but know you'll have the most trouble getting into. I email professors of courses I definitely want to take to make sure I will have a spot without pre-registering and then pre-reg for 2 or 3 options for one course slot. ...At Amherst College, this should NOT occur. The system needs to be re-thought out. I don't know if there were some obscure courses with 2 students or faculty drastically decreased, but this semester, every course I know of is overenrolled. Pre-registration and add/drop direly need to be fixed.

I'm just not sure why Add/Drop had to be shortened. Two weeks gives ample time to visit multiple classes, and to have your advisor(s) sign the sheets. I personally have 2 majors and 2 advisors, so it is difficult to coordinate getting signatures quickly, especially when you aren't even sure which classes you want to take until the second week has already started. In my opinion shortening Add/Drop takes much away from the student body, and I'm not sure what benefits, if ANY, it gives to professors.

Two weeks is not nearly enough to decide between overlapping classes. Yes, if it's TTh, I can visit the introductory day for one class, the first real day of another class, and then the second real day of another class. But this is not nearly enough time to get a real feel for the classes. Having the period extend the full two weeks would allow a rather more relaxed investigation, at what seems to not be a terribly big expense. Teachers who want to restrict enrollment early can do so on their own, without an artificially truncated period. Add/Drop is one of the biggest advertised strengths of Amherst; let's not undermine that...

I was dropped from a class before add/drop started, and I had a lot of difficulty finding a replacement class because every class I shopped was over-enrolled already. I tried to shop as much as possible to find a class that wasn't full, but a lot of the classes I was interested in met at the same time, so that made finding a class even harder. I think add/drop should be longer.

Eliminating a day from the first week of classes because of holidays (e.g. in Fall semester when classes begin on Tuesday due to Labor Day) makes it very difficult to assess once-a-week seminar classes that do not meet until the second week. You are more or less committed to a course if you cannot attend and evaluate it until the final days of Add-Drop, when most courses are closed.

I am a junior and I was not guaranteed a spot in 3 out of the 4 classes I was preregistered for. I was almost dropped from Psych17 because sophomore "possible majors"/probable liars were given a spot ahead of all non majors. I preregistered for one specific section of Intro to Stats because I could not make the lab time for the other section due to athletic commitments, and then the registrar put me in the wrong section. I tried to switch into the section I had wanted originally but of course it was full. How can the registrar change your original preregistration selections without asking? Finally, the health econ prof. assigned an entire book and 4 lengthy articles to read the

weekend before classes started, which I took the time to complete before I was told that I might not even get into the class(despite being preregistered). The prof said econ majors were not guaranteed a spot and seniority had little influence because she likes a variety of students in her classes. I was lucky enough to get into all of the classes I wanted in the end but it was ridiculously stressful. Preregistration officially means nothing. Awful job on add/drop this semester (and every semester) Amherst College. We need a new system.

Amended May 3, 2010

The twenty-fifth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, April 26, 2010. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder, Recorder.

Professor Barbezat asked what role the Committee played in the review of visitors and coaches. The Dean said that the practice has been for the Dean to read the reappointment cases of lecturers and coaches and to report on these cases to the Committee of Six. If there is a case that has many difficulties, he said that he could ask the Committee to read and comment on the candidate's record. Professor Rockwell asked if departments are aware that these cases are shared with the Committee of Six and of the possibility that the members might be asked to read cases. The Dean said that departments know that he reports on the cases to the Committee of Six and that he may ask the members for advice.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the members that Professor Ringer would be delivering the annual Lazerowitz Lecture on April 28. He then suggested that it might be informative to include in the minutes a description of the process that is used to produce and approve the minutes of the Committee of Six. The Dean described the process as follows. Assistant Dean Tobin takes notes at the meetings of the Committee and writes up a draft that is shared with the Dean, as secretary, and President Marx, as chair. The Dean said that the President and he may make small changes, most often limited to their own comments. A first draft of the minutes is then placed on a shared network drive. Access to this drive is limited to the members of the Committee of Six, including the Dean and the President; Assistant Dean Tobin; and members of the support staff in the Dean's office who assist with posting the minutes on the Web and other administrative tasks. Committee of Six members review this first draft and insert whatever changes they wish to make within the document, with those changes highlighted and identified by individual. Once all the members approve the first draft, a second draft of the minutes is produced. This draft, which indicates all of the suggested changes from the Committee members, is provided to the President and the Dean. If they make any additional changes, they are indicated (and, beginning toward the end of the preceding semester, highlighted) within the document. The second draft of the minutes, which includes all changes, is then placed on the shared drive for the Committee. The members can then make changes once again, if they wish. Most often, the minutes are approved at this stage. If serious and/or numerous questions arise, however, a third draft is created, and any issues that have arisen may be discussed at a Committee meeting. Once the Committee approves the minutes, the Dean and his staff proofread them, and they are posted on the Web for the Faculty.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Saxton suggested that members of the Advisory Committee on Personnel Policies (ACPP) be invited to the next Faculty Meeting, as their input could prove valuable for the discussion of adding staff members to the membership of the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR). Professor Barbezat agreed that it would be useful to have staff members who have been involved in discussions of this issue at the next Faculty Meeting. The other members concurred. It was noted that, according to the *Faculty Handbook* (IV. R., 2.), "Other guests may be invited to specific meetings of the Faculty by the President with the concurrence of the Committee of Six. These persons, as guests, are not normally expected to participate in debate, although they may speak if questions are addressed to them." President Marx agreed to invite some members of the ACPP to the next Faculty Meeting. He informed the members that he had asked Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel, to

Amended May 3, 2010

request that, before the next Faculty Meeting, if at all possible, the ACPP develop a proposal for how staff would be added to the membership of the CPR. In addition, the President had requested that he be provided with an update on efforts to create an Employee Council. It is his understanding that this new body may be asked to carry out any process that is developed for selecting staff members to serve on the CPR.

Continuing with the discussion, Professor Goutte suggested that the members take a moment to reflect on the Faculty Meeting of April 20. She noted that, when questions had been directed to the Committee of Six during the meeting, the President had summarized the members' views. Professor Goutte suggested that, in future, the members of the Committee should respond directly to questions posed. President Marx said that he had spoken to questions on the Committee's behalf only when no member had responded, but that he agreed that it would be preferable for the Committee to speak for itself. Professor Saxton said that it may be difficult for the Committee to speak in one voice, since members may have different views on particular issues. Professor Ciepiela agreed. Professor Barbezat suggested that the Committee be given some time to confer if desired. Perhaps the members could sit together in the front of the room, he suggested. Professor Hall expressed the view that individual members of the Committee of Six should not be compelled to speak to particular questions, but that the Committee as a whole could respond, with one member speaking for the Committee. Professor Rockwell said that it would be impossible to have a meeting of the Committee of Six, however brief, during a Faculty Meeting. He suggested that members of the Committee of Six present their responses to questions posed, and that, if other members had dissenting views, they should express them. He said that he had been satisfied with the responses offered by members of the Committee who had responded to questions at the last Faculty Meeting and that, if he hadn't been, he would have presented his views.

Professors Saxton and Ciepiela agreed that it would be helpful if the members of the Committee of Six sat together at Faculty Meetings. Professor Hall suggested that the Committee of Six move to the front of the room and sit together when the Committee of Six minutes are being discussed and then return to their original seats. The other members of the Committee said that they would find such a procedure to be too cumbersome and would prefer that the members sit together for the duration of the meeting. Professor Ciepiela pointed out that it would be useful if the Committee were given a little time to formulate responses to questions. Professor Hall agreed, likening the situation to that of serving on a panel, when, at times, there is a pause in a discussion before an individual on the panel answers a question. Professor Goutte commented that another reason for having the members sit together during the meeting is that it is not always obvious to all members of the Faculty which colleagues are currently serving on the Committee of Six. The members agreed to sit together at the Faculty Meetings in the future.

