

Amended September 1, 2011

The first meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by Greg Call, Dean of the Faculty and Acting President (who is serving in this latter role until incoming President Biddy Martin assumes the presidency in late-August), in his office at 2:00 P.M. on Thursday, July 28, 2011. Present were Professors Basu (via telephone), Ferguson (via telephone), Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Dean Call opened the meeting by welcoming new and returning members of the Committee of Six and then discussed with the Committee the process for reviewing Ms. Martin's tenure case. The new president has indicated that she wishes to stand for tenure in the Department of German and the Department of Women's and Gender Studies (WAGS), Dean Call informed the members. The Dean reviewed with the Committee past practices, which have varied over the years, that have been employed for reviewing the tenure cases of Amherst presidents and shared the procedures that would be followed for Ms. Martin's case. He noted that he had contacted the chairs of the two departments, Professors Rogowski (German) and Barale (WAGS), who have agreed, with pleasure, to participate in the tenure process. The Dean said that the same procedures that are used for considering any appointment with tenure would be followed; the Committee of Six would be asked to nominate four full professors to serve on an ad hoc tenure review committee (two from the departments (German and WAGS in this case), and two from outside both departments). The ad hoc committee would review the case and write a letter of recommendation to the Committee of Six. In addition, each member of the ad hoc committee would write an individual colleague letter. The senior members of the two departments would also be asked to collaborate on department letters and submit individual colleague letters—these documents would be provided first to the ad hoc committee, and then, along with the ad hoc committee's recommendation, would be provided to the Committee of Six. The members turned to a personnel matter.

Dean Call next discussed with the Committee the procedures that are being developed for the search for the College's next leader of the Department of Information Technology (IT) and asked for the members' feedback. Dean Call explained that a good deal of conversation, informed by the report of the external team that had reviewed the Department of IT last spring, has already taken place about the position of the head of IT. The review team had recommended that the position, formerly called the Director of Information Technology, be re-named Chief Information Officer (CIO) and re-structured to report directly to the President as a member of the Senior Staff. Dean Call said that Ms. Martin and the Senior Staff unanimously support this recommendation, recognizing the important role that technology plays across the College. He informed the members that Opus Search Partners, a Philadelphia-based firm specializing in searches for leadership positions within academia and other sectors, has been engaged for the search. Continuing the conversation about the search, Dean Call noted that, typically, in an effort to be fully representative, a search committee for a position that touches on the work of the entire campus, as this one does, would be quite large. He said that, when he and colleagues began to envision such a committee, they had felt that it could easily become unwieldy. At the same time, it was agreed that ensuring broad consultation and participation in the search process would be essential to finding the right person for this important position at the College. As a result of discussions of these issues, a proposal for a search model has emerged in which a coordinating committee of six or seven members, drawing on the expertise of a team of search consultants, would be responsible for planning and administering the search, and in working with the Amherst community to define the position and to evaluate the candidates who seek it. The Committee expressed support for such a model and, after some discussion, suggested that the body have the following membership: Dean of the Faculty Greg Call, who would chair the

Amended September 1, 2011

committee; Bryn Geffert, Librarian of the College; David Hamilton, Director of Web Services; Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research and Planning; Jill Miller, Associate Professor of Biology and a member of the Faculty Computing Committee; and Katie O'Hara Edwards '87, Director of Advancement Operations. It was also agreed that consideration should be given to adding a student or recent alumnus to the Coordinating Committee. The members noted that the Coordinating Committee should be charged with ensuring the participation of a full range of campus constituencies, with the goal of informing the search process most substantively. Among the constituencies from which the Coordinating Committee and search firm will seek involvement and input would be the following departments, offices, and groups: the Faculty Computing Committee (and through its members, the Faculty and Academic Department Coordinators) and the Student Computing Committee (and through its members, the student body); the offices of Admission, the Dean of Students, the Dean of the Faculty, the Treasurer, Public Affairs, the Registrar, and the President; the Library, Center for Community Engagement, and Career Center; and the Departments of Information Technology, Advancement (including Alumni and Parent Programs), Facilities, Human Resources, and Athletics. The Coordinating Committee will advise the search firm on how best to gather input from each of these groups. The committee will also serve as the liaison between the campus and Opus Search Partners.

Turning to the topic of the title for the position, Professor Ratner asked what the reasoning had been for suggesting that it be changed from Director of Information Technology to Chief Information Officer. Dean Call responded that the CIO title appears to signal most effectively the envisioned campus-wide role of the position and that it would be a presidential report. Other institutions of higher learning commonly use this title for the leader of IT, he noted, and asked if the members would have concerns about adopting this name at Amherst. Professors Ratner, Hewitt, and Umphrey, while expressing some hesitation about the more corporate associations that the CIO title might evoke and a preference for the title of Director of Information Technology, also noted that it would be important to select the title that would draw the most highly qualified pool of applicants for the position and that the title could signal the responsibilities and stature that the position would carry. Professor Loinaz asked if the external review team had offered a lengthy rationale for the title change, and Dean Call said that the team had focused on the issue of how best to convey the nature of the position through the title and had felt that CIO would be most effective in this regard. Several members commented that it would be important not to adopt a title that would give the impression that IT and the library would be merged, if indeed that is not the intention. Dean Call said that there are no plans to merge IT and the library, and he noted that one of the tasks of the Coordinating Committee would be to define the position of leader of IT, including the title. The Committee also recommended that the report of the external review team be made available to the Coordinating Committee in order to inform the search. Professor Loinaz asked if the report would be shared with the College community, and Dean Call said that plans are in place to share a summary of the report of the external review team. He thanked the members for their advice and turned to the topic of events planned for Labor Day.

Dean Call noted that the College has experimented with different scheduling models for Labor Day events in recent years, with a goal of freeing up most of Labor Day by foregoing the former tradition of a Labor Day morning Faculty Meeting (which made sense when faculty had meetings with first-year advisees that afternoon). This year, he had proposed to Ms. Martin that, if the Committee agreed, a short Faculty Meeting be held at 5 P.M. in the Cole Assembly Room and followed by a light supper (sandwiches and other items that can be eaten while standing) in Converse lobby. The expectation would be that the Faculty Meeting would be less than an hour

Amended September 1, 2011

and that the supper would conclude by 7 P.M., giving everyone time to dress in regalia for Convocation, which would be held at its usual time of 7:30 P.M. (in Johnson Chapel). The Dean said that, under this plan, Ms. Martin would be able to have some time with the Faculty before her first formal event, Convocation. The Committee expressed support for the proposed plan and then reviewed the draft Faculty Meeting Agenda for the Labor Day meeting. Professor Hewitt suggested that, when names are called during the traditional welcome of new members of the Faculty, faculty members returning from sabbatic leaves and leaves of absence, visitors, fellows, new administrators, and administrators in new positions, individuals be asked to stand to be recognized. Dean Call agreed to try this procedure. The members then voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the agenda to the Faculty.

Professor Loinaz raised the possibility of having a discussion at a future Committee of Six meeting about the structure of Faculty Meetings and how they are conducted. A consideration of this issue would be timely during this upcoming transition in the presidency and would represent a continuation of conversations that the Committee had had last year about faculty governance. Professor Umphrey expressed the view that the members should engage in a discussion of this issue with the incoming president and should explore models of how Faculty Meetings are run at peer institutions to inform the conversation. The other members agreed. The Dean said that he would include this item on a future Committee of Six agenda. On a scheduling note, Dean Call proposed that the Committee's next meeting be on Monday, September 12, and the members agreed on this date and on a time of 3:30 P.M.

Dean Call next informed the members about which departments have been authorized to conduct faculty searches during this academic year. They are Anthropology-Sociology (one position in Anthropology and one position in Sociology), Biology, Economics, English (two positions), Asian Languages and Civilizations and History (a joint appointment shared between the two departments), Political Science (two positions), Psychology, Spanish, and Theater and Dance (a joint appointment shared equally with Mount Holyoke and based at Amherst). More information about the positions can be found at [https://www.amherst.edu/academiclife/dean\\_faculty/employment](https://www.amherst.edu/academiclife/dean_faculty/employment). There were sixteen FTE requests last year, the Dean noted, and all but one of the FTEs are replacements. As anticipated because of the demographic make-up of the Faculty, faculty members have been opting for retirement and phased retirement in relatively high numbers of late. Professor Umphrey asked if the FTE count will go up as a result of the anticipated new hires. Dean Call said that, while the count is going up very slowly because new hires are nearly matched by retirements, the teaching force is larger than in years past, as colleagues on phased retirement continue to teach two courses a year. Phased retirement has become a very popular option, he commented. These colleagues may also continue to serve on committees and to provide other forms of service to their departments and the College.

In regard to the faculty searches, Professor Umphrey asked how priorities and procedures surrounding the diversification of the Faculty will be communicated to departments that are conducting searches. The Dean said that he would work with departments individually to explore ways to attract the most diverse pools of candidates for faculty positions and the best approaches to take when outstanding candidates are identified. For example, he noted that, at times, it may be possible to make more than one hire from an individual search (hiring a second colleague, for example, who does not meet the precise needs of the authorized search but would be able to contribute in important ways to the department, especially if the candidate could meet other near-term needs of the department). Making a second hire from an individual search requires consulting with the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and asking for its recommendation on a second FTE allocation to the department. Professor Basu proposed that the Committee have

Amended September 1, 2011

a discussion early in the semester about target-of-opportunity hiring at the College. The members and the Dean agreed, and the Committee felt that it would be informative to have Legal and Administrative Counsel Paul Murphy, who has served as Special Assistant to the President for Diversity, participate in such a meeting.

Professor Loinaz next asked whether there is any sense that changes will be made to the College's faculty housing policy. He noted that President Marx had commented on a number of occasions that, while he had encouraged the development of proposals to improve the policy, no proposals had been brought forward. Dean Call responded that some conversations about this issue have taken place within the Housing Committee and the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) in recent years, and he said that faculty housing will be an ongoing topic of discussion. Professor Ratner commented that it would appear that plans to hire larger numbers of new faculty, many with young families, in the coming years will put additional strains on the housing system. Affordable College housing is particularly advantageous to such individuals. Dean Call agreed that faculty housing will be a significant issue in the coming years. The members decided to place the topic of faculty housing on its agenda. Professor Loinaz said that he is also interested in the issue of childcare for College faculty and staff and wondered about the status of a study that is being conducted to explore this topic. Dean Call responded that Marian Matheson has consulted with the CPR and solicited feedback from faculty and staff about their childcare needs and experiences. She is in the process of compiling and summarizing the results of several surveys and interviews and will soon share the information that she has gathered with him and Ms. Martin.

The meeting concluded with a question posed by Professor Umphrey, who asked Dean Call whether the gender identity and expression non-discrimination policy drafted last year had been brought to the Trustees at last spring's Commencement meeting. The Dean asked Assistant Dean Tobin to check with Mr. Murphy about this matter. (Mr. Murphy later reported that such a policy had indeed been brought to the Board at its meeting last May; some Trustees had wanted more information before voting on the proposed policy. He said that plans are in place to bring the proposal back to the Board at its next meeting.)

Before adjourning, the members extended a round of applause and expressed appreciation to Dean Call for his service as acting president.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Acting President and Dean of the Faculty

Amended September 26, 2011

The second meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, September 12, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Martin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with “Announcements from the Dean.” The Dean informed the Committee that Janet Tobin, Assistant Dean of the Faculty, will continue to serve as the Recorder of Committee of Six minutes and that Nancy Ratner, Associate Dean of Admission and Researcher for Academic Projects, will serve as the Recorder of the Faculty Meeting minutes. He turned briefly to a personnel matter. Dean Call next informed the members that President Martin’s inauguration is now set for the weekend of October 15, with the ceremony planned for Sunday, October 16, at 10 A.M., on the main quadrangle. He said that the Inauguration Planning Committee, of which he is a member, has begun meeting to shape what promises to be an exciting weekend of celebratory events.

Continuing his announcements, the Dean noted that the membership of the Coordinating Committee for the search for Amherst’s next IT Leader has been finalized. He thanked the members for their advice on the make-up of the committee and confirmed that he will chair the committee and that Mason Bradbury ’10; Bryn Geffert, Librarian of the College; David Hamilton, Director of Web Services; Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research and Planning; Jill Miller, Associate Professor of Biology and member of the Faculty Computing Committee; and Katie O’Hara Edwards ’87, Director of Advancement Operations, will serve. He then turned briefly to a committee nomination. The Dean next asked whether the College’s new Director of Human Resources, Maria-Judith Rodriguez, should be introduced to the Faculty at its next meeting, as Hurricane Irene had prevented Ms. Rodriguez from attending the Labor Day Faculty meeting. The members agreed that it would be desirable for the introduction to take place at the Faculty’s next meeting.

Continuing with his announcements, Dean Call expressed his thanks and admiration for remarks made by President Martin and Paul Sorrentino, Director of Religious Life, at the September 11 interfaith gathering held on Memorial Hill last Sunday, in honor of the tenth anniversary of the September 11 attacks. President Martin commented that she had been moved by the ceremony as well.

Under “Announcements from the President,” President Martin informed the members that she is looking forward to the October 14-16 Board of Trustees meeting and to the inauguration. She asked the members to please share with her suggestions for the inauguration. The President said that she expects that the Trustees’ agenda would include discussion of the science center project and remarked that she looks forward to gathering the Faculty’s views on the project. The Dean noted that, over the summer, the Trustees reviewed all aspects of the science center project—focusing on building systems, costs, and meeting the Faculty’s programmatic goals. He said that the architectural firms of Behnisch Architekten and Payette would be on campus beginning this week to meet with science center departments to present refined plans and receive feedback. In early-October, the architects will hold all-campus meetings to discuss the shape and progress of the project. Professor Ratner said that he and his departmental colleagues would be interested in sharing their reactions with the President, following the architects’ meetings. Professor Loinaz said that the Department of Physics looks forward to discussing the project with President Martin, as well.

Continuing her remarks and comments about her early days on campus, the President noted that she had enjoyed a comprehensive tour of the campus recently, which had been conducted by a group of students; she also conveyed how impressed she had been with the student research that was presented at the Summer Science research poster session held on September 9, which

Amended September 26, 2011

she had been pleased to attend, as had the Dean. Professor Ratner thanked the President and the Dean for coming to the event, noting that their presence had been particularly meaningful for students. President Martin next informed the members of her plans to visit academic departments, beginning this week, and said that she looks forward to meeting colleagues. The Committee turned briefly to a personnel matter.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Loinaz asked about the status of the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising, which the Committee of Six had charged in March 2011 to examine, in a broad sense, the issue of advising, at the College. Dean Call responded that the ad hoc committee had been constituted over the past several weeks and that Professors O’Hara (Dean of New Students) and Sarat have agreed to serve as co-chairs. The other members are Professors Rosalina de la Carrera and David Hall, Dean of Academic Support and Student Research Ben Lieber, and Assistant Dean of Students and Director of International Experience Janna Behrens. Ms. Ratner, who, through her work as the researcher for the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) is familiar with the issues that will be under consideration, has graciously agreed to provide administrative support to the ad hoc committee. Dean Call said that research suggests that, as is typically the case at peer institutions, students are less satisfied with pre-major advising than major advising at the College. Professor Ferguson commented that, in their early years at the College, before they select a major, many students have not defined their learning goals. This can make pre-major advising a challenge for faculty.

Professor Basu commented that, at present, advising is not considered as part of faculty members’ reappointment and tenure dossiers; this lack of evaluation and incentive may lead to less attention being focused on advising. Professor Basu said that she saw great value in the pilot project on intensive advising, which Dean Hart, Professor Sarat, and she had developed. Each faculty member who participated in this initiative worked with one advisee, helping him or her to identify specific learning goals. The advisors monitored the students’ progress toward these goals by consulting with their professors and with the students themselves, during the course of the first year, and now beyond. An assessment component has been built in to this project she said. The challenge of broadening this approach to include all students and advisors would be the prohibitive amount of time and expense involved, she noted. Professor Umphrey commented that, now that online registration is in place, more information should be available to advisors. Since it had taken some time to form the ad hoc committee, the Committee asked the Dean to review the charge to determine by when the ad hoc committee had been expected to report back to the Committee of Six, to ensure that sufficient time had been allotted to do so. Dean Call agreed to check the charge and to inform the members of the deadline that had been set by last year’s Committee of Six.