Discussion turned to a letter of April 23, 2010 ([appended via link](#)), which was sent to the voting members of the Committee of Six by Professor Upton. Professors Ciepiela and Saxton said that they had had difficulty understanding the substance of the letter. Professor Rockwell noted that he did not see the necessity of defining the term "College" before proceeding to discuss the motions to be brought before the Faculty, as Professor Upton has requested in his letter. The members again agreed to bring the CPR motions before the Faculty for a vote. The members declined to change the Faculty Meeting agenda so as to exclude discussion of adding staff members to the CPR and agreed that Professor Upton's correspondence should be appended to the minutes.

Amended May 3, 2010

Continuing the conversation prompted by Professor Upton's correspondence, President Marx asked the Dean about the policy for appending to minutes communications sent by individuals to the Committee of Six. The Dean explained that the longstanding practice has been to append letters to the minutes when the matters contained within them have been discussed by the Committee. Colleagues are informed by the Dean's office as to when their letters will be appended. If a colleague states at the outset that he or she does not want the contents of a letter discussed in the public minutes, the Committee will decide whether it wishes to take up the matter in question. On a related matter, the President asked about procedures for disseminating information via email to the Faculty from members of the community to inform a discussion that is set for a Faculty Meeting. He noted that the Committee of Six, the Dean, and he had received a number of requests to share information with the Faculty before the last Faculty Meeting. Professor Hall suggested that the Web might be used to share such breaking information, rather than email. Dean Call expressed the view that many colleagues at the College are currently at a point of transition in terms of electronic communication, with many individuals preferring to use email. Perhaps, in the future, members of the community will use Web portals more heavily, he noted. At the moment, the Dean said, his office often, and more generally, receives requests to send communications to the Faculty, but he tries to limit the number of all-faculty emails to avoid flooding colleagues' in-boxes with them. Professor Ciepiela noted that the Committee of Six also has received requests to communicate information to the Faculty.

The members next discussed an email ([appended via a link](#)) sent on April 23, 2010, by Professor Sarat to the voting members of the Committee of Six and copied to the Dean and the President. The Committee considered more broadly whether communications that are addressed individually to all colleagues on the Committee of Six represent formal communications to the Committee of Six as a body. Professor Barbezat asked whether it would be possible for a colleague to send a letter/email about an issue to those who are serving on the Committee of Six and for that correspondence not to be considered a matter of Committee of Six business. Professor Hall said that he believed the issue in question was whether a letter was actually presented for discussion by one or more members of the Committee. Professor Rockwell argued that, if such a letter requires Committee of Six action, or if issues raised within it fall within the purview of the Committee's charge, the communication should be considered Committee of Six business and, in keeping with the principle of maintaining transparency, should be appended to the Committee of Six minutes. Professor Ciepiela suggested that, if a colleague writes to a Committee of Six member individually, the member should ask the individual if his or her intention is for the Committee to discuss the substance of the communication, informing the colleague that doing so would mean that the communication would be appended to the minutes. Most members agreed that such a procedure should be followed under such circumstances. Professor Hall said he did not agree to a blanket policy regarding letters sent to a subset of the Committee of Six, and particularly those sent only to a single member, even if the substance of the communication was subsequently discussed by the Committee. The members did agree that, if communications are addressed to everyone on the Committee, it should be understood that such communications would be appended to the minutes.

Dean Call asked if the members wished to discuss the substance of Professor Sarat's email. Professor Rockwell said that he would prefer to postpone the discussion because he had not had sufficient time to review the email and to reflect on the implications of the proposals being made. He noted that the issues that were raised are complex and would require a good

Amended May 3, 2010

deal of time to be considered thoroughly. President Marx asked the members if they felt that there is a need, beyond the particular questions raised about procedures for making committee assignments, for the Committee of Six, as the committee that considers issues of faculty governance, to have a conversation about any concerns about faculty governance that have arisen, more generally. The members thought that discussing the procedures for committee assignments was important and agreed to consider Professor Sarat's email at today's meeting if time permitted.

Turning to the process that the Committee has followed for making committee assignments this year, Professor Hall expressed concern that, for two major standing committees of the Faculty, the Dean had asked the members to offer both a first choice, as well as an alternate choice, when making nominations of colleagues who might serve on these committees. The Committee did not provide alternate choices last year, he noted. Professor Hall wondered whether taking this approach was a response to an epidemic of colleagues declining to serve on committees. He noted that it has always been his understanding that there is an expectation that, when asked, colleagues will serve. He expressed concern that the culture at Amherst may be shifting, and that declining service might be becoming more common place than it has been in the past. Professor Saxton said that it has been her understanding that there is some flexibility in this process and that, if a colleague presents a compelling reason for not being able to serve on a committee, he or she could decline. Professor Rockwell commented that, if a colleague strongly objects to serving on a committee, he would prefer not to put him or her on the committee. He expressed the view that it is preferable to have colleagues who are invested in serving, rather than to appoint someone who is not, which would be a disservice to the College.

Continuing the conversation, Dean Call informed the members that very few colleagues decline invitations to serve on committees. In some cases, however, faculty members may inform him of personal circumstances, for example, health problems, that would make it very difficult for them to serve. Professor Hall said that, if a colleague feels that extraordinary circumstances would prevent him or her from undertaking committee service, the colleague should perhaps formalize that claim by requesting that his or her name be removed from the Committee of Six ballot. He expressed the view that that many colleagues have extenuating circumstances that might make it challenging for them to devote time to serving on committees, yet they do serve. Professor Hall said that ensuring that all faculty fulfill the obligation to serve on committees is an issue of fairness and equity. The Dean said that, in practice, a higher standard is applied when deciding whether to allow a colleague to be removed from the Committee of Six ballot, which is rarely allowed, than is applied when considering whether to permit colleagues to decline service on other faculty committees. He noted that, in response to invitations to serve on committees that he has extended on the Committee's behalf so far this year, only one colleague had declined. That individual had a compelling reason for not serving, he said.

Discussion about the process for making committee assignments continued. Professor Barbezat said that, if the Dean invites only one nominated faculty member at a time to serve for each vacant committee slot, as Professor Hall is suggesting, it will be necessary to start the committee process as early as possible so that the Dean can report back to the Committee as he hears back about invitations that he has extended. The Committee could then move forward with additional nominations with the knowledge of the result of prior invitations, knowing for certain which colleagues are available to serve. Professor Ciepiela commented, that in addition to the materials already provided to the members by the Dean (a list of the standing committees

Amended May 3, 2010

showing current memberships and indicating which colleagues need to be replaced because of leaves or completion of their terms; language from the *Faculty Handbook* about the committees; a list of “other committees” that are not included in the *Faculty Handbook* to which faculty are also assigned; a report showing committee memberships for the past ten years; and a list of faculty not assigned to a committee as of July 1 of the next year), she feels it would be helpful for the members to have a complete history of committee assignments, by faculty member. Having that information would help the Committee be mindful of colleagues’ past service, when making new assignments, she said. Professor Ciepiela noted that it is time-consuming to parse this information from the materials currently provided. Professor Goutte suggested that it would also be informative to have the department(s) of the individuals included next to their name on the list that has the history of committee assignments, by faculty member. Professor Hall agreed and said that it would also be helpful to include whether each individual is tenured or untenured. He also felt it would be helpful to have a list of eligible individuals organized by committee. The Committee agreed that it would be useful to have a complete history of committee assignments, by faculty member, when discussing committees for the remainder of the year. The Dean said that he would be happy to provide each member with such a list. The Dean, at the Committee’s request, also agreed to ask his staff to improve the way information on the list of faculty available for committee service is presented and to improve the accuracy of the list. He also agreed to provide information, in an easily accessible form, about colleagues who have immunity from service on particular committees for the next year.

The members discussed how best to ensure that the process for making committee assignments could occur with as much time as possible. The Dean said that the committee process cannot begin until after leave plans have been approved and until after the Committee of Six election. The earliest time that the election can occur is, perhaps, in late-February, and once it is completed, the colleagues who have been elected can be removed from the list of faculty who are available to serve on other committees; the process of making nominations can then move forward. The Dean agreed to begin the Committee of Six election next year as early as possible. Professor Barbezat next asked if colleagues who have immunity from serving on particular committees in a given year because of past service can, if they request to do so, serve on these committees. The Dean said that he would research this question and report back to the members. He then provided the Committee with the responses that he had received from colleagues who had been nominated by the members to serve on major committees. Now that those committee nominations are complete, the members asked the Dean to contact the colleagues whom they nominated for other standing committees, and he agreed to do so.

Discussion turned to the Mellon Senior Thesis Prize. Following the Faculty Meeting of April 20, during which the Dean had announced the new prize, the Dean wrote to the members to inform them that he had made an error. While his notes had suggested that the Committee of Six had discussed having the Fellowships Committee select the recipient of the prize, such a discussion had not taken place. Dean Call wrote that he had discussed the prize with the deans in his office and noted that he may have confused those conversations with one that he had thought had taken place with the Committee of Six. He offered his apologies to the Committee and, in particular, to Professor Hall who had registered concern at the Faculty Meeting that the matter had not been discussed by the Committee.

The members then took up the question of which body should select the recipient of the prize. The Dean noted that the Fellowships Committee would be a possibility, but said that the

Amended May 3, 2010

Committee of Six could consider nominees for this prize when the members review the senior theses and transcripts of seniors recommended for summa cum laude degrees. The Dean noted that he had intended to ask the Fellowships Committee (according to his notes) whether it wished to examine each nominated thesis itself, or whether it would prefer to make the choice on the basis of the description of the thesis and its strengths, as described by the thesis advisor and/or the department. He suggested that the committee that is ultimately tasked with making the decision should decide how it wished to proceed on this point, and in general. The Dean described the prize as follows at the Faculty Meeting and in his email to the Committee:

As part of the funding the College received from the Mellon Foundation to encourage student research, we will award the Mellon Senior Thesis Prize this year for the first time. A description of the prize is as follows: The Mellon Senior Thesis Prize is awarded to a graduating senior who has completed an honors thesis that has been judged by his or her major department to be of exceptionally high quality. The winner will receive a \$2,000 stipend and \$1,500 towards living expenses in the summer after graduation, to enable him or her to remain at Amherst and spend the summer doing work to turn the thesis into a publication, under the supervision of the original thesis advisor or another member of the same department. The advisor will receive a \$500 grant towards research expenses or as a stipend. Each department may nominate one of its theses to be considered for the prize, and the winning thesis will be selected on the grounds of intellectual quality, originality, and potential for publication.

Continuing the conversation about the Mellon Prize, Dean Call noted that funding for the prize has been provided through the Mellon Foundation for this year only. He informed the members that a team of colleagues (Professors Sarat and O'Hara, and Dean Lieber) and he had participated in a Mellon 23 Assembly meeting in February 2009 at Wellesley College. The meeting had focused on the topic of encouraging student research, and each institution that attended had received \$4,000 to support a related initiative. Since the Dean has received a number of requests to support students' continuing thesis work for the summer after they graduate, it was decided to develop and award one prize, using the Mellon award as seed funding to support a student in this way as an experiment, with the possibility of continuing to award the prize in the future. He suggested the possibility of choosing the award recipient from among the writers of summa theses. Professor Ciepiela stressed that it would be important to consult with a student's advisor to determine if there is a possibility that a student's work could be published. She suggested that advisors be asked to nominate students, and that students then be asked if they would like to spend the summer preparing their work for publication. Professor Barbezat asked if the recipient of the prize should be required to stay on campus to work with his or her advisor. Professor Rockwell expressed some concern that, because theses are due very late in the year, a student would have to, perhaps, change his or her summer plans suddenly if awarded the prize and, particularly, if required to stay on campus. He noted that it would be unfortunate if an advisor hesitated to nominate a student for the prize because the advisor might have summer plans that would take him or her off campus or which would prevent the advisor from working with the student over the summer. The members agreed that, if an advisor/department felt that a student should be nominated for the award and the advisor could not work with that

Amended May 3, 2010

student over the summer, another faculty advisor could do so. Professor Goutte commented that she sees a very real need for providing support to students' thesis research for the summer after graduation to work toward publishing their work. She suggested that students should, perhaps, be invited to apply for the prize. Professor Saxton expressed concern that the committee that was awarding this single prize might be overwhelmed with applications. The Committee agreed that having advisors/departments determine which student's work is the best in the field and is potentially publishable would be preferable. Professor Barbezat suggested that, since the Committee of Six reads all of the theses that are recommended for summa, the Committee could be the body that determines which student will receive the Mellon Prize. The other members agreed, while noting that many theses that are not recommended for summa might be worthy of the award. The Committee agreed that each department should be asked to nominate, at most, one student for the award, and that a recommendation for summa would not be a requirement for nomination. The members asked that a letter of recommendation from the department and from the thesis advisor be provided to the Committee of Six for each nominee. Dean Call agreed to solicit nominations for the award from departments as soon as possible.

Turning to the draft Faculty Meeting agenda of May 4, the Dean asked the members if there should be a Faculty Meeting on that date. The Committee agreed that a meeting should be held to continue the discussion and vote on adding staff to the CPR. In response to Professor Hall's request at the April 19 Committee of Six meeting, the Dean reported that he had consulted with the College's Parliamentarian, Professor L. McGeoch, on the question of whether the Committee of Six could propose to change the agenda of the Faculty Meeting on short notice, since the timeframe for their bringing motions before the Faculty is constrained by "Romer's Rule." The question had arisen as to whether "Romer's Rule" applies to the Faculty Meeting agenda, since the agenda itself may be considered a motion that is passed by the Committee of Six. The Dean said that Professor McGeoch had advised that "Romer's Rule" would not apply to a simple re-ordering of the agenda. The Committee could not, on the other hand, introduce a new motion for the agenda during any time after the Wednesday that immediately preceded a Tuesday Faculty Meeting, in accordance with the rule.

In the context of reviewing the draft agenda, the members discussed matters relating to the revision of committee charges. Returning to the question of whether to add a general statement that, unless otherwise specified, *ex officio* members of standing faculty committees do not have a vote, Professor Ciepiela suggested that it might be prudent to review the charges of all standing committees of the Faculty—one by one—to make sure that including the general statement would not result in inadvertent changes. She suggested that, in fact, all of the proposed motions, and possible additional motions, about the make-up of faculty committees should be considered together and brought to the Faculty for a vote. This process, she believes, would be an appropriate way to pursue the aforementioned conversation about faculty governance. The other members agreed and decided that, until a thorough review of the current charges for standing committees is completed, which would likely not be until the fall, the motions that the Committee had drafted and approved regarding the Faculty Computer Committee and the Faculty Committee on Research Awards should not be brought to the Faculty for a vote. In considering once again potential members of the Health and Safety Committee, the members recommended that both the Chemical Hygiene Officer and the Environmental Health and Safety Manager be added to the committee and that a revised charge indicating this revision be forwarded to the Faculty for its consideration in the future. Professor Hall then asked about

Amended May 3, 2010

the fate of motions voted by one Committee of Six after the subsequent Committee is seated. The Dean said that was a good question. He thought that the motions voted by the Committee of Six would stand as instructions for the next Committee of Six, unless reconsidered by that Committee or the Faculty.