Continuing with “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Umphrey asked whether target-of-opportunity hiring and other possibilities for encouraging a diverse Faculty were being communicated and made part of search practices. The Dean said that, before moving forward, he wants to make sure that the procedures are thought through with care. He informed the members that Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel, and he would be attending the President’s Forum on Transformative Leadership for Diversity and Innovation, a forum for presidents, deans, and diversity officers, at Columbia University on September 15 and 16. It is the Dean’s hope to come away from the forum with a better sense of approaches and procedures that would be viable and effective for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty, and possible administrative structures that could aid diversity efforts at the College. The Dean said that he looks forward to sharing information from the forum with the President and the Committee. Professor Hewitt asked if the College might look to models for encouraging diversity that have

Amended September 26, 2011

been successful at peer institutions. The Dean agreed that doing so is helpful and said that he hopes that the forum will be useful in this regard. President Martin noted that efforts can be aided by making faculty hires across a broad range of experience. The Dean agreed, commenting that another benefit of hiring at the senior level is additional support for chairing and other departmental administrative duties. He also noted that such hiring may also avoid replicating the faculty demographic that the College is now facing. Professor Umphrey asked how many colleagues are now on phased retirement. The Dean responded that there are twenty-two who have signed agreements, though a handful have yet to begin their phased retirement.

The President commented that it would be useful to learn more about departmental efforts to build diverse applicant pools and suggested that this information be gathered to inform the Committee's ongoing conversation about this issue. Professor Ferguson commented that it would be helpful to have an affirmative action officer to assist departments with the time-consuming work of building diverse applicant pools and other important efforts to enhance diversity at the College. Professor Ratner noted that knowledge of the discipline would be essential for such a process to be successful, which might make it a challenge for an affirmative action officer to contribute to a search in such a way. Professor Basu reiterated the idea of looking at structures that have been successful at other liberal arts colleges.

The Dean shared recent history about the position of Special Assistant to the President for Diversity and Inclusion, noting that the position had been frozen since 2008, due to the economic downturn. Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel, has been assisting with diversity efforts, but has many other duties and can only devote limited time to this area. He noted that there are a number of different models for diversity officers that range from having a single affirmative action officer, who may be charged with enhancing the diversity of the faculty and staff, to having separate diversity officers for faculty and staff, with a faculty colleague leading efforts to increase diversity within the ranks of the Faculty. It was agreed that it would be helpful for the members to review the Report to the President on Diversity and Inclusion at <https://www.amherst.edu/offices/diversityoffice>, which was authored by Professor Cobham-Sander in her former role as Special Assistant to the President for Diversity. Professor Ferguson noted that the diversity position has had a difficult history at the College and commented that it will be important to create a structure with which departments will feel comfortable, so that they will make use of support when planning and conducting searches. Professor Hewitt expressed the view that shaping the diversity position(s) would seem to be the best starting point for enhancing diversity efforts, as departments most often do not have expertise in this area. President Martin suggested that one model to consider would be to create a position for faculty recruitment in the broad sense. One of the responsibilities of the position would be in the area of faculty diversity. The individual occupying the position would need academic credentials to be effective as a resource to departments, she noted. The Dean said diversity will clearly be an area of ongoing discussion and that he looks forward to continuing this dialogue with the President and the Committee. President Martin noted that the next ten years of faculty hiring represents the opportunity of a generation to shape the make-up of the Faculty.

The members agreed that, at its next meeting, the Committee should consider issues for the year's agenda. The President asked the members to help identify for her campus issues and/or aspirations that might benefit from open discussion. Professor Umphrey asked the Dean about the significant issues that will be taken up by major faculty committees this year. Dean Call responded that the Faculty Housing Committee and the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) are considering the issue of the affordability of homes for Faculty. He noted that he would have a better sense of the agendas of the CPR and the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), once these committees have met. Professor Loinaz said that, following up on

Amended September 26, 2011

Committee of Six discussions of last year, it would be helpful for the Committee to discuss its communication and coordination with the other major faculty committees. Professor Umphrey said that she thinks that it is important for the members to continue last year's conversation concerning Faculty Meetings and their agendas before the next meeting, if possible. The Dean then provided information about some tenure procedures.

The Dean began a discussion of the Committee's minutes by conjecturing that more colleagues might read the minutes if they were less voluminous. He suggested that the members consider a goal of concision in the minutes. Professor Umphrey responded that there can be a trade-off between transparency and concision. The Dean 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. He noted that all personnel matters are kept confidential. The Dean informed the members that each Committee of Six has come to its own understanding, informed by the Faculty as a whole, of whether or when the members would be comfortable discussing issues in confidence. Instances might include when the Dean or the President is seeking guidance from the Committee on sensitive matters that cannot be made public, or if any member wants to discuss any idea that is not yet fully formed. Professor Ferguson said that he favors the approach of keeping discussions confidential when doing so would aid the deliberations of the Committee. Some members expressed the view that the Committee should aim for as much transparency in the minutes as possible, but should use reasonableness as a guide when determining if a discussion should be kept confidential. At the conclusion of the conversation, it was agreed that, when reviewing the minutes, Committee members could consider whether they wished to have direct attribution for the comments that they had made. The Committee then discussed the circumstances under which it would communicate via email. It was agreed that email would not be used to communicate about personnel or other confidential matters and that, in general, the use of email would be kept to a minimum. The Dean informed the members that there is a secure shared drive that the Committee can use for electronic communication.

Dean Call next discussed with the members options for a regular meeting time for the Committee of Six, and it was agreed that the Committee would meet from 3:30 P.M. to 5:30 P.M. on Mondays and at a number of additional times, as needed, during the period of tenure discussions. Continuing with his announcements, Dean Call discussed with the Committee 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 Dean then noted possible Faculty Meeting dates for the Fall semester. They are September 20, October 4, October 18, November 1, and December 6. The members agreed that there was insufficient business for a September 20 meeting to be held and to aspire to have a meeting on October 4. The members then turned briefly to a personnel matter.

The members next discussed proposals for the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Summer Stipend Program and approved the nomination of two colleagues.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty



Amended September 30, 2011

The third meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, September 19, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Martin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with “Announcements from the President.” President Martin informed the members that she feels it would be constructive for the College to embark on a long-range planning effort in the near term. Professor Loinaz asked if such planning would focus on a particular area of the College or would be overarching in nature. The President responded that she envisions an integrated, “big picture” approach for the purpose of helping to clarify opportunities, pressures, and challenges; identifying priorities, goals, and aspirations for the next two decades; and guiding decision-making. President Martin said that she is engaging the Senior Staff in thinking about long-range planning and hopes to work with the Committee of Six on this process. It was noted that planning efforts of late—the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) process, which primarily had an academic focus, and facilities plans have been more narrowly focused than the long-range planning that the President had described. The Dean commented that Amherst has not undertaken a great deal of master-planning on a broad scale, focusing instead on planning on individualized fronts. He expressed enthusiasm about planning that would be integrated and overarching, as well as aspirational, and for the goal of making use of such planning to inform decisions. Professor Loinaz asked how a long-term planning effort of the kind under discussion would dovetail with the capital campaign. The President responded that no decisions have been made, while expressing admiration for the success of the campaign thus far.

Under “Announcements from the Dean,” Dean Call informed the members that productive conversations had taken place at the conference (President’s Forum on Transformative Leadership for Diversity and Innovation) at Columbia University that he and Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel, had attended on September 15 and 16. Under discussion at the gathering, which was attended by presidents, deans, and diversity officers, were collaborations that might be initiated among liberal arts colleges and research universities. The goal of forming such groups would be to enable the colleges to engage with graduate students (future faculty) in productive ways, possibly including the creation of pre- and post-doctoral fellowships, with the goal of aiding recruitment efforts. The Dean said that, by forming collaborations, liberal arts colleges, which do not hire faculty in large numbers each year on an individual basis, but which do significant hiring in a broad array of fields, collectively, would achieve a scale that would make collaborations with research universities advantageous to these institutions and their graduate students. Continuing, the Dean noted that the position of diversity officer, which is new to many academic institutions, was also discussed at the conference. Speakers stressed that to be most effective, this position should be structured so that the portfolio of responsibilities encompasses diversity as well as some related areas and should be provided with sufficient resources to support the areas within its purview. Offering the example of Oberlin and the University of Michigan, Professor Umphrey said that she understands that liberal arts colleges have formed singular relationships with research universities in their geographic region. Dean Call said that he sees advantages to forming collaborations with outstanding research universities and other liberal arts colleges that are in close proximity to Amherst.

Following up on requests made by the Committee at its last meeting, the Dean noted that he had reviewed the [charge to the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising](#), commenting that the ad hoc committee has been asked to report back to the Committee of Six by March 31, 2012. In regard to coordinating and communicating with the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) and the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), the Dean noted that the CPR had not yet had its

Amended September 30, 2011

first meeting this year. The CEP, which has met, has a lengthy agenda and has expressed the desire to meet with the Committee of Six early this fall. Among the issues on the CEP's agenda are possible revisions to the online registration process, advising, and teaching evaluations (for tenure-track and tenured faculty). The Dean noted that diversity in faculty hiring is high on the CEP's list of topics for discussion. In terms of teaching evaluations, the Dean said that the CEP would like to focus on making the purpose of senior teaching evaluations clearer. He noted that such evaluations are meant to be a means of facilitating conversations about teaching and are for the use of the individual faculty member. The members agreed that the two committees should meet as soon as is practical, and the Dean agreed to make the necessary arrangements.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Umphrey asked whether it would be helpful for the Committee of Six to meet with the CPR. The Dean noted that, unlike the agendas of the CEP and the Committee of Six, the agendas of the CPR and the Committee of Six most often do not overlap a great deal. Dean Call said that it might be most helpful to wait for the CPR to clarify its agenda and to see if the CPR requests to meet with the Committee. Professor Basu asked if the CPR intends to return to the issue of the College's family leave policy. The Dean said that he does not know whether there are plans for the CPR to do so at this time. Professor Umphrey asked if the CPR will be considering the issue of childcare. The Dean responded that childcare is an important priority for the College, particularly as more and more new faculty with young families are being hired. He said that he expects that the CPR will return to this issue and noted again that Marian Matheson has consulted with the CPR and solicited feedback from faculty and staff about their childcare needs and experiences. She is in the process of compiling and summarizing the results of several surveys and interviews and will soon share the information that she has gathered with the CPR, President Martin, and himself. Professor Loinaz asked if there have been any further developments in regard to the future of the Little Red Schoolhouse. Dean Call responded that there is nothing new to report on this front, and that construction on the new science center will make it unsafe to use the school building. The facility is scheduled to close on June 30, 2012.

The Committee reviewed a proposal for a Senior Sabbatical Fellowship. The need to submit the proposal outside the regular application cycle was the result of a logistical error made by his office, the Dean explained. Dean Call reviewed the history of the Senior Sabbatical Fellowship Program and the application process. He noted that the fellowships are awarded to tenured members of the Faculty, upon approval by the Dean of the Faculty, in consultation with the Committee of Six, of a proposal for a program of research, study, writing, or other creative work to advance his or her professional growth and effectiveness as a scholar and teacher. The fellowship consists of the sum necessary to raise sabbatical salary support from 80 percent to 100 percent for one semester of leave after six semesters of service or two semesters of leave after twelve semesters of service. He said that the review process should yield feedback when necessary, and said that his office works with colleagues to respond to any recommendations that might be offered and to make all proposals viable for funding. The Committee discussed the pros and cons of requiring faculty to submit proposals for the fellowship, since all proposals are funded. Questions centered around whether the proposal process serves a useful purpose for faculty who are developing leave plans and/or who might wish to apply for outside grants; the Faculty's time might be better spent in other ways; the application process should be revised; and the current proposal process signals the importance of scholarly productivity at the College. In the context of last point, it was noted that the funding may support activities other than research and writing. The Dean said that, as part of the CAP process, which also resulted in an agreement that all sabbatic leaves should be supported at the 100 percent salary level, the Faculty

Amended September 30, 2011

and the Board had voted to approve the Senior Sabbatical Fellowship application process that is currently in use.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Basu suggested that questions surrounding expectations for the Amherst's Faculty's scholarly productivity be explored as part of the planning process envisioned by the President. Professor Ferguson agreed, commenting that it would be helpful, in addition, to discuss the intellectual isolation of faculty in the context of a broader discussion of intellectual life and culture at Amherst. Professor Umphrey expressed the view there should be a reflective faculty discussion about the life arc of faculty members and how best to help faculty flourish during different periods of their careers. The members also discussed how expectations for Amherst's scholar-teachers, in regard to scholarship and creative work, teaching, and service to the College, have evolved over time. The Dean noted that, as part of recruitment efforts, he stresses to prospective faculty that Amherst has a high standard in all of these areas and is committed to providing the support colleagues need to achieve their goals for their research and teaching. He also explained that College service is valued and expected. Professor Umphrey noted that support for research at Amherst is generous, but that the College asks more from the Faculty in all categories now than in the past. She suggested that it would be helpful to engage in a conversation on this topic in terms of scale, register, and balance. Dean Call commented that the concept of Amherst as a research college is appealing to many prospective hires. While Amherst may aspire to be a research college, he feels it is important to define what the term means and how the College makes such a model possible. Professor Basu suggested that this topic is linked to a range of other issues that the planning process should discuss, such as the different ways in which the College evaluates tenure-track and tenured faculty.

Professor Loinaz asked whether sufficient institutional structures are in place to support the work of the Faculty and asked, in this context, about the position of Director of Sponsored Research. The Dean said that this position was occupied for only a year (in 2007-2008) after it was created; the decision was made to cut it as part of the process of setting priorities during the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC). At present, the Associate Deans and the Office of Foundation and Corporate Relations assist faculty, upon request, with grant proposals and in identifying funding sources. In addition, the Dean's office has hosted workshops, bringing representatives from funding agencies to campus, on applying for grants. Professor Ratner commented that, while others can certainly aid a faculty member who is applying for a grant, he cannot imagine how anyone other than the faculty member could take on the most challenging parts of the process.

The members next discussed agenda items for the Committee, including those that fall within the regular work of the Committee as well as possibilities for other topics. The items include tenure, reappointment, and promotion review; review of proposals for internal and external fellowships, both pre- and post-tenure; review of proposals for new courses; committee nominations; advising and copyright and coursepack policies; teaching evaluations; the Amherst calendar; faculty governance; building a diverse Faculty; communication among major faculty committees; course release for College service; tenure procedures, including procedures for tenure-track faculty located in departments and programs; mentoring tenure-track faculty; faculty housing; the role of department chairs. After some discussion, the Committee identified the issues of building a diverse Faculty; prioritizing faculty time and work and the related topic of faculty productivity; mentoring; and communication with other major faculty committees as the first priorities for the agenda for the Fall semester. Professor Umphrey said that whenever possible, it would be helpful to have data to inform discussions. The Committee also discussed

Amended September 30, 2011

the tendency for faculty committees to, at times, become bogged down in process and mechanisms—to the detriment of moving forward on important issues.

Professor Hewitt asked how soon the Committee could start a conversation about diversity within the Faculty and ways to become more proactive on this front. The members agreed to discuss this topic as soon as possible. The President, the Dean, and the Committee expressed support for putting procedures and strategies in place that would encourage and assist departments in ensuring the broadest possible applicant pools when conducting searches. To further faculty conversation on this topic, it was agreed that there should be a meeting of department chairs early in the Fall semester. Open meetings and/or Faculty Meetings would be other vehicles for encouraging broader faculty discussion, the members agreed. Considering how best to structure a position at the College that focuses on diversity and inclusion, and moving forward with a hire, are also top priorities, the President, the Dean, and the members agreed. The Committee asked the Dean to gather comparative data from peer institutions on approaches and procedures that would be viable and effective for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty and on possible administrative structures that could aid diversity efforts at the College. He agreed to do so, working with colleagues in his office and Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research and Planning.

In the time remaining, the Committee turned to the [evaluation of the theme-based format of the Copeland Colloquium](#) (appended via link), which was conducted by Professors Aries, A. George, and Harms as members of last year's Faculty Research Award Committee (FRAP), at the request of the Committee of Six. After some discussion, the members expressed support for the theme-base approach and agreed that it should be continued. If more administrative support for the program is needed, as the evaluation suggested, the Committee agreed with the Dean that faculty theme groups should be informed that they may allocate funds from the colloquium's budget for the year to support such assistance.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 13, 2011

The fourth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, September 26, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Martin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with the Committee reviewing its meeting schedule and agreeing to hold some additional meeting times during the fall. Dean Call informed the members that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel and Special Assistant to the President for Diversity and Inclusion, would be available to meet with the Committee on October 3 for discussion on the topic of building a more diverse Faculty. At the conclusion of that conversation and following the departure of the CEP, Mr. Murphy could remain at the meeting to speak with the Committee, prior to personnel discussions, to provide general legal advice related to the tenure and reappointment processes. James E. Wallace, Jr., who served as an attorney for the College for many years and who has performed this function in recent years each fall, passed away in 2010. Mr. Murphy, who participated in this discussion last year with the Committee and Mr. Wallace, has now taken on this role. The Committee agreed to the schedule for its next meeting, as outlined by the Dean, and looked forward to having the colleagues from the CEP and Mr. Murphy join the meeting of October 3. The Committee then turned briefly to a procedural matter.