Continuing the discussion of the agenda, the Dean said that he had received a request that the Faculty discuss the Five College Certificate in Ethnomusicology before the motions regarding the addition of staff to the CPR. The members agreed that the CPR motions should be discussed first and that, if insufficient time remained for a discussion and vote on the Five College Certificate, the proposal for the certificate should be discussed at the Commencement meeting. The members then voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the Faculty Meeting agenda to the Faculty. (Following the meeting, a proposal for a new course was sent to the Committee for the members' review. Via email, the Committee voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the course to the Faculty and six in favor and zero opposed to add the course to the previously approved Faculty Meeting agenda.)

The Committee next reviewed drafts of the Dean's letters to department chairs and candidates concerning reappointment, tenure, and promotion that are sent to department chairs and candidates each spring. Professor Rockwell noted some small logistical changes that he felt should be made, and the members agreed that the letters regarding reappointment and tenure, once these changes were made, were ready for distribution and approved them by a vote of six in favor and zero opposed. Before reviewing the letter regarding promotion to full professor, the Committee agreed that it would be helpful to review the evolution of changes to procedures for promotion to full professor that were approved by the Faculty in the spring of 2007. The Dean said that he would provide the members with the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion, which had been charged in 2006 with exploring and recommending whether the College should adopt more thorough and comprehensive procedures for evaluating candidates for promotion to full professor, in order to encourage further development of its tenured Faculty in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service to the College community. He said that he would also provide the members with relevant minutes of Committee of Six and Faculty Meetings.

The members returned to Professor Sarat's email, which was co-signed by Professors Epstein, Rager, and Reyes, in which he proposed that language be added to the *Faculty Handbook* about the process for making committee assignments. Professor Rockwell began the discussion by raising a question about the proposal that faculty members interested in serving on particular faculty committees should feel free to volunteer for service on them. He wondered whether there would be an expectation that colleagues who volunteered to serve on a particular committee would necessarily be nominated to serve on that committee. Some colleagues had volunteered to serve on committees this year, he noted, but the Committee had felt under no obligation to nominate those colleagues for those committees. Professor Barbezat said that he would prefer to discuss the structure of the process for making committee assignments in general terms, rather than considering the specific proposals found in the email message, some of which are already in place, he noted. He continued, commenting that the process for making assignments this year had been much improved over the year before, in his experience. This improvement, he feels, came out of a number of changes—starting the process earlier, for one. He said that it would be helpful to review what worked this year and what had not, in order to inform the process moving forward. Professor Goutte reiterated that it would be helpful for the members to have a committee history by individual and for the committee assignment process to

Amended May 3, 2010

begin as early in the spring as possible, noting that it would be essential for the Committee of Six election to be held as early as possible in order for this to occur, and that the Committee make nominations in stages, with those for the major committees (the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR), the College Council, the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA)) being made first. Professor Goutte noted that it would still be important for the Committee to receive all of the materials about all committees before the process of making assignments began. Professor Saxton reiterated that it would be preferable for the Committee to nominate one colleague for each available slot on committees. The Dean would then invite colleagues to serve and would report back to the members on which colleagues had accepted their assignments. Based on the results of the first round of invitations, the Committee would continue to make other assignments. Professor Rockwell proposed that, in an effort to avoid misunderstanding and ambiguity, the Committee should vote on each nominee that it puts forward. Such a procedure would also prevent more assertive members of the Committee from being able to push particular candidates for committees forward because less assertive colleagues who might be more prone to acquiesce would have to vote on their choices. Professor Barbezat supported voting for each nominee. He noted that doing so would slow the process down a bit, making it clearer. He added that the voting could be done for each individual committee assignment, with the names collected by one member of the Committee as they are suggested. Carefully setting policies for this selection process for future committees is a good idea, but getting the details right is important. He hoped the Committee would continue discussing the process with the intention of setting clear guidelines. Dean Call expressed support for having the process start earlier and for extending it over a period of weeks, commenting that doing so would likely make the process more iterative.

President Marx commented that he agrees that the process for making committee assignments is an important one, and he returned to the earlier questions about how to consider the particular questions and broader concerns about faculty governance as interrelated. Professor Saxton responded that it is her understanding that the process for making committee assignments is one of several elements of faculty governance about which there has been some concern. Professor Goutte commented that she had experienced the process of making committee assignments as being positive and fair, while she understood that this year's process represented an improvement over that of past years, given that it had begun earlier. Nonetheless, she suggested that further improvements are always possible and should be explored. She also noted that most of the specifics raised in the letter from Professor Sarat et al. described policies that were already in place this year, albeit not stipulated in the *Faculty Handbook*. Professor Rockwell viewed the Committee's discussion of the specifics of the committee assignment process as a way of providing a window into an aspect of faculty governance that occurs "behind closed doors" and, for that reason, may appear to be mysterious. Making the process less mysterious by outlining procedures should reassure faculty, he said. Professor Rockwell said that he does not feel that there is sufficient time remaining in this academic year to address larger questions about faculty governance. He suggested that such a conversation occur next year. Professor Barbezat said that he did not think there has been any call to re-imagine faculty governance or any broad concern with the notion of faculty governance *per se*. Rather, he believes that colleagues want more attention paid to the way minutes, committee memberships, and appointments are handled. This is what the Committee should be discussing now and in conversations next year. Professor Hall agreed, noting that making the procedures clear helps to

Amended May 3, 2010

eliminate mischief, perceived or otherwise. He agreed that the committee assignment process went well this year, largely because it was less rushed, and that it was much improved over last year. Professor Barbezat and Professor Hall thanked the Dean for responding to the Committee's request that committee assignments begin earlier and for providing necessary materials in a timely manner.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended May 10, 2010

The twenty-sixth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 8:15 A.M. on Monday, May 3, 2010. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with a discussion of a personnel matter.

The members had a brief discussion about the position of Lecturer at the College. The Dean said that he has tried to regularize this position (as part of a larger effort to move away from having long-term visiting appointments at the College), which is largely part of the teaching structure in foreign languages and arts departments, though there are a few Lecturer positions outside of those departments. Professor Rockwell asked if Lecturers are assigned to faculty committees. Dean Call said that some Lecturers have served on committees, and he feels that many colleagues in this position could be asked to serve on certain committees. Professor Goutte asked if Lecturers are eligible for sabbatic leaves. The Dean replied that Senior Lecturers are eligible for a single one-semester leave during the course of their careers at Amherst. He noted that, while Lecturers are often scholars in their fields, their primary role at the College is a teaching one, and their performance is evaluated on the basis of teaching alone. While he has worked toward regularizing these positions already, he noted that he would be open to further discussion about the roles and procedures surrounding the positions of Lecturer and Coach at the College.

The members then returned to the topic of committee assignments, and the Dean reported to the members about the responses that he had received to the invitations that he had extended on the Committee's behalf to colleagues to serve. He noted that, in this latest round of invitations, all colleagues who have responded thus far have agreed to accept their assignments.

In the course of discussing committee assignments, Professor Goutte asked that the next Committee of Six, during its anticipated review of faculty committees and their charges, consider the request of the previous Committee of Six that the number of faculty on the Health Professions Committee be reduced by one. The Dean agreed to inform the next Committee of Six of this proposal. The members discussed the establishment of a Copyright Task Force, as recommended by the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR). The Dean said that he is working on a draft charge to the group, which he plans to share with the Committee. The members agreed that Dean Call should invite four faculty members, including Associate Dean Courtright, the Librarian of the College (as Chair), another representative of the library, the Director of Information Technology, and an Academic Department Coordinator to serve. It was further agreed that Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel, should be of counsel to the task force.

The members next turned to a set of ad hoc and "Dean's committees," on which faculty serve but which are not standing committees of the Faculty and which do not appear in the *Faculty Handbook*. After the members discussed several possible nominations for these committees, President Marx asked for the Committee's views on the process of assigning faculty to committees that rarely ever meet. Professor Ciepiela responded that the committees are kept in place as a means of addressing questions or problems that may arise. The Dean pointed out that federal or Town of Amherst regulations require that certain procedures be followed in appointing members to certain committees, including the Institutional Review Board (IRB), the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), and the Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC). Professor Hall noted that, although some of these committees may ask little of their members in a typical year, many of the faculty members who serve have other committee assignments. After discussing a few more potential nominees, the Committee agreed that the process for assigning faculty to these committees need not have the same level of involvement on the part of the

Amended May 10, 2010

Committee of Six as the process that is used to make committee assignments to the standing committees of the Faculty. The members asked the Dean to invite colleagues to serve on these ad hoc committees or, in the case of some committees in which this is appropriate, to ask departments to assign representatives to serve. Dean Call said that he would be pleased to do so and that he would report back to the members on the make-up of the committees.

Continuing with the topic of committees, the Dean informed the members that he had received a request that an ad hoc advisory committee for the Center for Community Engagement (CCE) be formed. A group of colleagues now meets unofficially in this role and has requested that a more formalized structure be established. Professor Barbezat said that he would support establishing such a committee, and the other members agreed. The Dean said that he would report back to the committee on the membership of the new committee, which he anticipates should be formed by the end of the year.

The members next reviewed the second draft of the Committee's minutes of April 26 and, after agreeing on corrections to the minutes, voted to approve them. Since there were some delays in approving the minutes, the Dean said that he would inform the Faculty at the May 4 Faculty Meeting that questions about these minutes were welcome during the May 4, as well as the Commencement Faculty Meeting. The members agreed that reviewing the second draft of the minutes during a Committee meeting proved to be more efficient and easier for conversation than the usual manner of reviewing and approving the draft on a shared network drive, as they have been doing. The Committee members preferred to adopt this practice for the future, so as to enable face-to-face conversation about any issues that may need to be resolved and to approve corrections that had been made. Also in relation to the Faculty Meeting, Dean Call informed the members that he had received a request from Professor Sanchez-Eppler that one of her students be permitted to attend the May 4 Faculty Meeting. The student had attended the April 20 Faculty Meeting and wants to observe the continuation of the discussion begun then. The members agreed that the student could be invited to attend the May 4 meeting. Professor Hall said that he is concerned that photographs were being taken during the April 20 Faculty Meeting. The Dean agreed that photographs should not be taken, and that anyone that is seen doing so would be asked to stop.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Barbezat noted that, when the Dean described the process for creating the Committee's minutes the previous week, he had been prompted to consider the procedures that have been used. He suggested that for a number of reasons, including enhancing the work flow of all involved in the process, the Committee, the President, and the Dean should receive the first draft of the minutes at the same time, rather than continuing to have the President and the Dean do an initial reading. Dean Call responded that changing the procedures in this way could be considered, while noting that, he has found it valuable to review the minutes before they are distributed to the members for the purpose of fact-checking, to ensure that procedural descriptions are correct, and to ensure that the process of creating minutes is as efficient as possible. The Dean said that he views this process as his responsibility as the designated Secretary of the Committee of Six; he noted that he is ultimately responsible, at a formal level, for the minutes. Professor Barbezat suggested that the revision to the process that he had suggested be implemented. He noted that, since Professor Hall had expressed serious concern at the Faculty Meeting of April 20 about the Committee's minutes, he feels that the process should be re-considered. He noted that sharing the first draft of the minutes with everyone who is involved in the process at the same time and approving the minutes at meetings, instead of virtually, will slow down the process of minute approval and improve communication, both among the members and with the Faculty. He noted that the next Committee of Six could certainly reconsider any changes, but said that he would like to propose

Amended May 10, 2010

that these modifications be put in place for the remainder of this academic year. Professor Hall and Rockwell said that they agreed. Professor Saxton commented that revising the process in these ways could assuage any unease that some faculty members may have that the minutes may be tainted. Professor Ciepiela agreed. The members voted to have the first draft of the minutes shared with the Committee, the President, and the Dean simultaneously.

Continuing the conversation about the minutes, Professor Hall noted that the Committee sometimes discusses issues over email and expressed concern that the substance of such “conversations” may not be included in the public record of the Committee. He suggested that an abstract be created of email deliberations for inclusion in the minutes. Dean Call expressed concern that conversation could be constrained if everything that the members write to one another becomes part of the public record. Assistant Dean Tobin asked if the members wanted her to create abstracts of all email exchanges and to include them in the minutes. The Committee agreed that, if any member feels that a conversation that takes place over email should be included in the minutes, he or she would draft an abstract for inclusion in the minutes, which would be reviewed by the Committee in the regular fashion.

Professor Barbezat emphasized that, when some concerns are raised about procedures, it is important to be mindful of these concerns and to address them by making procedures as clear as possible. He said that much of the Committee’s success in clarifying the procedures for making committee assignments should be helpful to the future Committees of Six as a guide. Assistant Dean Tobin noted that the minutes are growing increasingly lengthy and have been shifting in format to favor exacting transcription over summation. She asked the members for guidance about when summary would be welcome. Professor Saxton noted that the length and detail of the minutes has become overwhelming at times. The Committee agreed that, when conversations at the meetings do not involve major divisions of opinion among those in attendance, an approach to the minutes that emphasizes summary is acceptable. The members further agreed that, to identify such moments clearly, the members would vote during their meetings to indicate when summary is appropriate.

Professor Hall asked the President if Trustees Howard Gardner and Diana Chapman Walsh plan to meet with the current Committee of Six or the newly elected Committee. President Marx said that, since the meeting would be after Commencement, it might be most effective for the Trustees to meet with the new Committee; since the Trustees have requested the meeting, he will ask them for their preference. Professor Hall noted that the current members make up the Committee of Six until June 30, 2010, and asked whether the meeting has been scheduled before or after this date. President Marx said that he is aware that Professor Gardner cannot be on campus for Commencement, which would have otherwise been a convenient time for the meeting. He said that it is his understanding that the meeting between these two Trustees and the Committee will be a follow-up to the conversation that the Committee had with the full Board and will include a discussion of the potential competing goals for the Committee of Six of exploring ideas and of full transparency. The meeting has not yet been set and will depend on the Trustees’ and faculty members’ schedules. It is possible that it could take place in June or July, or even in the fall. Professor Barbezat said that he thinks it would be helpful if the current members, who met with the Trustees in March, meet with them again to continue the dialogue. Professor Rockwell said that he will be out of town for a period during the summer and informed the President of his availability for the intended meeting.

Professor Rockwell requested that the remainder of the Committee’s agenda be discussed at the members’ next meeting. The Committee agreed. The Dean noted that the colleagues who have proposed the new Biochemistry/Biophysics major have offered to meet with the Committee to discuss any questions about the new major. The Committee agreed that those proposing the

Amended May 10, 2010

major had provided thorough written answers to the Committee's questions, and the members agreed to return to their discussion of the major, with the hope of forwarding the proposal to the Faculty, at their next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 A.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended May 17, 2010

The twenty-seventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 10:00 A.M. on Monday, May 10, 2010. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder, Recorder.