Dean Call next asked if Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services, could attend Faculty Meetings as an invited guest during this academic year, as the new science center project would be under discussion. The members agreed that Mr. Brassord should be invited to attend meetings regularly during 2011-2012.

Returning to the Committee's question of the previous week about the agenda that the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) has set for this year, the Dean said that the CPR had now had its first meeting and had decided that it will investigate the possibility of extending to all eligible parents at the College a benefit equivalent to the more generous family leave benefit (currently available only to faculty parents of a newborn who are eligible for a medical leave) of a full semester at 100 percent salary with no teaching responsibilities, which was approved last year. (See [https://www.amherst.edu/academiclife/dean\\_faculty/fph/medparsummary](https://www.amherst.edu/academiclife/dean_faculty/fph/medparsummary) for a summary of the basic provisions of the current medical leave and parenting leave policies.) The CPR expects to review the family leave policies of peer institutions and the costs of extending the College's new policy to all parents, as part of its assessment of this issue. The Dean noted that, in particular, the CPR plans to discuss how the structures that are unique to faculty and staff work schedules might be considered if the policy is adjusted.

Continuing with his report back to the Committee on the CPR's agenda, Dean Call informed the members that the CPR had also discussed the possibility of conducting a campus climate survey, for the purpose of getting a better sense of the working conditions/environment at Amherst. The President, the Dean, and the Committee raised questions and concerns about the project and felt that clarification would be needed in order to make a decision about whether it should move forward. The members wondered about the reasons for doing a survey at this time and its goals, as well as the origin of the proposal. Dean Call said that it is his understanding that the Department of Human Resources had brought the idea for the survey forward last spring. Other questions centered around the potential costs of the survey, who would be responsible for designing the instrument, which campus constituencies would receive the survey, possible uses for the results, and whether peer institutions may regularly conduct such surveys and find them useful.

Amended October 13, 2011

Professor Basu suggested that, if long-range planning efforts move forward, the survey might represent a duplication of effort. If the decision is made to do the survey, she wondered if it should be guided by and/or integrated into the long-range planning process. Dean Call commented that the details of the project have not been fully discussed or worked out, but he said that, if an outside firm were to be engaged to design and conduct the instrument, the costs could be substantial. It was suggested that information gathered through the survey could be useful when addressing other issues that might be identified in the future. Professor Loinaz asked why this project was being considered by the CPR. He wondered whether the decision to undertake the survey was within the purview of the Department of Human Resources and/or Institutional Research. The Dean speculated that the committee's interest may stem from the idea that the survey could inform choices that would have financial costs to the College and that the capacious nature of such an effort would mirror the work and make-up of the CPR. He reminded the members that faculty, students, administrators, and staff serve on the committee. President Martin, noting the specificity of the Faculty's work life, wondered about the usefulness of using a single survey for the full range of campus constituencies. The members agreed. Professor Hewitt said that, when data are gathered, perhaps through the survey or through the long-range planning process, it would be important to learn more about the impact that joint appointments have on the family life of those appointed under this structure. She noted that there seem to be significant challenges associated with it. Professor Basu asked that the survey explore the different challenges that male and female faculty encounter around work/life balance. President Martin suggested that, for now, the survey be put on hold, so that consideration can be given to this effort within the context of the long-term planning process. She noted that the Board chair has indicated his support for having a long-range planning process. The members then turned to a personnel matter.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Martin said that the Dean and she would like to pursue further conversation about building a more diverse Faculty. The President mentioned that she had been impressed with a t-shirt that said "Diversity: The Art of Thinking Independently Together," which had been designed by Amherst students, and which she had seen at the Diversity Open House breakfast on September 26. President Martin spoke at the event. To communicate with the Amherst community about issues surrounding diversity and other topics of significance, and to encourage dialogue, the President said that she would like to explore vehicles other than minutes, including but not limited to letters and open meetings. She feels that these formats will enable her to provide more detail and depth than is possible in minutes.

President Martin noted that planning is under way for the meetings of the Trustees that will be held October 14-16. The President said that arrangements are being made for the Trustees to have dinner with the Committee of Six, the CPR, the CEP, and Senior Staff. President Martin commented that she would like to encourage more interaction between the Board and members of the Faculty and senior administration. In her view, the work of these constituencies will be enhanced if individuals get to know one another under circumstances that encourage more casual interactions and ongoing conversations. At present, it was noted, the Faculty and Senior Staff's gatherings with Trustees are limited to more formal, governance-centered interactions. Professor Basu asked how it is determined when members of the administration, for example, the Associate Deans of the Faculty, attend Trustee meetings, noting that practice has varied over the years. The Dean responded that the President and the Chairman of the Board have made such decisions and that practice has evolved over time. He has the sense that, in the past, the Board had spent more time with faculty members, while noting that the Board has been engaged in recent years in conversations that have focused on financial and

Amended October 13, 2011

facilities issues. In addition, in recent years, the Board has been holding a number of meetings off campus at cities throughout the country, in order to coordinate the Trustees' with events that are held for local alumni. In an effort to keep travel costs down, the number of administrators and faculty members who attend Trustee meetings has been kept to a minimum, and faculty have been asked to participate in Trustee meetings in conjunction with talks that colleagues are giving at alumni events. Dean Call commented that the Board meets each spring with the major faculty committees. Professor Umphrey said that she would favor having more opportunities for the Board and the Faculty to interact, as a means of learning more about their respective roles. President Martin suggested that, when the Instruction Committee is on campus for Board meetings, it might be fruitful to invite its members to visit departments and/or academic facilities as another means of encouraging Faculty/Board interaction. The Dean expressed his support for this approach, commenting that it would expose the Trustees to a wider range of Faculty and vice versa.

Continuing the conversation, President Martin asked if presentations about the nature of Board discussions that have been offered by the President at Faculty Meetings have been well received. Professor Ratner responded that the Faculty has welcomed such reports. President Martin noted that she envisions a long-term planning process that would encourage the engagement of Trustees, alumni, faculty, students, and staff with the issues, and one another. The President, the Dean, and the Committee discussed how best to create opportunities for meaningful interaction and communication between the Board and the Faculty, while sustaining an appropriate sense of the areas in which each has primary responsibility. Further conversation focused on the role of the administration as an intermediary between the campus community and the Board and the governance role of the Trustees. The Board, it was noted, has responsibilities in the areas of fiduciary and policy matters, but would not choose to engage in the day-to-day management of the College. President Martin said that it will be important to assess different formats of interaction and communication with the campus and the Board, and to make adjustments, when necessary.

President Martin commented that, as a general matter and to inform the process of setting the agenda for the Trustees, she has asked the Senior Staff to be thinking in more proactive and anticipatory ways about issues facing the College, in particular, and higher education, in general. She feels that the College's ability to respond to significant developments within higher education will be strengthened in this way.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Basu reiterated that she feels that it is important that upcoming discussions about building a more diverse Faculty include consideration of the issue of hiring and retaining women Faculty. She proposed that the Dean gather comparative data from peer institutions on this issue, and he agreed to do so. Professor Loinaz asked if data were available on the make-up of the staff, and he asked if there were conversations about the diversity of the staff that were akin to those about the diversity of the faculty and the student body. The Committee asked about recruitment efforts that might be in place to shape a more diverse staff. Dean Call responded that national searches, which attract broad applicant pools, are conducted for some administrative positions, and that the scope and responsibilities of the position determine the approach to the search. He noted that the College is trying to enhance its efforts to build diversity in all areas and said that he would ask Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research and Planning, to gather some information about the make-up of the staff and administration at the College.

Continuing with questions from the Committee, Professor Ratner commented that, while the members had offered their endorsement at its last meeting for retaining the theme-based format of the Copeland Colloquium, they had not discussed some details. He wondered, for

Amended October 13, 2011

example, if the recommendations made by the committee (a subset of last year's members of the Faculty Research Awards Program) that had reviewed the program would be implemented. In particular, Professor Ratner asked if themes would be selected earlier than they have been, to afford organizers more time to select fellows and plan programming. The Dean said that the request for proposals for the 2012-2013 Copeland themes would be sent in October, and that the theme would be selected earlier this year, if possible. Moreover, he would make efforts to have the theme for 2013-2014, and future themes, selected in the spring. Professor Hewitt asked if theme groups would be provided with increased administrative support. Dean Call responded that he would have conversations with theme groups about their budgets and how funding could be allocated for additional administrative support. Professor Ratner noted that the Committee that had reviewed the program had not been able to survey the impact of the Copeland Colloquium on the student body; he said that he would have liked to have learned how students view the program. Professor Ratner asked how this year's theme group, which is focusing on the theme of "The Future of the Humanities in an Age of Technics," would involve students, which he feels is an admirable goal. Professor Hewitt, who is a member of this year's theme group, said that her experience thus far suggests that the program will primarily benefit faculty and their scholarship. Dean Call commented that, while the primary goal of the Copeland Colloquium is to support faculty scholarship, it has also been the intention of each Copeland group to involve the Amherst community, including students, in the theme each year. He noted that this aspect of the program has been more successful during some years than in others.

On a related note, Professor Basu asked if it might be possible for the College to provide additional administrative support, perhaps under a centralized model, to departments for organizing lectures and conferences. She pointed out that some Academic Department Coordinators are asked to take on more responsibilities in this area than others, based on departmental needs. The members noted that Patricia Allen, who is a part of the Public Affairs office, organizes some events, but that her time is limited and her responsibilities are in the area of campus-wide public events, such as Commencement and Convocation and large lectures that have broad public appeal. She also coordinates public events for the Copeland Colloquium. The Dean said there would be significant budgetary implications associated with creating a new position to coordinate conferences and lectures. President Martin responded that it might be useful to consider this issue in the context of discussions about ways to enhance faculty members' scholarly lives and research. With this issue and others, it will be important to know more before assessing what the trade-offs would be and allocating resources in ways that will have the most impact, she noted.

The Committee next discussed a draft Faculty Meeting agenda for a possible October 4 meeting and decided that there was insufficient business to have a meeting on that date. In addition, the Dean noted that open meetings about the new science center are planned during the week of October 3; he expressed some concern that having those meetings and a Faculty Meeting during the same week might diminish attendance at all of the meetings. The members agreed that it would be best to have the next Faculty Meeting on October 18. In considering the agenda for October 4, which included reports from administrators, the members discussed alternative ways of sharing such reports with the Faculty. The members agreed that committees and individuals who wish to make reports might reference significant issues on the agenda and could, perhaps, post written summaries prior to Faculty Meetings. These reports could then be available to receive questions at the meeting. The President, the Dean, and the members felt that this structure would be efficient and provide opportunities for reflection before Faculty Meetings, which could inform conversation during the meetings. In a related matter, Professor Hewitt said that she had been asked by a colleague to request that the Dean and the President use



Amended October 13, 2011

microphones at Faculty Meetings, as it has been difficult to hear them at times. The Dean and the President agreed to do so.

Continuing the discussion about Faculty Meetings, the Dean asked the members for their views about the possibility of having the Faculty vote on course proposals electronically. He noted that faculty members now review all course proposals electronically, rather than in hard copy, and that more flexibility when scheduling Faculty Meetings would be possible if it were not necessary to have Faculty Meetings for the purpose of approving course proposals. Faculty, perhaps, would not have to indicate a vote. They could be expected instead to review the proposals, course-by-course, as they do now, by a set deadline, and could then be asked to forward any questions to the Dean, who could share them with the Committee of Six. He noted that questions about course proposals have rarely been raised by the Faculty in the past. The members noted that there are numerous layers of review (at the department level, the CEP level, and the Committee of Six level), before the proposals are forwarded to the Faculty.

Professor Ferguson said that he would favor the approach of having faculty review the course proposals online. It could be presumed that they had been approved unless questions were raised. Other members wondered how often Faculty Meetings are held for the sole purpose of approving courses. They noted that it is possible to have students register for courses before the Faculty has voted on them, if the CEP and Committee of Six have approved the proposals and the designation, "Pending Faculty Approval," is used. Professor Umphrey said that she would prefer not to switch to an electronic voting system, feeling that it would be unwieldy and that it would burden the Faculty. She noted the value of having regular Faculty meetings and commented that the nominal purpose of the first, largely ceremonial Faculty Meeting that is held on Labor Day is to approve courses. However, she feels that it also serves as a means of reconstituting the community after the summer hiatus and faculty return from leaves. While the vote on course proposals at Faculty Meeting may also be largely symbolic, Professor Umphrey noted, she sees value in the symbolism of the Faculty, as a collective, taking responsibility for the curriculum. Professor Umphrey and Hewitt supported having a number of layers of approval before the proposals reach the full Faculty, noting that these reviews provide opportunities to ask questions and catch errors. Professor Ratner wondered whether having departments and the CEP review the proposals before they are brought to the Faculty might be sufficient. Professor Ferguson noted that voting online would relieve the pressure to have a Faculty Meeting for the sole purpose of approving courses. Professor Loinaz, who said that he did not have a strong preference for how the Faculty approve courses, noted that the *Faculty Handbook* contains the following [reference](#) (IV, R., 3.): "During the academic year the Faculty holds at least three stated meetings which take place in the Converse Auditorium: one at the opening of College, one before spring vacation for the approval of new courses or changes in courses for the coming College year, and a meeting immediately before Commencement."

Turning to the broader issue of the rationale and goals for Faculty Meetings and questions that focused on their structure, Professor Umphrey advocated for having regular Faculty Meetings, commenting that in some years there are many more meetings than in others. Prior to the meeting, she shared with the members models for Faculty Meetings at peer institutions. The Dean noted that some colleagues maintain the view that Faculty Meeting should not be held unless there are action items on which to vote, while others favor having meetings for the purpose of having discussions about important issues. Several members noted that, if meetings occur only when there is business, the result is a sporadic meeting schedule. Professor Ferguson suggested having several stipulated meetings for ritualistic purposes, perhaps at the beginning and end of the semester, with other meetings held only when there are action items. The members asked for the President's views. She said that she would be in favor of the model

Amended October 13, 2011

proposed by Professor Ferguson, noting that it is desirable not to take up too much of the Faculty's time with Faculty Meetings that do not require some action, just for the sake of having Faculty Meetings. On the other hand, she said she is eager to have opportunities to discuss issues with the Faculty, perhaps in other formats and in venues other than the Red Room.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Ferguson noted that the formal rules that govern discussion and the legislative ambiance of Faculty Meetings do not facilitate open, substantive discussion and respectful exchange. He commented that Faculty Meetings often become bogged down with meta-exchanges about procedures and rules; he favors supplementing Faculty Meetings with other kinds of meetings that foster discussion. Professor Umphrey commented that rules are meant to facilitate orderly conversation, while adding that it may be that some conversations benefit from them more than others. Professor Ratner asked if the committee-of-the-whole format at Faculty Meetings could be a vehicle for open discussion. The Dean suggested that, if Faculty Meetings are alternated with other meeting formats, it would be useful to announce the dates for formal Faculty Meetings and to adhere to these dates. Professor Basu agreed, favoring the idea that there would be an expectation that Faculty Meetings would be held and Faculty would be aware, well in advance, of when the meetings would take place. She also supported having more forums for discussion and having Faculty Meetings, for the most part, when decisions are needed. Dean Call said that he would favor a rhythm of deliberations that would be structured first as open discussions and then, a month later, at Faculty Meetings, where discussions become more formalized and oriented toward decision making. Professor Ferguson said that the choice of topics for open discussions would be important, as the issues would have to engage the Faculty. The members agreed that the question of how to build a more diverse Faculty and the associated topic of how departments request and search for colleagues would engender the type of discussion being envisioned. President Martin said that it would be fruitful to have the Faculty discuss issues that would be part of the long-range planning process, enriching the plan through the expression of faculty perspectives. The members agreed that a viable and desirable format for some discussions would be Friday lunch meetings, perhaps from noon to 1:00. A small-group format would offer different possibilities for exchange than the committee-of-the-whole structure, most members agreed. It will be important to assess which format would be the most beneficial, depending on the issue under consideration and the type of discussion that would be most informative, it was agreed. At times, there could be a combination of both structures. The members stressed the importance of having the President and the Dean present, no matter what approach is taken.