President Marx began the meeting by asking for the members' views on possible ways to support and structure efforts to foster and further diversity, inclusion, and community among faculty, staff, and students at the College. After experimenting with several models of meeting the College's needs in this area, President Marx has observed that faculty, students, and staff have distinct needs that might best be addressed through specialized approaches and structures. The President suggested that one possible structure might be to have someone within Human Resources be responsible for diversity and inclusion for the staff, someone within the Dean of Students office be responsible for diversity and inclusion issues involving students, and to appoint three faculty members (representing the three traditional divisions of the College) to work with departments on faculty searches, and other related issues, including target-of-opportunity hires. Those faculty members who would be invited to do this work could be paid a stipend. If this model were to be adopted, President Marx suggested that someone would need to coordinate all of these structures and efforts.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Rockwell asked if, in the past, the Affirmative Action Officer has been the point person for addressing grievances from faculty and staff. Dean Call responded that occupants of the Affirmative Action Officer position, as well as the Special Assistant to the President for Diversity and Inclusion position previously occupied by Professor Cobham-Sander, have worked with the Dean of the Faculty to address some complaints informally. The Dean noted that the Ombudsperson for the College serves the entire College community, listening to concerns and offering confidential advice, though this is a shared position and the Ombudsperson is only on campus one day a week. Professor Barbezat asked for clarification about the reporting line of the Ombudsperson position and whether all conversations with him/her, by statute, are kept confidential. President Marx said that this position reports to him and that there are safeguards in place so that it is independent of any office, including Human Resources, at the College. President Marx said that conversations with the Ombudsperson are kept confidential and noted that Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel, also works with members of the College community to investigate and resolve grievances informally.

Professor Barbezat expressed concern about the possibility of the person who provides legal support for the administration also being the person to whom members of the community would bring their grievances, which could represent a conflict of interest and lead to unfair practices. Professor Barbezat expressed support for having faculty work with departments on searches, while noting that specialized training would be required and that diversity and inclusion efforts on the faculty side would need to take a discipline-specific approach. President Marx noted that if a three-pronged structural approach is taken, the details associated with each part of the structure would need to be worked out carefully. Professor Saxton asked if the Committee on Adjudication could play a role on the faculty side. The Dean said that, if some faculty or student grievances/complaints cannot be addressed informally, they are considered by the Committee on Adjudication. Professor Barbezat suggested that, in designing any new structure, the roles of the individuals involved should be made clear. Professor Goutte asked if some responsibilities of the Director of Diversity and Inclusion might be shared among the Five

Amended May 17, 2010

Colleges, particularly with the university, which may have more resources in this area. President Marx said that he has explored this approach in the past, but that he would consult with the UMass chancellor to determine if there might be interest in sharing any resources and responsibilities.

Continuing his remarks, the President noted that at the Commencement meeting of the Board, the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) would meet with the budget and finance committee of the Board to discuss the committee's report on the implementation of the recommendations of the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC) and the CPR's own recommendations. In addition, Bryn Geffert, the new Librarian of the College, would be introduced to the Trustees and would meet with them. The Committee next reviewed the final draft minutes of May 3, 2010, and, after making some corrections, voted to approve them. Dean Call wondered whether the ex officio members of the Committee of Six should vote on the minutes, since their comments were included in the minutes. He reminded the members that, as the Committee's secretary, he is ultimately responsible for the minutes. The members then reviewed two course proposals and voted six to zero in favor to forward them to the Faculty. The members turned to personnel matters.

Dean Call thanked the Committee and noted that he would discuss recommendations for the reappointment of coaches at the next meeting. President Marx asked if it would be possible, to inform discussion, to gather longitudinal information about the disciplinary records and academic performance of students on the teams of the coaches who would be discussed.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Barbezat extended his thanks and congratulations to the administration for the manner in which Amherst has weathered last year's financial "shock." He noted that Amherst—including its faculty, students, and staff—has done extraordinarily well in comparison to other institutions. The other members agreed and applauded. The President and the Dean thanked Professor Barbezat and the other members for the sentiment expressed.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Goutte commented that the handling of questions posed to the Committee of Six at the most recent Faculty Meeting had gone more smoothly, she felt, and that it appeared to be effective to have the Committee of Six sit together to provide responses to colleagues' questions. The members then returned to the topic of committee assignments, reviewing nominations for a fourth faculty member who would be added to the slate of nominations for the CPR, in accordance with the Faculty's recent revision of the committee's charge. The members voted five in favor, with one abstention, to nominate a colleague. In answer to a question posed previously about eligibility to serve on the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), the Dean reviewed the *Faculty Handbook* language on this topic. He noted that, according to handbook, "All members of the Faculty are eligible to serve on the Committee on Educational Policy, with the same exceptions as govern eligibility for the Committee of Six." (IV.,S., 1., i.). He then noted the following relevant *Faculty Handbook* language (IV.,S., 1., a.) for the members' information.

All professors, associate professors, and assistant professors appointed to regular, part-time or part-time tenure-track positions are eligible to serve on the Committee of Six, except: 1) the President and the Dean of the Faculty; 2) those newly appointed during their first year at Amherst; 3) those who will not be at Amherst for one or both

Amended May 17, 2010

semesters of the year following the election; 4) members of the Committee on Educational Policy; 5) members of the College Council; 6) retiring members of the Committee on Educational Policy and the College Council (who are also ineligible for one year for election or re-election to either of these committees); 7) retiring members of the Committee of Six and those who retired from it in the previous three years (i.e., retiring members cannot be reelected for four years); 8) those who have served three or more terms on the Committee of Six and then exercise the option of taking their names off the ballot each year by contacting the Dean of the Faculty's Office before the election begins; 9) and under extraordinary personal circumstances, after petitioning the President or the Dean of the Faculty, those individuals for whom service on the Committee would be a particular hardship.

The Dean also noted, in response to the question of whether colleagues who have exemptions from serving on particular committees because of prior service may choose to do so if they wish, that colleagues who have the exemptions ((1)-(7) above) are “ineligible” to serve, even if they wish to do so, whereas exemptions (8) and (9) are clearly indicated as a faculty member’s options.

In setting the Faculty Meeting agenda for the May 21 meeting, the members discussed the parliamentary procedures that would be employed should nominations come forward from the floor for substitutions for the nominees that appear on the ballot for committees forwarded to the Faculty by the Committee of Six. It was noted that, while substitutions have not been made in the past, it is theoretically possible for the Faculty to do so, so that the President should be prepared to respond to any motions that might be made. The Committee agreed that, if this scenario arises, it will be essential that invidious comparisons not be made among colleagues in the course of making substitutions. Professor Hall said that, should this occasion arise, it would be important for the President, as chair, to ensure, as a point of order, that the boundaries of decorum are enforced assiduously, (as outlined in *Robert's Rules*, section 43). The Committee agreed that it would be helpful to remind the Faculty of the prescribed membership criteria, which are described in the *Faculty Handbook*, for each committee on the ballot. President Marx said that he would also consult with the Parliamentarian, Professor L. McGeoch, about the issues raised. Professor Ciepiela reminded the Committee that Professor Sarat had requested that the members discuss the procedures that they had followed when nominating colleagues to serve on committees, and the members agreed to discuss this topic further at their next meeting. The Committee noted that the agenda for the Commencement Faculty Meeting is very full, but that it is traditional for the standing committees to give their annual reports at that meeting. The members agreed that, if time does not permit these reports, they will be included on the agenda of the first Faculty Meeting in the fall. The Dean said that he would be pleased to offer the invitations. President Marx suggested that, in lieu of oral reports, chairs of committees could be asked to submit written reports. The other members felt that committee chairs might be too pressed for time to do so at this time of year.

The members agreed to discuss the responses ([appended via link](#)) that they had received from the proposers of the new Biochemistry/Biophysics major, in response to the Committee’s questions about the proposal. Professor Ciepiela expressed thanks for the proposers’ careful

Amended May 17, 2010

consideration of the issues raised by the Committee of Six and for their thorough, thoughtful response to the questions posed, which she noted would be timely and useful for the Faculty. The other members agreed that the response was exemplary. After some discussion, the members voted six to zero in favor of the substance of the proposal for the new major and six to zero in favor of forwarding the proposal to the Faculty. The members then reviewed the draft Faculty Meeting agenda for the Commencement Meeting of May 20, made some adjustments, and voted six to zero in favor of forwarding the agenda to the Faculty.