Turning to the [report of the Task Force on Copyright, Reserves, and Coursepacks](#), the Committee focused discussion on two questions raised by the report—the use of technology in the classroom and questions of open access. Professor Umphrey expressed concern that the Committee was not asked to, and hence the report does not address the costs, which may be substantial, of providing iPads, training Faculty to use them, and putting new programs and infrastructure in place to make use of technology. While interested in using technology to enhance teaching, she nevertheless expressed some concern about how it can affect the classroom environment and the ways in which it can interfere with pedagogy—a problem that the Committee also raised, but one to which in the end it seemed resigned. Teaching faculty how to use technology well will be critical, she noted. Professor Ferguson said that he has found that classroom management efforts can overcome many problems associated with the use of technology in the classroom, which he said is the wave of the future. The Dean agreed that integrating technology and pedagogy has become a necessity and that doing so is of benefit to students, who rely on technological tools now and will do so in the future. Professor Hewitt noted that additional resources may be needed to ensure that technology can be used effectively,

Amended October 13, 2011

offering the example of ensuring that scans of scholarly work are provided to Faculty for their courses in a format that makes it possible to annotate the documents electronically and to search them as a means of reading texts closely. In regard to the issue of open access, the members favored exploring this avenue. Professor Ratner noted that, last spring, the Library Committee had proposed that the Committee of Six charge a task force with investigating the feasibility and advisability of crafting an open-access resolution, and, if such work were found to be both feasible and advisable, crafting a resolution for discussion and vote by the Faculty. The Dean said he would place this issue on the Committee's agenda for an upcoming meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 13, 2011

The fifth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, October 3, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Martin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The members of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), Professors Lyle McGeoch, Bishop, Clark, Corrales, Lopez and student members Matthew DeButts '14, Pranay Kirpalani '12, and Jacob Ong '14; the CEP's recorder, Nancy Ratner, Associate Dean of Admission and Researcher for Academic Projects; and Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel and Special Assistant to the President for Diversity and Inclusion, joined the Committee of Six for the first hour of the meeting for a discussion on the topic of building a more diverse Faculty.

Prefacing the discussion with some remarks, the Dean expressed his appreciation to the Committee of Six, the CEP, and Mr. Murphy for coming together to continue their ongoing conversations about diversity. Dean Call commented on the timeliness of "Half a Century of Women Teaching at Amherst: Gender Matters," a symposium that brought together former and current women faculty from 1962 to 1984 to examine that period in the history of the college and to consider the lessons Amherst can learn from their experiences. Attending this thought-provoking event over the weekend had prompted the Dean both to reflect, and to continue to look forward to discussions about issues of diversity and inclusion at the College. The Dean said that today's conversation might encompass aspirations, challenges, processes, best practices at peer institutions, and possible legal constraints and questions.

The conversation began with a review of approaches that have been used at the College to attract the most diverse pools of candidates for faculty positions, and those target-of-opportunity procedures that could be used, when outstanding candidates are identified within and outside regular search processes. The Dean asked the committees to consider whether these are viable tools that should be pursued with equal vigor, and he noted the importance of developing a collective understanding of the criteria that should be used for faculty hiring. Dean Call then described the strategies have been or could be employed. At times, it has been possible to make more than one hire from an individual search (hiring a second colleague, for example, who does not meet the precise needs of the authorized search but would be able to contribute in important ways to the department, especially if the candidate could add expertise in areas of the curriculum that the department wishes to pursue in the near term). Making a second hire from an individual search requires consulting with the CEP and asking for its recommendation on a second FTE allocation to the department. Exceptional colleagues have also been hired at the senior level, either through previously authorized searches or through an expedited process, after being identified during, or outside, the regular search cycle. Once again the CEP would be involved in the process. Finally, talented graduate students may be brought to College as pre- or post-doctoral fellows. If a department is impressed with a fellow's performance during his or her initial appointment, and feels that the colleague would bring needed strengths to the department and the College, the department may propose that the fellow be hired into a tenure-track position—either through the regular FTE allocation process or through an expedited process that does not require a national search. Once again, consultation with the CEP would be required. If departments wish to make hires outside the regular search process, the first step is to make a request to the Dean, who would discuss it with the CEP and the President.

Mr. Murphy noted that the primary consideration when making hires should always be the quality of the candidate as a teacher-scholar. Mr. Murphy stressed that making efforts to develop the broadest possible applicant pool and making hires through the regular hiring process is the preferred approach. The other strategies described by the Dean can be used effectively to supplement the regular hiring process. Agreeing that the primary criterion for any faculty hire

Amended October 13, 2011

should be excellence, President Martin suggested that the conversation focus on the College's aspirations in regard to building a more diverse Faculty. Consultation with legal counsel about how any specific goals and procedures fit within the legal framework should be a separate consideration, she said. The President noted that, with the wave of faculty retirements that is occurring throughout the country, there is tremendous competition to hire outstanding scholar-teachers, particularly those who may be from diverse backgrounds. The President said that she supports making use of mechanisms that will allow the College to hire compelling candidates, as opportunities arise.

Professor Umphrey asked about the impact of hires made outside the regular FTE process on the FTE count. Dean Call responded that it is unlikely that the FTE cap will be reached any time soon. He explained that the FTE count is going up very slowly because new hires are nearly matched by retirements and emphasized the unusual flexibility that the College will have to make hires over the next five years. A number of factors are contributing to this fortunate circumstance. The budgeted number of tenure-line Faculty will be increased by three positions a year for the next five years; retirements are occurring in robust numbers; and the Board has provided additional hiring flexibility by allowing hiring during a given year to go beyond the budgeted number of hires, when the Dean can find the financial resources and there are compelling reasons for doing so. The Dean commented that the College should take advantage of this moment of opportunity, while allocating resources carefully and responsibly.

Questions were raised about whether the priorities identified by the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) would guide the allocation of FTEs, as envisioned in the CAP report and affirmed by the Faculty and the Board. Conversation focused on whether the CAP allocation priorities have been informing FTE proposals, whether the CAP allocation system has been helpful and/or remains relevant, whether priorities should be shifted, and/or whether new priorities, which may emerge through the envisioned long-range planning process, should replace the CAP priorities.

The committees discussed the progress that has been made, toward the CAP categories/goals through the allocation of FTEs. The chart below represents the hires, or fractions of hires, made toward the eighteen FTEs that were awarded through the plan.

	<b>Number of CAP allotments</b>	<b>Number of Positions filled</b>	<b>Number of positions available</b>
<b>Quantitative (IS)</b>	2.5	1.5	1
<b>Global</b>	2.5	2	0.5
<b>Existing needs</b>	4	1.25	2.75
<b>Writing (IS)</b>	2	0.5	1.5
<b>Interdisciplinary</b>	5	2.75	2.25
<b>Targeted opportunity</b>	2	0	2
<b>Total</b>	18	8	10

Professor Ratner commented that the consideration of departmental needs may make it difficult for the CEP and College to make ready use of the numerous FTE slots still available according to the CAP guidelines. Rather, a given department's needs would come to the fore in any particular FTE actually allotted. Professor McGeoch agreed, commenting that, in his experience serving on the CEP, the CAP categories have not been all that useful when considering FTE allocations. The Dean noted that the two FTEs allocated to target-of-opportunity hires by the CAP are still available and are part of a rotating bank. Departments who

Amended October 13, 2011

make such hires do encumber a future FTE, he said. Professor McGeoch noted that accounting for FTEs in terms of CAP priorities had become less useful in recent years. While these priorities were intended to guide the allocation of eighteen new positions, they did not apply directly to the reallocation of the FTEs that became available due to retirements. Furthermore, certain priorities have been included within FTE requests without regard to CAP, for example, an emphasis on interdisciplinarity. The members of the CEP agreed that, while departments would pursue most of the CAP priorities without having incentives, the commitment to focus on writing and quantitative skills, for most departments, would not be part of an FTE request, without the incentive provided by the CAP. Professor McGeoch noted that, last year, the CEP took seriously the expectation that replacements are not automatic. For this reason, none of the FTEs recommended by the CEP to the administration was labeled as a replacement by the committee; when faculty retire or enter phased retirement, the position that they occupied returns to the FTE pool, Professor McGeoch commented. Those proposals that would address particular CAP priorities were identified as doing so, he said.

Professor Hewitt commented on the importance of educating departments about the ways in which they can be more proactive about considering diversity as a factor in the hiring process—by broadening applicant pools, by familiarizing themselves with practices at peer institutions through articles such as those provided to the Committee by the Dean’s office, and by researching graduate programs that generate individuals with Ph.D.s who are from diverse backgrounds. The Dean noted that constructing ads to be broad, in terms of field, is one way of attracting a rich array of candidates. President Martin stressed that using a variety of approaches leads to intersections that produce positive results. Rather than waiting for diverse candidates to approach searching departments, when departments work to build diverse applicant pools, different kinds of candidates in different kinds of fields emerge, departments’ interest is piqued in new ways, and departments are inspired to engage in creative approaches to hiring. Professor Lopez commented that it will be important for departmental plans for diversification to dovetail with their long-range curricular planning to ensure that the curriculum is coherent. Professor Ferguson noted that it would be helpful for departments to have assistance with the time-consuming work of building diverse applicant pools and other important efforts to enhance diversity at the College.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Basu asked about the possibility of identifying a thematic focus and making a number of appointments in different disciplines that relate to the theme, leaving open the combination of departments that would house the new FTEs. They would be, in essence, “floating FTEs.” Departments could, perhaps, apply for the FTEs, which could be appointments in single departments or joint appointments. President Martin said that she has had experience with “cluster hiring,” which involves having different departments apply for a set of positions (three or four) surrounding a priority. This approach can be a mechanism for encouraging conversation among departments, President Martin said, and the benefits include creating cohorts of faculty with a powerful level of interdisciplinary cohesion. Professor Umphrey said that she is intrigued by approaches such as this one that may provide a discursive space for engaging with a set of themes. Professor Ferguson suggested that, if cluster hiring were done around a broad, interdisciplinary theme—such as the global study of race and ethnicity—a diverse applicant pool of excellent candidates would emerge.

Professor Lopez asked what the role of the CEP would be if such an approach were taken. Would the CEP, for example, have the authority to identify certain areas of needed growth for the College around which hires would be made, or would the CEP’s responsibility be merely to vet proposals that would come before it? Professor McGeoch expressed his hope that the long-range planning process would address curricular needs. President Martin responded

Amended October 13, 2011

that, after having conversations with six departments during her first month at the College, she believes that the planning process should explore, in integrated ways, the needs of departments—offering as examples needs surrounding enrollments and infrastructure. The President said it is her hope that the planning process will take shape soon, and then commence.

The committees reviewed the process that is in place for requesting and considering requests for FTEs at the College. It was agreed that it would be helpful if the CEP would engage in a thoughtful consideration, earlier than is typical, of the substance of the letter that it sends to departments about FTE requests. Questions to be addressed would be the significance of CAP priorities when constructing FTE requests; defining the CAP priorities more clearly, if they are used; and considering how plans to address questions of diversity can be incorporated into proposals. The committees discussed the benefits of soliciting and receiving proposals, and making FTE awards, earlier than has been done in the past, in order to give departments more time to conduct their searches. The Dean thanked the CEP and Mr. Murphy for coming to the meeting and commented that the conversation had been most valuable. The CEP left the meeting at 4:40 P.M.

Mr. Murphy remained at the meeting and provided general legal advice related to the tenure process. He left the meeting at 5:05 P.M.

The Dean next reviewed with the members some demographic information about the make-up of the Faculty, focusing on age, gender, and race, to inform the members' continuing discussions about diversity at the College. Professor Ferguson commented that building a more diverse Faculty will require imaginative efforts. He stressed the importance of considering what diversity would mean going forward, beyond the structuring of positions. Having a chief diversity officer would seem critical to such efforts, he said. The President and the Dean said that they are convinced of the need for the position and plan to move forward, but they are taking some time to consider how to structure the position to be most effective. The Committee asked the Dean to provide examples of models that some peer institutions have adopted for this position and the description that had been developed by the Amherst search committee that had conducted the recent (failed) search. The Dean agreed to do so. Professor Basu suggested that, for this year's searches, departments could benefit from having a consultant work with them.

The Committee approved the Faculty Meeting agenda for the October 18 Faculty Meeting. President Martin left the meeting at 5:40 P.M., and the Committee turned to a personnel matter.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended November 1, 2011

The sixth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, October 17, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Martin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

President Martin expressed delight and gratitude for the wonderful inaugural celebrations that had occurred over the past weekend, and she shared with the members highlights of the meetings (October 14 and 15) of the Board of Trustees. The President explained that she plans to give a report to the full Faculty, as well, at its meeting on October 18. The Committee congratulated President Martin on her inauguration and on joining the ranks of the tenured Faculty at Amherst.

Continuing her remarks, President Martin said that the Board had voted to approve the schematic design for the new science center and had authorized the College to move forward with the design development phase of the project, which is expected to take eighteen months. The building will cost approximately \$200 million. The President noted that plans call for forming a committee to consider public spaces in the building. This group would include faculty across the disciplines. Professor Umphrey asked what the timetable is for the project. President Martin said that the preliminary timetable is that preparatory infrastructure work will begin this summer, and construction will begin in the summer of 2013 and conclude in 2017.

Returning briefly to a discussion of the demographics of the Faculty, the Dean said that a closer look at the data on faculty hiring by gender, and by decade, had revealed some inconsistencies in the information that had been provided to him initially. After the data had been corrected, the Dean said his analysis has revealed that 41 percent of faculty members hired from 1981 through 1989 were women; from 1990 through 1999, 42 percent were women; and during the first decade-plus of this century (2000-2011), the figure was 45 percent. He pointed out that the numbers in all cases are quite small, so that one or two additional hires in a category would have a noticeable impact on the overall percentages of men and women. When looking at specific disciplines, it is clear that progress has been made in the sciences over the past ten or eleven years, where an equal number of men and women have been hired since 2000, the Dean commented. There has been a downward trend in the social sciences, and the balance has remained about the same over the decades in the humanities. Professor Ferguson noted that it is important to recognize that the apparent success in diversifying the faculty within the sciences is indicative of the strides that can be made when attention is paid to issues of diversity.

Professor Basu noted that discussions about building a more diverse Faculty should not simply focus on the College as a whole but also on the distribution of faculty of color across divisions and fields. Dean Call reviewed with the Committee current departmental practices that had been discussed, as well as new ideas that had emerged, during the productive meeting that he had held on October 7 with representatives from departments that are currently conducting searches. Colleagues from the Committee of Six and the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), and Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel and Special Assistant to the President for Diversity and Inclusion, had also participated in this gathering. Among the approaches and procedures that had been discussed as viable and effective practices for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty members were those described in the [attached document](#). Professor Ferguson suggested that discussions about the institutional benefits of having a diverse Faculty should be built into all search processes. President Martin said that she had found it useful, and suggested that members of departments might as well, to watch videos focused on hiring diverse faculty. Issues of unconscious bias are often discussed in helpful ways. (Useful links on Cornell's ADVANCE website include <http://www.advance.cornell.edu/recruitment.html>. The ADVANCE group is focused on hiring



Amended November 1, 2011

and retaining women in STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) fields, but many of the resources are applicable for hiring in other fields as well. The recruitment link on the Initiatives and Resources page is <http://www.advance.cornell.edu/resources.html>. One of the videos can be found at <http://www.advance.cornell.edu/CITEII.html#>. The President also noted that several Amherst Trustees, who are alumni of the College as well as scientists, had suggested that Amherst ask alumni-scientists, who may have talented post-docs or other researchers who have diverse backgrounds working in their labs, to inform the Dean if they think such colleagues could be viable candidates for faculty positions at the College. The Dean could then provide the names of such individuals to departments, who might consider them if they wish. Professor Ferguson pointed out that implementing the ideas under discussion would require additional assistance for searching departments, which would place a greater burden on an already busy Dean's office. President Martin agreed, noting that she has decided, with the support of the Senior Staff, to move forward with the search for a Chief Diversity Officer, noting that she would continue to consult with the Faculty and administrators about the best structure for this position.

On a related note, Dean Call informed the members he had been approached by a group of students, including the president of the Association of Amherst Students, who are interested in exploring how students may best participate in the process of building a more diverse Faculty and curriculum. After meeting with these students, the Dean had agreed that a forum should be held in early- to mid-November that would include students who are participating in this year's faculty searches, to solicit their involvement and help with diversity efforts; faculty; and members of the administration.