The Dean asked if the Committee wished to discuss the proposal, letters, and report of the Committee on International Education ([appended via link](#)). Professor Rockwell noted that the report might not require discussion, as it is advisory to the administration, provides information, and does not require a vote of the Faculty. He suggested that the letters and report be appended to the Committee's minutes to inform the Faculty. Professor Hall said that he wishes to discuss the report at the Committee's next meeting, and the other members agreed to do so. President Marx noted that the Dean and he would be discussing over the summer the recommendation that the position of Director of International Experience be moved to the Dean of Faculty's office. While he is supportive of the proposal, President Marx expressed some concern at a structural level about the burden that might be placed on the Dean of the Faculty by adding additional direct reports.

The members next reviewed the theses and transcripts of students recommended by their departments for a summa cum laude degree and having an overall grade point average in the top 25 percent of the graduating class. After a discussion of the theses and the departmental statements, the members agreed to vote at their next meeting on forwarding them to the Faculty. Professor Hall suggested that the theses, for the sake of the convenience of the Committee, should, perhaps, be submitted in an electronic form next year. The members next considered the procedures that they would employ to select the recipient of the new Mellon thesis prize. The Committee agreed to read all of the departmental recommendations for the seven nominated theses and to rank order the thesis writers, based on the potential for the work to be published. Following this first stage, the entire Committee would read the two theses that received the highest rankings. At the end of the meeting, with no time remaining for discussion, the Dean distributed for the members' review a draft of a charge for the Copyright, Reserves, and Coursepack Task Force, which the Committee agreed to discuss at their final meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty

Amended June 11, 2010

The twenty-eighth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2009-2010 was called to order by Dean Call in the President's office at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, May 17, 2010. Present were Professors Barbezat, Ciepiela, Goutte, David Hall, Rockwell, and Saxton, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder, Recorder. President Marx, who was traveling for the College, was absent.

The members reviewed the final draft minutes of May 10, 2010, and voted six to zero in favor of approving them. Since President Marx had not yet had the opportunity to review those minutes, it was agreed that, if he wished to make any changes to them, the corrections would be shared with the members and they could take another vote, if necessary. The Committee then turned briefly to a personnel matter.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the members that the nominee for the fourth faculty slot on the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) had accepted the Committee's invitation to serve. The members next discussed a letter ([appended via link](#)) from Professor Dumm and related issues that had been raised at the May 4 Faculty Meeting regarding the revision process and accuracy of the Faculty Meeting minutes. In his letter, Professor Dumm requested that the Committee of Six explore the feasibility of tape-recording Faculty Meetings and then making the minutes available to colleagues via the College's Web site. Professor Barbezat commented that, in recent discussions, the distinction between minutes and a transcript has sometimes been lost. He said that he agreed with Professor Dumm that an important aspect of the minutes are their accuracy as a sum and substance. He said that he would support having Faculty Meetings taped as a means of settling disputes concerning the sum and substance of the minutes. He envisioned a process in which a colleague, after reviewing the written record of the meeting, could consult with the Faculty Meeting recorder, who would review the recording of the meeting, if the professor felt that his or her remarks had been recorded inaccurately. Having a recording would be a useful tool for handling such situations, Professor Barbezat argued. Professor Saxton disagreed and expressed the view that taping Faculty Meetings could have a chilling effect on colleagues' willingness to speak, discouraging participation in discussion and creating an unwelcoming atmosphere. She expressed concern that tape-recording the meetings could be construed as a form of surveillance. Professor Hall suggested another approach might be not to tape-record the meetings, but to have a stenographer create a full written transcript of the proceedings, as is done, for example, in the Supreme Court. The transcript need not be distributed, he said, but could be used to settle questions of accuracy in the minutes, as Professor Barbezat had described. Professor Ciepiela expressed support for the idea of tape-recording the meetings and for consulting this record in the event of questions about comments made at Faculty Meetings. She expressed concern about the cost of using a stenographer.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Barbezat noted that small, inexpensive tape recorders would provide excellent recordings. Professor Goutte shared information about special "Smart Pens" technology that enable electronic audio recording that is directly linked to the minuter's hand notes. Professor Goutte felt that recording meetings could be most useful for minuting accuracy, rather than for the permanent record, but that this would be difficult to distinguish; for example, she asked if those missing a Faculty Meeting should be permitted to listen to recordings of the meetings. The Committee did not think that doing so should be allowed, and the members agreed that it would be best if any recordings that were made were used only for fact-checking purposes. Professor Barbezat argued that, if a recording were made,

Amended June 11, 2010

it should be destroyed after the minutes are approved. Professor Rockwell said that the question of whether to tape-record Faculty Meetings is up to the Faculty to decide. He suggested that, in the fall, the Faculty should be asked to consider the preferred method of producing Faculty minutes. The question of the best procedures for revising minuted comments that a colleague might feel are recorded inaccurately could be part of this larger conversation about Faculty Meeting proceedings, he noted. In regard to correcting comments in the Faculty Meeting minutes, Professor Hall asked who should “own” statements that are made. He expressed the view that the assembly owns the minutes, and that faculty should not be able to amend their own or others’ comments in ways that are not faithful to what was actually said. He noted that sometimes those listening to remarks may remember them more faithfully than those who actually make them. Professor Rockwell agreed that the practice of allowing colleagues to amend their own words is not in keeping with the view that the official record of a meeting’s comments belong to the collective. He pointed out that, while the current procedure may lead to awkward moments, the practice of correcting one’s own statements is one of the Amherst Faculty’s practices. Professor Rockwell agreed that having a recording of the meeting could be helpful for the recorder who is taking the minutes of Faculty Meetings as a record to which he or she could refer. Professor Hall noted that *Robert’s Rules of Order* mentions that notes of meetings should be kept as a record until minutes are approved, and he suggested that a recording could be treated in the same way. The members agreed that the next Committee of Six could take up this issue in the fall and make a proposal that could be brought before the Faculty, or that Professor Dumm or others might choose to make a proposal to the Committee of Six, which would then be forwarded to the Faculty. The members themselves were not in favor of making a tape-recording of Faculty Meetings available on the College’s Web site.

The Committee next discussed a letter ([appended via link](#)) sent to the members by four colleagues in the Department of Asian Languages and Civilizations about the provisions made for Arabic instruction at the College for the next academic year. Dean Call said that he was appreciative of these colleagues’ initiative in writing to the Committee about this issue and noted that he had already had discussion with Professor Ringer about meeting the needs of Arabic instruction, through efforts coordinated among the Five Colleges and the Five College Center for the Study of World Languages. Dean Call noted the high demand for Arabic instructors and the shortage of qualified instructors. He said that he would be pleased to support having an additional Arabic course at Amherst, while pointing out that the current instructor, who is held in high regard, must divide her teaching between Amherst and Smith next year; Lecturers, he said, have a different teaching load at Smith than they do at Amherst, which can make coordination between the two institutions difficult. Dean Call commented that there is an expectation, at present, that Amherst students may have to travel to another campus for some Arabic classes, at present second-year Arabic. Professor Rockwell, while acknowledging that this issue is outside the purview of the Committee of Six, said that the interest in studying Arabic has been growing at an impressive rate and expressed hope that the Dean would be able to provide the resources necessary to continue to encourage the study of the language at the College. Dean Call said that he would continue to support, as much as is possible, robust resources for Arabic instruction at the College.