Professor Loinaz expressed the view that finding ways to assist the spouses and partners of candidates who are considering and/or assuming faculty positions at the College find positions in the area can be an important aspect of the hiring process. He asked the Dean if the College has resources to support such efforts. Dean Call said that he does everything he can to assist spouses and partners, but that the resources available to him are limited to informal arrangements and negotiations. He noted that the Academic Career Network, which is administered through the Five Colleges, where it is based, provides access to job postings at colleges and universities in New England and upstate New York. In addition, member campuses belong to a listserv on which deans and human resources directors share resumes of job-seeking partners and spouses. Continuing the conversation, President Martin said that she envisions that the portfolio of responsibilities assumed by the Chief Diversity Officer would include assisting partners and spouses with issues surrounding their careers, and with other aspects of the transitions that individuals and their families may experience when joining the Amherst community. Professor Loinaz asked if the College is a member of the Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC). Dean Call said that the Five Colleges are considering joining HERC as a consortium.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the Committee that many important ideas had been raised during the open meetings that were held earlier this month to inform the campus community about the new science center. Continuing his remarks about the science center, the Dean noted that a strong case had been made to the Trustees at their meetings over the weekend for providing additional support for post-doctoral, post-baccalaureate, and lab technicians to work in Amherst laboratories to enable science faculty to provide more Amherst students with research experiences. Professor Loinaz asked what level of staffing would be provided. The Dean said that the exact parameters have not yet been worked out, but that it is his hope that there would be approximately a half-time post-doc or post-bac in each lab. To effect this change, the College will likely need to assume more of the costs of supporting these staff members over time. Professor Ratner said that his department (Biology) would be

Amended November 1, 2011

delighted and appreciative if this level of staffing were to be provided, and that doing so would certainly allow the biologists to take additional students into their labs, he noted. While such positions in the past had often been supported through faculty members' grants, this is less often the case, as grant funding has been reduced, and fewer faculty members have grant funds to support staffing in their labs.

The members turned next to proposals for new courses. Prompted by his review of the proposals, Professor Ratner raised the question of the appropriate role of the Committee of Six vis-a-vis the CEP in such evaluations. He asked whether the length of time that courses should meet should be defined further and suggested that consideration of this matter falls within the purview of the CEP. Professor Umphrey noted that the question of whether to define the length of time that courses should meet has been considered by the CEP with regularity, and she expressed the view that it may not be necessary to refer this issue to the CEP again. The members agreed that the duration of class meetings should continue to be left to faculty members' discretion. Professor Ratner next raised the question of whether it might be sufficient to have departments and the CEP review and approve course proposals before they come before the full Faculty, eliminating the step of having the Committee of Six do so as well. The Dean noted that, while the Committee has continued to review these proposals, in recent years the members have not voted on the substance of the proposals, only on whether the proposals should be forwarded to the Faculty. It was agreed that reviewing course proposals is clearly within the jurisdiction of the CEP, and that the Committee of Six has been reviewing the proposals as the part of its role that focuses on setting the agenda for Faculty Meetings. Professor Umphrey noted that the CEP does a thorough job of reviewing proposals. Another layer of scrutiny occurs when the full Faculty reviews the proposals. Professor Umphrey commented that, if any questions are raised, they can be addressed either before or during a Faculty Meeting. She also noted that a significant shift in practice has occurred: having the course catalog online rather than in print now makes it possible to make any necessary adjustments to course descriptions quickly and easily, perhaps obviating the need for multiple layers of review as a practical matter. The Committee agreed that the CEP should be asked to consider whether the Committee of Six should no longer review and approve course proposals. The Committee turned to personnel matters for the remainder of the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

**Suggestions for Ways to Build a More Diverse Faculty  
Meeting with Representatives of Departments that are Conducting Searches in 2011-2012  
October 7, 2011**

Place an emphasis on building a diverse applicant pool

Have departmental conversations about curricular needs/new fields for the near term before making an FTE request

Have departments develop diversity impact statements and mentoring plans.

Discuss mentoring with candidates and place an emphasis on Amherst/the department as a welcoming place to be. Try to be welcoming.

Have departments be intentional about the campus interview process. Be proactive about what department members will discuss. Think about how interviews play out in advance of inviting candidates to campus or speaking with them by phone or Skype.

Share information about which departments will be searching, including names of those who will be chairing searches, soon after the allocations have been made

Move entire timeline for FTE requests earlier, possibly as early as fall

Inform the Dean who search chairs and committees will be by spring

Include diversity language on departmental websites

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) should take the subfield into account in judging FTE requests; the committee should ask what the prospects are for a diverse hire, when reviewing a request

The Dean should provide information about diversity organizations that a department should contact when an FTE request is granted

The Dean should consider release time for those heading searches and increase search budgets

The Dean should distribute names of Ph.D. graduate programs that have a history/record of graduating individuals with Ph.D.s who are from diverse backgrounds.

Construct ads to be broad, in terms of field to attract a rich array of candidates.

Search committees should include a question with a diversity focus in Skype pre-interviews and other interviews

Professor Cobham-Sander agreed to circulate the questions that the English department uses during Skype interviews

The CEP should pose a diversity-focused question in its letter inviting FTE requests

The CEP should ask departments to explain the ramifications for diversity hiring if the position is focused in a narrow vs. a broader field

The Dean should share the names of diversity administrators at top graduate schools with searching departments

Departments should invite a wide range of faculty, particularly tenure-track faculty, to meet informally with candidates who come to campus. Such meetings should not be limited to departmental faculty.

Representatives from searching departments should meet again mid-way through the process and at end of process (maybe in combination with next year's search committees)

Sentences in ad should not be pro forma when discussing diversity The Dean should send examples of personalized (by department) approaches adopted by peer institutions

The Dean should discuss issues surrounding diversity with searching departments now

Encourage current students to think about Ph.D.s, graduate school, fellowship opportunities, etc.

Take advantage of networks for students that focus on diversity—host a conference to help students learn more about Amherst

**The Dean reviewed approaches that have been used at the College to attract the most diverse pools of candidates for faculty positions, and those target-of-opportunity procedures that could be used, when outstanding candidates are identified within and outside regular search processes.**

**1. Making more than one hire from an individual search**

Hiring a second colleague, for example, who does not meet the precise needs of the authorized search but would be able to contribute in important ways to the department, especially if the candidate could add expertise in areas of the curriculum that the department wishes to pursue in the near term.

Making a second hire from an individual search requires consulting with the CEP and asking for its recommendation on a second FTE allocation to the department.

**2. Hiring at the senior level, either through previously authorized searches or through an expedited process, after being identified during, or outside, the regular search cycle.**

Once again the CEP would be involved in the process, and the Committee of Six would review the case for tenure.

### **3. Bring Talented and Diverse Pre-and Post-Docs to Campus**

Graduate students may be brought to College as pre- or post-doctoral fellows. If a department is impressed with a fellow's performance during his or her initial appointment, and feels that the colleague would bring needed strengths to the department and the College, the department may propose that the fellow be hired into a tenure-track position—either through the regular FTE allocation process or through an expedited process that may not require a national search. Once again, consultation with the CEP would be required. If departments wish to make hires outside the regular search process, the first step is to make a request to the Dean, who would discuss it with the CEP and the President.

Amended November 11, 2011

The seventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, October 24, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Martin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

President Martin commented that she had enjoyed the Homecoming events that she had attended the previous weekend and getting to know Amherst alumni and their families. Earlier today, she reported, she had met with participants in the Five-College Counselor Colloquy, a group of high school guidance counselors from different regions of the country that visits Five-College campuses biannually to meet with students, faculty members, and admission staff. Continuing her remarks, President Martin informed the members that a Senior Staff retreat has been planned for November 1 and 2, during which the long-range planning process will be discussed. She said that she would report back to the Committee about these discussions. The President informed the members that, at the October 15 meeting of the Board of Trustees, the Board had voted to amend Amherst's non-discrimination policy to state explicitly that the College does not discriminate against individuals on the basis of gender identity or gender expression. Expressing her pleasure with this news, Professor Umphrey commented that this step is indeed a positive one for the College.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Umphrey said that some colleagues have asked her if she would inquire about upcoming changes to the Amherst College Defined Contribution Retirement Plan. The Dean noted that information sessions about the changes are planned for October 27, October 28, and November 1. If colleagues have questions at any time, they can also contact Ernie Leblanc, the College's Benefits Administrator. The Dean explained that new federal regulations have increased the responsibility of employers, requiring them, as plan sponsors, to take a more active role in the management and administration of their plans. The changes that the College is about to implement reflect efforts to identify "best-in-class," presumably better-performing investment fund choices, for the Amherst community. These options have been selected with the help of an independent investment advisor. The plan will become effective on December 2, 2011. Retirement contributions made on or after this date must be made from a new investment menu, which will include several new investment fund choices, and certain TIAA-CREF annuity funds that are currently used by Amherst participants now. Retirement contributions that were made prior to December 2 will remain in the investment funds to which they were originally allocated, unless an individual chooses to move those investments into funds offered through the new investment menu. This initiative, which was authorized by the Board of Trustees, is being led by the Defined Contribution Retirement Plan Investment Committee (Peter Shea, Treasurer and chair; Mauricia Geissler, Chief Investment Officer at the College; Maria-Judith Rodriguez, Director of Human Resources; Ernie Leblanc, Benefits Administrator; and Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel). Baystate Fiduciary Advisors, Inc., an investment advisory firm, has assisted the committee with selecting and evaluating the investment options and will assist the College in monitoring these options on a quarterly basis.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Ratner, noting that the budget for fiscal 2011-2012 is the final year that is covered by the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC) report of 2009, asked what the expectations are for the budget moving forward and what entities are considering whether the economic climate might necessitate the development of a new ABC-like plan when the current plan concludes. The Dean responded that

Amended November 11, 2011

the administration and subcommittees of the Board of Trustees have been monitoring how the College's operating budget, endowment distribution, and endowment spend rate compare with what had been projected, and the steps that the College took to reduce the operating budget and the projected spend rate of the endowment. The volatility of investment markets and other economic factors have prompted a decision to revise endowment assumptions (which had been based on historical averages) and projected investment returns on the endowment to 0 percent for 2011-2012, and from 6.8 percent to 6.0 percent, after this year. President Martin noted that, as part of its long-ranging planning efforts, this fall the administration will be examining the assumptions currently in the projections. Dean Call commented that the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) will also have a conversation about the budget in the early spring, when projections are put forward. He said that he does not expect that a new plan will be needed once the ABC plan has concluded. President Martin commented that there is an expectation that current funding levels will be maintained and that expenditures will not increase. Professor Loinaz asked whether the College's debt service is included in budget projections and whether the taxable debt that had been taken out during the financial crunch of 2008-2009 might be restructured at interest rates that are more advantageous. The Dean responded that funding for debt service is built into the projections, and that currently the costs of restructuring that particular debt issue would make refinancing disadvantageous. Professor Loinaz next inquired about the status of the Dakin Estate, noting that the property seems to be in decline. President Martin said that she is unaware of any specific proposals regarding this property, while noting that she has not yet considered this matter.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Loinaz suggested that it would be productive to consider ways in which science departments and science programs might be enriched outside the process of developing the new science building. Dean Call commented that such a process is already under way. After visiting a number of science departments and learning about their anticipated needs, Dean Call said that the President and he had informed the Board that additional resources will be needed to support staffing (post-docs, post-bacs, and lab technicians), as providing these positions, the departments told them, will enhance the science faculty's ability to pursue their own research and to provide more research opportunities for the increasing number of students who want them. The details of this proposal still need to be worked out, the Dean said, but he anticipates that there would be space and support for one position for every two labs. Professor Basu suggested that a similar model might be considered for the humanities and social sciences. Dean Call noted that the College currently has post-docs in the humanities and humanistic social sciences that are supported through the Mellon-Keiter post-doc endowment. These colleagues, who have two-year appointments and teach one course per semester, are mentored by their host departments. There are typically three such post-docs at the College each year. In answer to the question of how these positions are allocated to departments, the Dean said that he determines the allocation of these positions through conversation with departments and consideration of short- and long-term staffing needs, and, taking a longer view, the development of the department. The program encourages young colleagues to consider teaching at liberal arts colleges. In addition, the Dean noted, there are Five College shared post-doc positions that are being funded through a grant from the Mellon Foundation. At present, the Dean said, in terms of the sciences, there is a post-doc in statistics at the College that is being funded through a grant from the National Science Foundation; there have also been post-docs funded through the Howard Hughes Medical Institute. Professor

Amended November 11, 2011

Umphrey said establishing a post-doc program in the social sciences, in her view, would raise different sets of questions than those that might arise when establishing a post-doc program in the sciences because of the differing nature of scholarly work in those divisions, given that the sciences remain more collaborative and lab-based than other fields. The Committee then discussed the importance of having robust mentoring programs for new faculty.

The members then turned briefly to personnel matters.

Under “Announcements from the Dean,” Dean Call reported that there had been constructive discussion on the topic of building a more diverse Faculty at the department chairs meeting ([click here to read the minutes](#)) that had been held on October 21. Professor Ferguson commented that the Faculty, overall, seems quite receptive to moving forward with efforts in this area. The Committee then moved to personnel matters.

The Committee returned to the topic of the structure of Faculty Meetings. The Dean asked if the Committee felt that it would like to implement any of the suggestions that it has made previously. Agreeing that the committee-of-the-whole format had generated good discussion at the Faculty Meeting of October 18, the members decided not to make any changes to the structure of Faculty Meetings at this time. Professor Umphrey said that she does not see the need for monthly Faculty Meetings, but that two meetings per semester might be a good goal. Professor Ferguson expressed the view that there should be two meetings that occur every year (one at the beginning of the year and one to vote degrees before Commencement), but that other meetings, for the most part, should be held when there are action items that require a vote of the Faculty. Lunch meetings would also be good vehicles for engaging the Faculty and gathering input, the members agreed, noting that it would be most productive for the President and the Dean to attend such gatherings. The President and the Dean concurred.

Turning to the prospect of the long-range planning process, President Martin suggested that the members review a list of the potential topics that had been under discussion by the Committee this fall, and set priorities. She noted that she had asked the Senior Staff also to think about what should be discussed as part of the long-range plan. Professor Basu said that it will be important to consider the pace at which issues covered by the plan are discussed. There should be a balance between thinking capaciously and not taking on too much too fast, she suggested. It would be useful, perhaps, to organize the list of priorities into clusters by related topics and time frames, she added. Professor Ferguson asked the President what the anticipated time frame is for developing the long-range plan. She responded that she expects that it would be for a year, beginning in January. The Committee agreed that the need to be deliberative should be balanced with the desire to move forward on some issues and not to defer them because of the ongoing planning process. Professor Umphrey noted that Amherst is not a complacent institution, but rather a self-reflective one. Professor Ratner commented that the College has tended to be less introspective when it comes to institutional practices. Individual faculty and departments, however, frequently focus on self-evaluation with the goal of making improvements. President Martin commented that it appears that, for a number of purposes, it would be helpful if the College would articulate more explicitly its practices and strengths for a larger public.

One area in which this approach would be helpful would be in the area of reaccreditation. President Martin discussed with the Committee needs surrounding the upcoming five-year reaccreditation review by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges. It will be necessary to begin gathering data for the review this year, she noted. Professor Griffiths has



Amended November 11, 2011

agreed to make a presentation to the Committee about the process at the October 31 meeting.  
(Note: this meeting was later rescheduled.)

The Committee returned to its conversation about possible ways to structure the position of Chief Diversity Officer at the College and reviewed a number of models. It was agreed that the position would only be successful if the individual who is hired has the support of the College's leadership and is provided with the resources and authority. The Dean noted, and the members and the President agreed, that the ad for the position should be constructed broadly in order to attract the widest possible applicant pool.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended November 11, 2011

Amended November 28, 2011

The eighth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, November 7, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Martin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with President Martin offering high praise for the ways in which the Amherst community had responded to the rare October snowstorm that had caused power outages and damage to trees on campus. The Committee and the Dean joined the President in expressing appreciation to the Dining Services and Facilities staffs, in particular, for their extraordinary dedication and hard work during this emergency. It was noted that the staff's efforts to offer meals at Valentine to members of the community, many of whom were without power at home, made a tremendous difference to many families. The President also commented on how much she had enjoyed the events of the Family Weekend, which had been held over the past weekend.

Continuing with her remarks, the President informed the members that the Senior Staff of the College had just returned from a successful planning retreat. She said that she would share details with the members about the approaches to long-range planning that had been discussed during the retreat, and that she would seek feedback from the Committee as the planning process is developed. The members then turned briefly to a personnel matter.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the members that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) had discussed the Committee's proposal that the Committee of Six no longer review proposals for new courses and had agreed that this layer of review is not needed. In future, course proposals will continue to be reviewed by departments and the CEP, before being forwarded to the full Faculty for approval.

Noting that meetings are being scheduled on campus with Barbara Brittingham, Director of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE), and Patricia O'Brien, Deputy Director of the Commission, on December 1, the Dean asked if members of the Committee would be able to join members of the CEP for one of the meetings. Professors Basu, Hewitt, and Loinaz agreed to participate, and the Dean thanked them for their willingness to do so.

Conversation turned to the [College Council's recommendation regarding the Amherst College calendar](#) for the Fall semesters of 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16. The calendars for the Spring semesters of these years were approved by the Faculty in the spring of last year, the Dean noted. Much of the Committee's discussion focused on the proposed calendar for 2015-2016, which would have a shortened fall break (three days rather than the typical four) because of the late start to the year that would occur because Labor Day would fall on September 7, which is as late as it possibly can. Professor Ratner asked if there is any precedent for shortening fall break, under this circumstance. The Dean responded that this pattern (a late start to the academic year because of the timing of Labor Day) last occurred in 2009-2010. The fall break was also shortened to three days—Saturday through Monday—during that year. The Dean pointed out that, in 2015-16 the semester will resume after the break on the Tuesday after Columbus Day. On that Tuesday, Monday classes will be held in order to make up for Monday classes that had not been held on Labor Day. Regarding the reading period, the Dean noted that the College Council has recommended an extension from three to four days in years when fall classes begin before September 5, i.e., in 2012-13 through 2014-15. In those years it is possible to push back exam period and the close of residences without cutting into the late-December holiday period, Dean Call said. This year, next year, and in 2015-16, exam period ends on December 22, with residences closing on December 23. In years when the College Council recommends extending reading period to four days, the semester would still end a day

Amended November 28, 2011

earlier, with residences closing on December 22. Professor Umphrey, arguing the value of having a four-day fall break, wondered if the exam period might be shortened in 2015-2016, rather than shortening the fall break. She noted that many faculty members now give final exams before the formal exam period and/or require that final papers be submitted before the exam period. The Dean said that this approach, which had been tried once before, would result in insufficient time between the end of exam period and the closing of dorms for the holiday break. After some discussion, the Committee voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward to the Faculty the College Council's proposal for the Amherst College calendar.

At 4:00 P.M. Ernest LeBlanc, Benefits Administrator, and Peter Shea, Treasurer, joined the meeting to answer questions about upcoming changes to the Amherst College Defined Contribution Retirement Plan. Before discussion began, Mr. LeBlanc and Mr. Shea noted that they had been pleased by the attendance (around 260 people) at information sessions that had been held on campus in recent weeks to review changes to the plan. President Martin asked Mr. Shea and Mr. LeBlanc to summarize the process that has led to the decision to make these changes. Mr. Shea explained that the College had begun the process of developing changes to the plan about a year ago, in response to new federal regulations and increased oversight by the federal government that have increased the responsibility of employers, as plan sponsors, to take a more active role in the management and administration of their plans. On the recommendation of the Investment Committee of the College's Board of Trustees, the Trustees had authorized the creation of the Defined Contribution Retirement Plan Investment Committee (Peter Shea, Treasurer and chair; Mauricia Geissler, Chief Investment Officer at the College (whose duties include helping to manage the College's endowment); Maria-Judith Rodriguez, Director of Human Resources; Ernest Leblanc, Benefits Administrator; and Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel) to lead this effort. Baystate Fiduciary Advisors, Inc., an investment advisory firm, has assisted the committee with selecting and evaluating the investment options and will assist the College in monitoring these options on a quarterly basis. Mr. Shea noted that the committee's first step had been to gather data on different record-keepers. Record-keepers coordinate the services of the plan and provide account statements to plan participants. After evaluating the options, the committee had decided to retain the services of TIAA-CREF as Amherst's record-keeper.

Mr. LeBlanc explained that the changes that the College is about to implement reflect the past year's efforts by the committee to identify "best-in-class," presumably better-performing investment fund choices, for the Amherst community. The committee selected these options with the help of Baystate Fiduciary, and made use of an investment rating system that is based on a number of factors to assess the investment funds that were under consideration. These factors include the following: the fund's performance history over three- and five-year periods, as well as the current year; the fund's sharpe ratio (the risk-adjusted performance of the fund relative to its peers and within its asset class), its style drift (the fund's adherence to its stated goals and objectives), its total assets under management, and the tenure of the investment advisors for the fund. A short list was constructed of funds that had the best scores, and one fund from each committee-approved asset class was then selected to be part of the new menu of options. The score needed to retain a current fund was not as high as to add a fund. However, if a lower-scoring fund was retained, a competing, higher scoring fund from the short list was added to the new menu from the same asset class.

Mr. Shea stressed that these efforts to offer better-performing funds are a positive development for all employees of Amherst, who now have the opportunity to invest in them. Mr. LeBlanc noted that not all of the funds are new. After evaluating the available choices in each asset class, it was agreed that about half of the funds currently offered should remain among

Amended November 28, 2011

the available options. Those TIAA funds that did not meet the evaluation criteria were replaced with competing funds that have performed better, based on the committee's criteria. While there are currently sixteen asset classes being made available, the committee may choose to add additional funds and classes in the future. President Martin asked if there is a limit to the number of funds that may be made available. Mr. LeBlanc said that there is no limit, but added that having too many choices can have a paralyzing effect on individuals who need to make choices. Mr. LeBlanc noted that the plan will become effective on December 2, 2011. Retirement contributions made on or after this date must be made from the new investment menu, which, he reiterated, will include the new investment fund choices, including certain TIAA-CREF annuity funds that are currently used by Amherst participants now. Retirement contributions that were made prior to December 2 will remain in the investment funds to which they were originally allocated, unless an individual chooses to move those investments into funds offered through the new investment menu. If individuals do not redirect their contribution to funds within the new menu by this date, new contributions will automatically be redirected to an age-appropriate T. Rowe Price Target Date Fund. Mr. LeBlanc explained that individuals who do not redirect their funds by December 2 (or the end of December for exempt employees, whose retirement contributions are allocated monthly) can do so after the deadline.

Professor Hewitt said that she has received a number of questions from colleagues, which she would like to share. On their behalf, she asked whether the College is benefiting financially from the upcoming changes to the plan. Mr. Shea responded that the College is not benefiting financially, but that employees will presumably benefit from the improved investment returns that they are expected to receive. Professor Hewitt said that colleagues have also asked whether any Board member has an interest in any of the investment options, including in the T. Rowe Price Company, and is likely to benefit financially from the new plan. Mr. Shea said that, to his knowledge, no Trustee has a financial interest in the selected funds that would enable him or her to profit from the new plan; he pointed out that the committee had selected the funds that are being made available purely on the basis of the criteria described, and had done its work independently from the Board. Professor Hewitt next asked what would happen to an individual's funds if T. Rowe Price should go bankrupt. (Mr. LeBlanc later researched this question and reported that investments in mutual funds, including those offered through TIAA-CREF, T. Rowe Price, and other funds, are held in trust and are not subject to the claims of creditors in the event of the bankruptcy of the vendor.)

Mr. LeBlanc explained that, under the current RA, SRA, and GSRA contract set up, annuity funds are offered as individual contracts. This means that only the participant can transfer funds out of the annuity contract into another fund. On the other hand, many of the other funds offered through TIAA-CREF are mutual funds. In addition, all new contributions after December 1 will be allocated to the new RC and RCP contracts, whether to an annuity fund (TIAA Traditional, CREF Money Market, and CREF Stock), or to one of the other funds that are all mutual funds. All contributions made to the new investment menu on or after December 2, 2011, will be invested in funds for which the investment committee will perform a quarterly analysis to determine if the evaluative criteria are being met. If a fund fails to meet the evaluative criteria, the fund will be placed on a watch list. If the overall performance of a fund on the watch list has not improved after a period of time (probably three to four quarters), the fund may be replaced. Furthermore, the assets in the fund being replaced will be transferred, at the direction of the College, to the replacement fund.

Questions were raised about whether there will be new/greater transaction fees as a result of the changes to the plan. Mr. Shea said that most often there will not be transaction fees associated with making changes occasionally. This might not be the case if reallocations are

Amended November 28, 2011

made with great frequency. If funds have been selected that do have higher management fees, it is expected that the greater returns on the funds will outweigh these costs. Professor Hewitt noted that, under the current TIAA-CREF contract, there are some changes in the amount of interest credited to investments in the TIAA Traditional funds within the existing RA, SRA and GSRA, versus new contributions received by the new RC and RCP contracts. Investments in the TIAA Traditional fund through RA, SRA, and GSRA contracts have a higher minimum guaranteed rate of interest (3 percent), versus TIAA Traditional investments going into the new RC and RCP contracts (minimum guaranteed rate of 1 percent). (Mr. LeBlanc later provided interest rates for contributions to TIAA Traditional Annuities in November: 3.5 percent for RA; 3 percent for GSRA; 3.5 percent for RC; and 2.75 percent for RCP.) In the new RC and RCP contracts, participants have the ability to move all funds invested in these contracts at any time, providing more flexibility and liquidity, which is the primary reason why the contract types were selected. TIAA Traditional investments in an RA contract can only be withdrawn in ten annual installments, not as a lump-sum. Mr. LeBlanc noted it is important to note that all investments in the TIAA Traditional RA, SRA, and GSRA contracts will remain in those contracts and earn the higher interest rates. Only new contributions invested into the TIAA Traditional Fund through RC and RCP contracts will be subject to the lower interest rates.

The Dean noted that, while the changes to the plan represent the College's efforts to be as responsible as possible about the investments that it is making available to its employees, as required by law, the changes will result in constraining some choices, depending on the investment choices that an individual had made through the plan previously. In some cases, individuals will no longer be able to invest in funds that they may have had as part of their retirement portfolios for many years. Mr. Shea said that this may be true, but the hope is that the new funds will out-perform the previous ones. He noted that funds that are in particular investment vehicles need not be moved. However, if the funds have been eliminated from the menu of choices, no future contributions may be allocated to them. The Treasurer noted that, prompted by regulations and government oversight, most employers in the profit sector began making changes more than ten years ago to its 401K plans that resemble the changes now being made by colleges (including Amherst) and universities throughout the country.

The President, the Dean, and the members agreed that it would be helpful for many members of the Amherst community to receive more advice about how to move forward with selecting investment vehicles from the new menu. Mr. LeBlanc said that he would be happy to meet with any individuals and groups on campus to offer information, and that the College is working with TIAA-CREF to add more on-campus advising sessions. Individuals can also receive advice over the phone by calling TIAA-CREF. Professor Basu commented that she had not found a telephone advising session in which she had participated to be helpful because it was not individualized; much of her information was not available to the advisor, she noted. Mr. LeBlanc said that he is developing [a commonly asked questions/answer document](#) that he hopes to distribute to the community soon. Mr. Shea then offered apologies for the letter that had been sent to all Amherst employees by TIAA-CREF over his signature the previous week. This letter, which was intended for retirees only, had been sent without the Treasurer's knowledge, and Mr. Shea noted that he had contacted TIAA-CREF to seek an explanation. The company is currently investigating what happened and will provide a response in writing. At the conclusion of the discussion, which the members said had been helpful and reassuring, the Committee decided that it would be beneficial to have an open meeting for faculty and staff to answer questions about the Defined Contribution Retirement Plan. At the conclusion of the discussion, Mr. LeBlanc and Mr. Shea left the meeting. The members reviewed a draft Faculty Meeting agenda for a possible November 15, 2011, meeting and agreed that there was insufficient business to hold a meeting.

Amended November 28, 2011

The Committee then decided that the open meeting about the Defined Contribution Retirement Plan should be held in the November 15 timeslot (7:30 P.M.) that would have been used for a Faculty Meeting, should one have occurred. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 1, 2011

The ninth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, November 14, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Martin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with Dean Call sharing with the members an email from Professor Cox, who wrote to the Committee in his role as chair of the Housing Committee. Professor Cox had requested that the Housing Committee be provided with time at the next Faculty Meeting to make a brief report. The members agreed that a report by the committee should be added to the Faculty Meeting agenda. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty



Amended December 2, 2011

The tenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, November 28, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Martin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with “Questions from Committee Members.” Professor Loinaz commented that some colleagues had conveyed to him their continuing concerns about the upcoming changes to the Amherst College Defined Contribution Retirement Plan and the schedule for making these changes. He said that some faculty had found that the open meeting about the Defined Contribution Retirement Plan that had been held on November 15 had not been helpful and were displeased that there was a delay in receiving answers to questions posed at the event. (It was agreed that, when this information was provided via [a helpful question-and-answer page](#) on the Human Resources website, it had been useful.) Professor Hewitt commented that colleagues had shared similar concerns with her. It was agreed that there is a sense that some members of the Amherst community may feel that there has not been sufficient time to digest the information that has been provided about the new options and to make informed decisions, though it is difficult to gauge how many individuals feel this way. The members noted that concerns have also been raised about the lack of availability of individual counseling sessions with representatives from TIAA-CREF. The Committee asked the Dean to inquire about whether it might be possible to delay the implementation of the changes, and he agreed to do so. (The Dean later reported that he had consulted with a number of colleagues and had learned that few felt it would be helpful at this late stage, and many agreed it would not be practical, to delay the implementation of the changes.)

Associate Dean Griffiths joined the meeting at 3:50 P.M. to discuss with the members the preparations that are now under way for the fifth-year reaccreditation review by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEAS&C). Plans call for Amherst’s fifth-year report to be submitted to NEAS&C’s Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) by December 2012. Dean Griffiths explained that accreditation nationwide increasingly focuses on the learning goals (or “outcomes”) that colleges articulate and on how students achieve those goals. The College is being asked to articulate and communicate learning goals for both the curriculum and for departmental majors, and then to begin to develop ways of assessing how effective Amherst is in helping students to achieve those goals.

Continuing, Dean Griffiths commented that there seems to be little controversy about the responsibility of faculty to clarify the aims of liberal arts education for increasingly diverse populations of students. From information gathered for the College’s ten-year review in 2008, Dean Griffiths said that he knows that Amherst departments have formulated goals for their majors, though by local custom most departments say relatively little about those goals on their websites or in the course catalogue. As part of its standards for accreditation, NEAS&C asks for a list of the URLs where those goals are posted. He expressed the view, and the members concurred, that development of goals for the curriculum poses a larger challenge, given the added burden of explanation on the open curriculum and the general disuse of the recommendations about breadth (which appear in the current course catalog on page 72) that Amherst adopted in the 1970s. Revising these goals and incorporating them into advising will be a larger project, perhaps to be undertaken under the aegis of the long-range planning committee that will soon be established, Dean Griffiths commented.

The difficulty of measuring the intellectual and personal growth valued in the liberal arts is everywhere acknowledged, Dean Griffiths stressed, but accrediting agencies emphasize a practical approach. Faculty need to demonstrate that they are making some kind of systematic assessment of student learning and using those evaluations to improve instruction. The continual

Amended December 2, 2011

changes in departments' major programs and course offerings indicate that in informal and unreported ways this loop of assessment and innovation proceeds actively. However, to satisfy NEAS&C, the College now needs to document the process. Dean Griffiths pointed out that not all aspects of learning need to be assessed at once; more important is to find what is most in need of improvement and address that need. As in the case of learning goals, meeting the challenge of assessment on the level of the curriculum will take broader efforts of consultation and planning, he noted.

The members discussed possible processes and structures for meeting NEAS&C's expectations for establishing and promulgating learning goals for students and for evaluating learning outcomes in ways that, whenever possible, are meaningful for faculty and students and do not place excessive burdens on them. However, it was agreed, that the Faculty will play an essential role in this process and that it is critical to have faculty support for it. President Martin said that it is clear from her recent visits to departments that faculty think deeply and carefully about their departmental curriculums in both practical and aspirational ways. While departments are continuously assessing and revising their courses, they may not raise to an explicit level all that they are doing. To satisfy the accreditation requirements, she suggested that it might be most helpful and expeditious to provide the best models and templates from peer institutions as starting points for departments, as they work to articulate their learning goals and plans for assessing student learning. President Martin said that, once learning goals and ways of assessing student learning are established at the departmental level, the Faculty can be asked, as part of the long-range planning process, to consider ways to incorporate ideas that were generated through the departmental process, and ways to extend them, as a means of guiding the process for developing learning goals for general education. The members felt that this would be a workable approach. Dean Griffiths thanked the members for their input and support, and the Committee acknowledged him for his hard work. He left the meeting at 4:55 P.M.

As part of its review of a draft agenda for a possible Faculty Meeting on December 6, the members discussed briefly a proposal for a Five-College Sustainability Studies Certificate Program that had been endorsed by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). Professor Basu expressed some concern that details about the proposed requirements and their implementation were not articulated fully. The Committee agreed that it would be best to return to the discussion of this proposal at a future meeting and not to include it on the agenda for the December 6 Faculty Meeting. The members then voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the agenda to the Faculty. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 14, 2011

The eleventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by Dean Call in his office at 4:30 P.M. on Tuesday, November 29, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Martin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. President Martin joined the meeting at 5:00 P.M.