Conversation turned to the first Faculty Meeting in the fall, which, it was agreed, need not be held on Labor Day unless additional new course proposals must be approved. If the meeting is held on Labor Day, Professors Hall and Rockwell said that they would prefer not to

Amended June 11, 2010

have a Faculty Meeting in Johnson Chapel immediately after the Convocation ceremony, as was done once before, because they felt that having colleagues remain in their seats while students left the building affected the quality of the Convocation experience. In the event that a Faculty Meeting needs to be held on Labor Day, the members decided to try a new procedure to retain both the integrity of the Convocation ceremony, while accomplishing the business of approving courses most conveniently. On Labor Day evening, the Faculty will be asked to gather in Cole Assembly Room in academic regalia fifteen or twenty minutes before Convocation for the purpose of voting on the proposals, with no other business. The Faculty will then process to Johnson Chapel for Convocation, which will be held at 7:30 P.M., as is traditional. The members then turned to a personnel matter.

The Dean next presented nominations for endowed professorships. The next step will be for the President to recommend these professorships to the Board, Dean Call noted. Professor Rockwell asked what criteria are used to award named professorships. Dean Call responded that, when making nominations for professorships, he and one of his Associate Deans review individuals' overall contributions to the College, with an emphasis on scholarship and with departmental considerations in mind. However, many professorships are discipline-specific or have other criteria that must be taken into account. At times, there might be too many or no qualified individuals who meet the criteria for a particular professorship. In addition, Advancement may suggest that particular professorships be filled if they are vacant and a living donor is involved. Dean Call said that he brings forward a list of suggestions for professorships to the President, and that, after consultation with the Committee of Six, a final list of colleagues who will be nominated for professorships is completed for the Board's approval. The Committee then turned to personnel matters.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Goutte suggested that, to assist the Committee of Six in its work each year, departments be provided with more explicit instructions about submitting recommendations for summa cum laude. She proposed that the following language be added to the letter from the Registrar that solicits such departmental recommendations: "The departmental letter should make clear why the thesis deserves more than high praise from the College. The members of the Committee of Six rely heavily on their colleagues in the given fields to place the body of work in perspective and to explain why the thesis is deserving of the College's highest praise." The members agreed that adding this language would be helpful and noted that most departments did provide this information within their recommendation letters this year. The new language, they agreed, would not represent a change of any kind, but would clarify expectations that are already in place. Professor Goutte next asked about the number of first-year students expected to enroll at Amherst this fall. The Dean said that, if there is no "melt" over the summer (e.g., students choosing to defer their admission to Amherst for a year or choosing to enroll at another institution after being taken off that institution's wait list), five hundred students will be expected. Melt may result in a class of 485 or so, but the actual number is hard to predict. The target for the class had been 465 students, Dean Call said, but the yield in every subcategory of the admitted student pool was higher than expected. Professor Goutte asked if this is the second year that over-enrollment has occurred. Dean Call replied in the affirmative, while noting that the recommendation of the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC) was to increase the student body by one hundred students over four years by adding twenty-five students per year, which results in the target of 465 for the first-year class.

Amended June 11, 2010

The members then reviewed proposals for new courses and voted six to zero in favor of forwarding them to the Faculty. The members also voted unanimously to forward to the Faculty recommendations by departments for summa cum laude degrees for students who also have an overall grade point average in the top 25 percent of the graduating class. The Committee then approved the nominee for the Woods-Travis Prize and selected the winner of the new Mellon Senior Thesis Prize.

Dean Call next asked the Committee for suggestions of colleagues who might serve on the Advisory Committee for the Center for Community Engagement and noted that Professor Bumiller has agreed to serve as the Faculty Advisor to the Center. The Dean informed the members that he had spent the previous Thursday afternoon in the Hampshire County Jail, where he had observed Professor Bumiller's Regulating Citizenship class, which was made up of both Amherst students and incarcerated individuals; he had been very impressed with the students' projects and their rapport, he said. Dean Call next asked the members for their response to the draft letter to departments and candidates regarding promotion to full professor. Professor Rockwell said that the letter was entirely appropriate, and Professor Saxton said that it was entirely consistent with official legislation. The Committee then voted unanimously to approve the letter. The Committee agreed that another Committee of Six might wish to return to the topic of promotion procedures in the future.

The meeting ended with a discussion of issues relating to study abroad raised by the proposal, letters, and report ([appended via link](#)) of the Committee on International Education. Professor Rockwell expressed support for the committee's proposal that the reporting line of the Director of International Experience be moved from the Dean of Students to the Dean of the Faculty. He noted that the French department has advocated for this structure for some time and continues to be in favor of it. Professor Barbezat said that he would also support this shift. In another matter relating to study abroad, Professor Rockwell noted that the assertion that is made regularly that significantly more students study abroad during the spring semester than in the fall semester is not true. He pointed out that there was very little difference in the number of students studying abroad in the fall and spring in 2006-2007, that slightly more students studied abroad in the fall than in the spring during 2007-2008, and that slightly more students studied abroad in the spring than fall in 2008-2009. He noted that the number of vacant beds at the College in the spring arises not from a study abroad imbalance, but from having some students graduate after completing the fall semester. The members had a brief discussion about possible advantages of admitting students for the spring semester. The Committee agreed that there would be curricular difficulties that would result from such a system, particularly for students who wished to pursue the sciences and that there could be disadvantages socially for students as well.

Returning to the topic of moving the reporting line of the Director of International Experience to the Dean of the Faculty, Professor Ciepiela asked what the chances were that this change would be made, given information supplied earlier about how burdened the Dean's office is. Noting that study abroad should be viewed as an academic enterprise, the Dean said that he would be pleased to welcome this position to his office and that, in the event that this change is made, he would ask Dean Lieber to work with Ms. Behrens in partnership with the Dean of Students office. Professor Rockwell suggested that it would be advantageous for the position to be devoted to study abroad on a full-time basis. At present, one quarter of the position is dedicated to other responsibilities in the Dean of Students office and the Career Center and Ms.

Amended June 11, 2010

Behrens does not have the time to make visits to study abroad programs as a result. Professor Rockwell said that it is essential that she make such visits to ensure the proper level of comfort and security for Amherst students who study abroad and to avoid creating the impression that Amherst is not monitoring the details of the programs to which it sends its students. Students who study abroad should be ensured of high quality instruction and an appropriate residential experience, he said. At present, representatives of the College do not regularly visit study abroad programs, and Amherst must rely on student evaluations, word of mouth, and the views of study abroad directors at other schools to assess programs. Having Amherst's study abroad director visit programs would be preferable to the current situation and would likely not be a major expense, as many study abroad programs provide support for such trips.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Ciepiela noted that having more information about study abroad programs would aid faculty who advise students about study abroad. Professor Rockwell agreed and commented that parents who are reluctant to allow their children to study in non-traditional locations would be reassured if College officials have a personal knowledge of particular programs and have seen locations first-hand. Certainly, in his opinion, they would be more likely to allow their children to participate in such programs. The Committee discussed the fact that Amherst has a greater number of approved study abroad programs than many other schools. The Dean asked if it might be preferable to have fewer approved programs but to have closer contact with the programs that are approved. Professor Ciepiela agreed that this approach would be preferable. She noted that, for many years, the College has relied mainly on student reports to decide whether to approve programs. Once a program is approved, it is rarely dropped, she noted. The Dean said that moving the position of Director of International Experience would likely prompt a larger discussion about study abroad. He noted, however, that having the director focus on study abroad on a full-time basis would represent a loss to the Dean of Students office that would have to be considered. Professor Ciepiela commented that the comparative information included in the report about the resources provided at other schools for study abroad argues for a full-time position. Professor Rockwell concluded the conversation by pointing out that Amherst is dedicated to providing stellar educational opportunities in every area; if Amherst is going to meet that standard for study abroad, some of the above mentioned reforms would be advisable. He added that the College should not drop programs from its approved list only when there have been numerous negative reports about students' experiences there; each of those students only has the opportunity to go on a program once. Instead, Amherst should assess programs in part through site visits and make determinations on a regular basis.

The meeting concluded with the Dean thanking the members for their excellent work throughout the year.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call
Dean of the Faculty