The members discussed the Library Committee's request ([appended via link](#)) to form a task force to explore whether the College should develop a resolution promoting free and open-access to the Amherst Faculty's journal publications. The members agreed that there would be a number of benefits for adopting an open-access policy. As the Library Committee noted, studies have shown that publications that are made available through open-access models are cited and read with greater frequency than those that are not made available in this format. Professors Basu and Ratner, who said that they favor having an open-access policy, noted that it would enhance opportunities for scholars from other countries to gain access to the scholarly work of Amherst Faculty. At present, some scholars, particularly from other countries, face challenges when attempting to do so, they pointed out. Professor Ratner commented that there may be some costs to adopting the policy, but that, in his view, the benefits of doing so outweigh them. For example, the College would need to develop and maintain a website to enable articles to be shared. Professor Ratner said that he has been told that resources within the library would make doing so possible and would not pose an excessive burden on staff. Some publishers, he noted, will not permit authors to retain copyrights. If a journal refuses to publish a faculty member's work if it were to be made available via the College's open-access policy, the faculty member should be permitted to opt out of the policy, he said. Some journals, Professor Ratner noted, will not allow the final version of an article to be shared through open access, but may permit an "author's version," which can be very close in substance to the published iteration, to be shared. Continuing, Professor Ratner commented that academic societies, which often publish journals and rely on the income generated by journal subscriptions, may resist open access because they will suffer as a result of it. The Committee agreed that, rather than forming a task force to explore this issue, the Library Committee itself is well equipped to investigate the pros and cons of open access and should be asked to study this issue and report back to the Committee of Six and the Faculty as a whole. If the committee feels that the Faculty should move forward with an open-access resolution, it should craft and propose one, the members noted. Professor Umphrey wondered if there might be colleagues who are not on the Library Committee with expertise in this area who should be asked to join with the committee to explore the question of open access. The members felt that doing so would be beneficial, and the Dean agreed to make an announcement requesting participation, perhaps at a Faculty Meeting. Professor Basu wondered if copyright costs to the College might be lowered through the open-access effort. It was noted that, at present, only a small number of institutions have open-access policies, so adopting the policy would not have an impact on copyright costs now. However, if many institutions decided to make their faculty's scholarship available through open access, copyright costs would likely decrease.

Discussion turned to approaches for moving forward with the upcoming long-range planning effort. Prefacing her remarks by noting a number of external trends that are having or could have an impact on the College, President Martin commented that this is an interesting moment for Amherst, for liberal arts colleges, and for higher education more generally. She noted that the planning process, which will be a mechanism for Amherst to define what it wishes to be, set goals, and to determine how it plans to realize its aspirations, will provide avenues for

Amended December 14, 2011

exploring a wide range of significant issues. Inclusiveness will be a priority, she emphasized, and faculty, students, staff, and alumni will be invited and encouraged to participate. President Martin asked the members for their views on questions that the process should seek to address and on the structures that might be employed to facilitate the process.

The members discussed possible advantages and disadvantages of using existing committees to facilitate the planning process, with the goal of gathering wide-ranging and innovative ideas from faculty, students, staff, and alumni. The Committee agreed that there should be a steering committee that could serve a coordinating function and synthesize ideas, and that particular issues/questions that are raised could be taken up by a combination of existing structures and groups that would be constituted to explore them. President Martin agreed and asked whether the Committee of Six, in its role as the committee on committees, should appoint the members of the steering committee. The members agreed that the Committee of Six could do so. Professor Umphrey asked if proposals that emerged from the process would require votes of the Faculty. President Martin responded that she envisions that some proposals, which would be within the purview of the Faculty, would require votes and some might require consultation. Professor Ferguson wondered if there might be mechanisms other than committee deliberations—and approaches that place less emphasis on consensus-building and more on generating creative ideas—that might be employed. The Dean suggested that an open call for proposals be offered, perhaps with some recognition for the most interesting ideas, in order to generate new, imaginative ways of approaching particular issues and/or needs.

Continuing the conversation, President Martin said that those involved in the planning process will be encouraged to think broadly, beyond the operational and toward the visionary. She stressed the importance of welcoming all ideas and of members of the community feeling that they are not constrained in the range of suggestions that they are prepared to offer. Professor Basu suggested that the planning process would benefit if conversations began with a dynamic, decentralized approach that encouraged discussions across constituencies. Professor Ferguson agreed and offered the view that there could be a series of events that could serve as a foundation for the planning process and guide the directions in which it would proceed. The Committee agreed that, particularly in this early stage, the planning effort would also benefit from perspectives from individuals from outside the College community. Experienced and imaginative thinkers could be brought to campus to offer views around a central theme, for example. Panel discussions and/or debates could be held that would allow for the presentation of multiple, divergent opinions surrounding key issues facing higher education and liberal arts colleges, generally, and/or Amherst, specifically. The members suggested that conversations could encompass topics such as the increasing emphasis on technical learning; the globalized world; the ways in which teaching at liberal arts college is distinctive; the connection between education and democracy; the advantages and disadvantages of an open curriculum; and questions such as who ought to be educated; what it means to be an educated person and the essential categories of knowledge; and why residential education matters and the impact that this system has on American culture. Questions that might focus on Amherst more narrowly could include issues surrounding students' course selection patterns as reflections of interdisciplinary interests; the paths that students chart for themselves as they navigate the curriculum; how students are allocating and spending their time; athletics; the needs of international students; grade inflation; Amherst's role within the Five-College consortium; and a number of issues that address the worklife of faculty. The President commented that the Committee's suggestions

Amended December 14, 2011

about the planning process were most helpful. Dean Call asked if the members would consider devoting part of the Committee's weekly meetings to conversations about long-range planning, and the members agreed that doing so would be productive. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 14, 2011

The twelfth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, December 5, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Martin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with President Martin sharing with the members plans, which are still evolving, for the upcoming (January 27-28) meetings of the Board of Trustees. She noted that Trustees would be having dinner with small groups of Faculty, that the Treasurer, Peter Shea, would be giving a presentation on the financial outlook of the College, and that there would be discussions about emergency preparedness procedures. The Board is considering having a retreat in March and meeting with faculty committees during its May meetings. President Martin informed the members that the newly renovated Lord Jeffery Inn will be open to the public beginning January 6.

Under “Announcements from the Dean,” Dean Call said that he had received a request that Rosemary Feal, the director of the Modern Language Association, who is currently visiting Amherst and the Five Colleges as an ACE Fellow with faculty status, be invited to attend the December 6, 2011, Faculty Meeting as an observer. The members agreed that Ms. Feal is welcome to do so. The Dean then provided additional information about the process that he had followed to inform the recommendation to move forward with the changes to the Amherst College Defined Contribution Retirement Plan on the schedule that had originally been set. He noted that he had spoken about this issue with members of the campus community, who represented a range of constituencies, and had come away from those conversations with the sense that most people had reached decisions with which they were comfortable, and that delaying the changes would not be practical. Dean Call said, if the changes had been delayed, the College would have had to wait until March to implement them.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Ratner noted that two colleagues—one tenured and one tenure-track—had spoken with him about the practice of holding back grades from students until they have submitted teaching evaluations. One colleague was uncomfortable that some tenure-track faculty members are being asked to prompt students to submit online teaching evaluations if they wish to receive grades. The Dean noted that, while departments may make the decision to withhold grades until teaching evaluations are submitted, in no circumstances should tenure-track faculty be put in the position of having to make that decision or be seen by their students as having chosen to withhold their grades. Department chairs or Academic Department Coordinators should re-solicit the evaluations in these circumstances, explaining the department policy. He commented that, if a department decides to withhold grades until teaching evaluations are submitted, students are not being required or coerced to write an evaluation; simply sending in a blank evaluation suffices. Dean Call stressed that departments need to make the decision about withholding grades as a department, so that using this approach is not seen as the responsibility of a tenure-track faculty member. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 14, 2011

The thirteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, December 12, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Martin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with President Martin asking the members about the possibility of the Committee meeting with Jack Stripling, a reporter at the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, who will be on campus later this week to conduct interviews and do research for a story that he is writing about Amherst. The President explained that she had met with Mr. Stripling, whom she admires as a journalist, when she was in Washington recently. Among the topics that they had discussed was the Amherst Faculty's central role in the governance of the College, including the importance and unusual set of responsibilities of the Committee of Six. Mr. Stripling, who had been impressed to learn from President Martin about the range and great regularity of the consultation between the President and the Dean and the Committee of Six, had expressed interest in learning more about the Committee and about possibly including details about its role in his piece. President Martin said that she sees the article as an opportunity to showcase Amherst's many strengths and noted that the visibility it could bring could be helpful in faculty recruitment efforts, particularly if the piece stresses the critical role of the Faculty in the governance and administration of the College. The President cautioned, however, that the College will not have any control over the journalistic approach that Mr. Stripling chooses to take, or the substance of his article. President Martin informed the members that she had invited Mr. Stripling to attend her holiday party on Thursday as one way of giving him a sense of the Amherst milieu and community. The members said that they would be willing to meet with Mr. Stripling as a committee during the members' final meeting of the semester, which has been set for Friday. It was agreed that he could be invited to observe the portion of the meeting during which the long-range planning process would be discussed. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 22, 2011

The fourteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 12:30 P.M. on Friday, December 16, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Martin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The meeting began with a discussion of personnel matters.

Dean Call asked the members to consider possible approaches to regularizing long-term visiting appointments for scholars who have taught at the College for significant periods and who have the credentials and record of scholarly productivity that might qualify them for an appointment with tenure at Amherst. He requested the Committee's help with thinking about possible processes and noted he would also be soliciting the advice of the Committee on Educational Policy. The Dean asked the members if they would be willing to return to this question during the Spring semester. The members agreed to discuss this matter in the spring.

At 1:45 P.M., Jack Stripling, a reporter at the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, joined the meeting. The Committee, the President, and the Dean discussed with Mr. Stripling, the history, role, and responsibilities of the Committee of Six, and faculty governance at Amherst more broadly. At the conclusion of the conversation, Mr. Stripling thanked the members, the President, and the Dean for their time and for their thoughtful answers to his questions.

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty



Amended February 13, 2012

The fifteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, January 23, 2012. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Martin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

At the beginning of the meeting, Kelvin Ma, a photographer with the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, spent a few minutes taking photographs of the Committee at work for a piece that is set to appear in the *Chronicle*.

Under her announcements, President Martin discussed with the members responses to the need to cease the operation of the Little Red Schoolhouse at its current site by summer 2012 to enable construction on the new science center. The College owns the school building (a gift to Amherst enabled it to be built) and the land on which it was constructed and has provided an endowment (through another gift) that has supported the school's operation. While Amherst provides the space to the school, the College does not participate in running it. Conversation turned to how the College plans to address childcare needs moving forward, particularly in light of the anticipated hiring of tenure-track faculty in significant numbers over the coming decade. President Martin said that providing high quality, affordable, and flexible childcare is essential for recruiting, retaining, and supporting faculty who have young children and requires action in the near time. In regard to the Little Red Schoolhouse, she noted that only one faculty member has children enrolled at the school at this time and that Little Red's schedule (Monday through Thursday, 8:45 A.M. to 11:30 A.M., with an optional lunch hour until 12:30, September to mid-May) does not meet the needs of faculty families. Professor Loinaz asked about the status of the study that is being conducted on childcare needs at the College. Dean Call responded that, after consultation with the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR), Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research and Planning, solicited feedback from faculty and staff about their childcare needs and experiences and has now completed her study. The results will help the administration understand the limitations of current programs and to develop projections about future needs. Dean Call said that the study indicates a preliminary estimate that the College will need roughly ten additional childcare slots. Ms. Matheson will continue to conduct surveys and interviews this spring in an effort to gauge more precisely the future childcare needs of Amherst faculty and staff.

Continuing with her announcements, President Martin noted that the Board of Trustees will meet January 26-28 and that the tenure process, the budget, admission, emergency preparedness, and the process for selecting a new Board chair are among the agenda items. The President said that she would report on the Board meetings at the Committee's next meeting. Dean Call commented that, in preparation for the Board's discussion about the tenure process, his office has been gathering data about tenure decisions, beginning with those colleagues who stood for tenure in 1984 (the beginning of Peter Pouncey's administration) and ending with tenure results for this fall. Records before 1984 are more difficult to gather, he said. The Dean explained that he was interested in learning more about the experience of those hired into tenure-track positions—for example, how many colleagues during this period left the College before standing for reappointment, were denied reappointment, left Amherst following reappointment and before tenure, stood for tenure, and left the College after receiving tenure. Dean Call said that he would be happy to share the results of this research with the Committee. The Dean noted that the data indicate that one can make the following approximation: on average, of those faculty who stood for or were scheduled to stand for tenure between 1984 and 2011, for every five faculty members who were hired into tenure-track positions, one has left the College before standing for tenure, one has been denied tenure, and three faculty members have been granted tenure. The research also revealed that the tenure rate for women during this period is higher

Amended February 13, 2012

than that for men. Professor Ferguson asked how the tenure rate for faculty of color compares with the overall tenure rate. Noting that the number of faculty of color who have stood for tenure between 1984 and 2011 is small, the Dean said the tenure rate for this cohort is somewhat lower than the rate of the full cohort. Professor Umphrey asked if the experiences of practicing artists, who have not always been appointed to tenure-track positions, are captured in his study. The Dean responded that the study had focused on tenure-track hires, while noting that it would be interesting to explore the experiences of practicing artists at the College.

Conversation turned to the topic of mentoring tenure-track faculty. The Dean said that, as part of the hiring process, he now often informs candidates about the College's willingness to facilitate mentoring relationships outside home departments or the College, when a candidate focuses on a research area that is outside the scholarly areas of colleagues within the hiring department(s). The Dean said that he has provided funding to offer such mentoring, which colleagues have found helpful. He is pleased to continue to support these opportunities for tenure-track colleagues. Professor Basu asked if the Dean would provide funding to host workshops at Amherst in tenure-track colleagues' research areas. The Dean said that he has provided such funding recently and would be happy to make funds available for this purpose. Dean Call commented on the positive feedback that his office had received from tenure-track colleagues about the workshop that the Dean's office and senior faculty, in collaboration with the Office of Foundation and Corporate Relations, had organized. Sixteen faculty in their first through third year at the College attended the event, which was held on January 20, and eight senior faculty participated. Other events for this cohort are already planned for this spring.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the members that Professor Zajonc, who retired from the College in December 2011, has been named the director of the Mind and Life Institute, a nonprofit organization dedicated to building a scientific understanding of the mind through the investigation of contemplative practices. The organization is currently based in Boulder, Colorado, but would like to move to Amherst, at least for the duration of Professor Zajonc's presidency and, perhaps, beyond. The institute has asked whether the College would be willing to provide space for its offices on or near campus, in return for which rent would be paid by the Mind and Life Institute. The Dean said that the College is exploring the possibility of offering a College house for this purpose, and that one colleague would be willing to vacate his home in order to accommodate the Mind and Life Institute's relocation. Dean Call noted that the Mind and Life Institute's move to Amherst may or may not be permanent and that any facilities that are made available to the organization might be used in the future to meet the College's ongoing need for space for short-term visitors, such as Copeland Fellows, and/or other institutes that it may wish to host. Plans are not finalized, and permission from the town may be needed for the organization to occupy a house in Amherst. The Dean said that the institute wishes to relocate to the area as soon as possible so may seek temporary housing while the Amherst house is renovated, should it be allowed to occupy it. Professors Loinaz and Ratner stressed the importance to the College, generally, of offering viable housing options near campus for the Faculty, for rent and purchase, and expressed concern that the effect of providing a College house for purposes other than faculty housing would reduce the number of houses that could be made available to the Faculty and others who qualify for College housing. Professor Loinaz asked if the College has considered renovating one of its vacant, deteriorating properties, such as the Dakin Estate, for use by institutes and/or to house short-term visitors. President Martin said that the College is conscious of the need for housing for faculty and that evaluating how best to meet that need will be part of the planning process. She commented that faculty housing is part of an integrated set of issues and should be considered together. The President agreed that the College should explore uses for the Dakin Estate and

Amended February 13, 2012

other vacant properties, including high visibility institutes. Cost will be a factor in whatever decisions are made, she noted. The Dean said that the College has supported the Housing Committee's request to engage a consultant to assess the demand for College housing going forward. This study will be conducted this spring.

Continuing with his announcements, Dean Call provided an update on the search for the College's Chief Information Officer (CIO). He said that he has been impressed with the strength of the applicant pool and of those who have been selected as finalists. The committee that is coordinating the search, which the Dean chairs, will bring three finalists to campus, and the community will have opportunities to meet the candidates and to provide feedback to the committee before an appointment is made.

The Dean next informed the members that proposals for two courses (POSC 106 and POSC 303) that are already under way this semester have been approved by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and now need the approval of the full Faculty. He explained that this is an atypical situation that needs to be addressed as soon as possible. Students have been able to register for these courses, with the understanding that they are "pending faculty approval." The Dean explained that, since the earliest possible Faculty Meeting this spring would occur after the add-drop period, the CEP has recommended that the Faculty vote on these courses via email. The members agreed that this seemed like the best course and asked the Dean to request that the Faculty vote on the proposals by email and decided that the courses should be approved by a majority vote. At least eighty votes would be needed to constitute a quorum, the Dean said. Any serious objection to the courses could prompt a discussion at a Faculty Meeting, it was also agreed. The Committee turned briefly to a committee nomination.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Hewitt said that, during the advising workshop in which she had participated during Interterm, she had been concerned about reports that some international students were isolated, alone, and without meals provided for them during some periods during College breaks. The Committee, the President, and the Dean expressed concern, and President Martin said that she would seek a solution to this problem. Continuing, Professor Hewitt said that the advising workshop had also left her with the impression that some students feel that the information about advising that is provided to prospective students in the College's admission materials does not accurately reflect the experience of advising at the College. Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Loinaz asked if the College might consider facilitating the insulation of College-owned housing units that are not well insulated in an effort to reduce heating costs for tenure-track faculty. The Dean said that he would check with Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services, about the possibility of doing so.

The members next set the Committee's meeting time for the Spring semester (3:30 P.M. on Mondays) and discussed its calendar of meetings. The Dean next noted the possible dates (February 7, February 21, March 6, April 3, April 17, May 1, and Thursday, May 17, which will be the Commencement Faculty Meeting) for Faculty Meetings this spring. The members agreed that they would decide whether there was sufficient business to have a Faculty Meeting on February 7 after discussion of the items on today's agenda.

Discussion turned to the [proposal for a Five-College Sustainability Studies Certificate Program](#), which has been endorsed by the CEP and about which the Committee had had a brief conversation in the fall. The members raised the following questions and asked that the Dean share them with Professor Dizard, who could discuss them with the other proposers of the program:

Amended February 13, 2012

1. Would capstone projects be developed across the campuses, or would each campus work to develop capstone projects for its own students? Some members of the Committee felt that distinctions among the experiential elements of the program are not fully articulated. What are the differences between an internship and an independent research project or capstone project that “addresses a contemporary, ‘real world’ problem”?
2. Would there be any limit on the number of courses that Amherst students would be permitted to take on other campuses?
3. Some concern was raised about the following: “An approved internship, independent research project, or upper level course within the area of concentration may be counted toward fulfillment of the advanced course requirement.” Some members expressed the view that an experiential offering should not be substituted for a requirement for an advanced course. It is noted that students will “take at least three courses within their declared concentration area (at least one at the advanced level).” Will the advanced course mentioned above be in addition to the other required advanced course?
4. Some of the courses for the program seem quite “applied.” Will courses selected by Amherst students be vetted on a case-by-case basis, under regular procedures (a review by the Dean of the Faculty’s office and the Registrar), to ensure that they meet the College’s standards for a liberal arts course? Or, since it was noted that the courses are “approved,” would Amherst pre-approve (under regular procedures) all of the “approved courses” that its students will be permitted to take within the certificate program? Please clarify the meaning of “approved” in this context?
5. Some members of the Committee felt that more details should be provided about the administration of the internship portion of the certificate.
6. It was noted that there is a typo on page five of the proposal. It says “...please see Appendix A,” but should say Appendix B.

Professor Umphrey, noting the proliferation of Five-College certificate programs, asked if the programs are reviewed regularly. She wondered whether it might be advisable to have the CEP consider the implications of the growing number of Five-College certificate programs. The Dean responded that the Five-College Deans regularly review the certificate programs and have established a schedule for these reviews. The Committee agreed to review the history of participation of Amherst students in the certificate programs over the past decade and to discuss this issue further at a future meeting.

Discussion turned to the [proposal for a Five-College major in Architectural Studies](#), which has been endorsed by the CEP. Professor Basu raised concerns that the major might lead to an emphasis on early and excessive specialization, which might lead students not to explore other potential areas of interest. She also commented that the proposed requirements for the major do not include courses in mathematics or in the “hard” social sciences. The Committee, the President, and the Dean also noted that the major, as described, appears to have a pre-professional focus; questions were raised about the large number of courses that would be

Amended February 13, 2012

required for the major, the “fit” and coherence among the courses, and whether Amherst students would be ensured access (noting that access to courses in the arts and design on other campuses has been problematic in the past) to the courses. The Committee also noted that most of the proposed courses are Europe-centered and that the more global elements of the major’s curriculum would be provided through courses by Amherst faculty. Professor Ratner said that the amount of course credit that would be granted for the capstone project, which appears to be a one-semester project, is not clear, but seems minimal. President Martin also found the designations of which courses would be introductory and which would be advanced to be unclear. The Committee noted that the proposal stressed that the advisory role of the Faculty would be of tremendous importance for the major. In light of the demands that would be placed on the faculty as a result, the Committee wondered whether the proposers’ view that additional resources would not be needed to support the major is realistic. Some members asked whether it might be useful to add to the curriculum a certificate program in architecture, rather than a major, to test possibilities and hone the program, before launching a major. Professor Loinaz wondered whether students, through their course selections, are currently putting together programs of study that essentially allow them to map a path through the curriculum to a major that is similar to the one being proposed. The Committee agreed that it would be helpful to know more about the New York Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, since engagement with this institution appears to be a centerpiece of the major. The members decided that it would be helpful to have a conversation about the proposal and asked the Dean to arrange a meeting with the Amherst proposers of the major. He agreed to do so.

The meeting ended with a conversation about the [College Housing Committee’s proposed changes to the \*Faculty Handbook\*, \(Section V. Salaries and Fringe Benefits, C. Fringe Benefit Programs for Full-time Faculty, 1. The Housing Program, a-j\)](#). The Committee discussed whether the changes represent clarifications to existing policy or substantive policy changes. The members agreed that the Committee’s changes are an attempt to make the existing guidelines, some of which reflect changes made in 2010 that have been put in practice but are not reflected in the current language, clearer and more explicit. The Committee praised the Housing Committee for its work to make the guidelines more transparent and agreed that revising the language in the *Faculty Handbook*, as recommended by the Housing Committee, does not require a vote of the Faculty. The Committee decided that it would be helpful for Professor Cox, chair of the committee, to make a presentation at the next Faculty Meeting about the revisions and requested that the Dean invite him to do so. After completing its agenda, the members agreed that there was insufficient business to have a Faculty Meeting on February 7.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended February 14, 2012

The sixteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, January 30, 2012. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Martin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Under “Announcements from the President,” President Martin asked for the members’ advice about several candidates who might deliver the 2012 DeMott Lecture. The President expressed a preference for having the speaker be an author of a book that would be assigned as the “common read” for the first-year class. Continuing with her remarks, President Martin shared with the members highlights of the winter meetings of the Board of Trustees, which had been held January 27 and January 28. Discussions about the tenure process, budget, admission, emergency preparedness, and the process for selecting a new chair of the Board had all gone well, she noted. Much of the discussion about the budget had focused on steps that might be taken to reduce the College’s reliance on the endowment to support its operations. The Board viewed the administration’s proposed ten-year plan for reducing the endowment spend rate, an approach that would combine a reduction in operating expenses with the generation of additional revenue, as a viable one. President Martin pointed out that, since the budget is constructed and approved annually, annual budgets would not be unduly constrained by the rolling ten-year model, as annual adjustments dictated by changing circumstances could easily be made.

Continuing with her summary of the Board’s meetings, the President noted that at a meeting that they had had with some of the Trustees, some students had raised issues surrounding online registration (including complaints about being bumped from classes during the add/drop period, a lack of space in introductory courses, and less contact with faculty members during the registration period) and had expressed concern about a lack of a sense of community (including a lack of shared traditions and the quality of the social life) at Amherst. She noted that some students had also communicated a desire to see the College offer more courses (e.g., accounting) that would prepare them for future careers. In this vein, the Dean noted that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has been discussing the possibility of having Amherst participate in a dual-degree program with Dartmouth, through which Amherst students (and students at other liberal arts colleges) may study engineering at Dartmouth. Under this program, Amherst students would spend their junior year at Dartmouth, return to Amherst for their senior year, and then return to Dartmouth for a fifth year of study. Those who complete this program would receive their bachelor of arts degree from Amherst and a bachelor of engineering (B.E.) degree from Dartmouth’s Thayer School’s engineering program.

The President noted that another Board conversation had focused on ways to minimize the effects of noise and other disruptions that will result from the construction for the science center project, which will present some challenges for students living in nearby residential halls. In addition, the Board had discussed the process for selecting the next Board chair. Jide J. Zeitlin ’85, who is in his seventh year as chair, will complete his term at the end of this year. To facilitate the search for Mr. Zeitlin’s successor, the Board will designate a past member of the Board to interview current Trustees. During this process, each Board member is asked about the goals and functioning of the Board, his or her own role on the Board, and whether he or she has an interest in serving as chair and/or has recommendations of others who might serve in this important role. The Board’s Committee on Trusteeship then makes a recommendation to the full Board, which is responsible for appointing the new chair. Continuing the summary of the Board’s meetings, Dean Call commented that the Trustees had responded with interest to his presentation on the tenure process and tenure decisions between 1984 and 2011. The Dean then offered more detail to the Committee about the data that had informed his presentation, about which he had provided some information to the Committee at the last meeting.

Amended February 14, 2012

Under “Announcements from the Dean,” Dean Call asked for the Committee’s advice about whether to move forward with a proposal made at the December 6, 2011, Faculty Meeting that the Faculty celebrate retiring faculty members at their final Faculty Meeting by having a citation read. Professor Ferguson suggested that retiring faculty members be asked if they would like to have such a citation read, rather than doing so without an individual’s consent. Other members felt that colleagues’ modesty might make them feel uncomfortable about authorizing a citation, even if they wished to have one read. Dean Call commented that, for a number of years, citations about retiring faculty members had been read at Commencement, noting that some retiring colleagues had objected to the practice, which had then been discontinued as a result. Some members of the Committee pointed out that most colleagues seemed to feel honored by the practice and that only a few had objected to it. Professor Ratner said that, in his view, the discontinuance of honoring faculty in this way at Commencement represents a loss. The Committee, the President, and the Dean agreed that honoring retiring faculty would not only celebrate the individual for his or her service to the College over many years, but would be a way of building a culture of recognition at the College. Professor Basu expressed the view that, while some faculty members might not feel comfortable having a citation read about them at Commencement, they might be more inclined to having a piece written by the colleagues who have been closest to them, read at a Faculty Meeting, which is a more personal venue. The Dean thanked the Committee and said that his office would work with departments to coordinate the citation process for retiring colleagues.

Continuing with his announcements, the Dean asked the members for their views on whether time should be set aside at the first Faculty Meeting of the semester for Professor Williamson and Mr. Geffert, Librarian of the College, on behalf of the Library Committee, to make a brief presentation about the rising costs of serial subscriptions and the need to make some budget adjustments as a result. Dean Call explained that dramatically rising serials costs, which are due in large part to the increasing commercialization and monopolization of academic publishing, are forcing academic libraries, including Amherst’s, to spend more and more of their budgets on serials. The Dean noted that the College’s library now devotes 71 percent of its materials budget to ongoing subscriptions, including individual serials titles (print and electronic), databases, and packages of serials titles. Dean Call said that it is his understanding that, prior to the first Faculty Meeting, the committee wishes to send a memo to the Faculty about this issue and to ask for participation in considering how best to address it. After a process of consultation, Mr. Geffert, with the support of the Dean, will decide whether to cap the percentage of the library’s materials budget that would be devoted to ongoing serials requests. The Committee agreed that it would be helpful for Professor Williamson and Mr. Geffert to make a presentation at the Faculty Meeting. The Committee turned to a committee nomination.

The members next discussed a nomination for a faculty representative to a new College committee, appointed by the President, which will be charged with leading the College’s efforts to comply with applicable laws and regulations. The following is the charge to the committee:

The Compliance Committee serves as an advisory committee to the senior administration with respect to the College’s efforts to comply with applicable laws and regulations. The Compliance Committee is responsible for reviewing, evaluating, and coordinating the College’s compliance efforts and for fostering a culture of compliance through such avenues as educational programs and the dissemination of information to the college community. Although each department will continue to be responsible for compliance efforts with respect to its particular areas of

Amended February 14, 2012

responsibility, the Committee may establish working groups to develop and implement policies and procedures, especially for areas requiring coordinated compliance efforts across the College community. The Committee will invite to its meetings department managers and such other individuals as may be necessary for the Committee to fulfill its responsibilities.

The Compliance Committee includes those in the following roles: Legal and Administrative Counsel (Chair); Director, Compliance and Risk Management (Five Colleges, Inc.); Treasurer; an Associate Dean of the Faculty; Director of Facilities; Director of Human Resources; Chief Information Officer; Dean of Students; Comptroller; and a faculty representative (to be chosen in consultation with the Committee of Six).

The following individuals will serve on the committee: Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel (Chair); Beth Carmichael, Director, Compliance and Risk Management (Five Colleges, Inc.); Peter Shea, Treasurer; Jack Cheney, Associate Dean of the Faculty and Samuel A. Hitchcock Professor of Mineralogy and Geology; Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services; Maria-Judith Rodriguez, Director of Human Resources; Chief Information Officer (to be named); Allen Hart, Dean of Students and Professor of Psychology; Stephen Nigro, Comptroller; and a faculty representative (to be named).

The Dean next informed the members that a department has recommended a member of the class of 2012E for a summa cum laude degree. The student has an overall grade point average in the top 40 percent of the graduating class. The Committee agreed that a Committee of Six member would review the thesis, offer a summary of it to the Committee, and that the full Committee would review the student's transcript and the departmental recommendation. It was noted that, while the student does not qualify for a summa degree because his/her GPA is not in the top 25 percent of the class, if the Committee agrees with the recommendation that the thesis is worthy of a summa, the student would be awarded a magna cum laude degree (without distinction), because the GPA is in the top 40 percent of the class.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Basu, expanding on the earlier conversation about recognizing retiring faculty members, suggested that more ways be found to recognize Amherst faculty members for their achievements as scholars and teachers, thereby celebrating individual colleagues, as well as enhancing the sense of intellectual community at the College. For example, colleagues could be invited to give a talk about their scholarship at the time of promotion to full professor, when they publish a book, and/or upon receiving a named professorship or prestigious grant or fellowship. It was noted that, for a short period, Amherst faculty members who received named professorships had been invited to give a talk about their research and a reception had followed as part of the event. The Committee agreed that these talks had been a successful recognition vehicle and that the program for honoring faculty achievement should be reinvented and broadened.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Ferguson commented that Amherst's "leveling culture" is both good and demoralizing, and he wondered whether efforts to honor and reward faculty members who make stellar contributions in teaching and/or research should be recognized in a variety of ways. He suggested, for example, that an award be created at the College to celebrate Amherst faculty who exemplify what it means to be an Amherst professor, both in terms of teaching and scholarship. The President noted that, when faculty members who distinguish themselves receive honors from their own institutions, these internal awards can be



Amended February 14, 2012

helpful when the individuals are being considered for honors by outside bodies. The Committee noted that most endowed professorships at Amherst are honorific but do not carry a financial award. The College should, perhaps, consider ways of rewarding faculty achievement with honoraria or additional research funding, some members suggested. The Dean was asked about the criteria for awarding endowed professorships at the College. Dean Call responded that, when making nominations for professorships, he and 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.

Expanding on the discussion about recognizing faculty members' service to the College, the members discussed the possibility of compensating department chairs, either through course release or additional salary. While recognizing that Amherst's current "democratic" system of appointing and rotating department chairs emerged out of a desire not to perpetuate an earlier model at the College, which saw some department chairs wielding considerable power for years, Professor Ferguson noted that a weakness of the current system is that there is no avenue or incentive for colleagues who are particularly skilled at being a department chair to continue as chair for a significant period. Professor Ratner said that, after experiencing both systems, he sees many advantages to the democratic model of rotating the chairmanship regularly and prefers it. Professor Hewitt noted that, under the present system, the chair has no authority to make decisions. Rather, the chair serves as a liaison officer of sorts between the department and the rest of the College and is charged with transmitting information and coordinating consultation with colleagues, she has found. The Dean said that it is often helpful for departments to adopt a model in which the duties of the chair are divided between the chair and a director of studies, thereby dividing the additional work of chairing a department, particularly a large one.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Ratner said that, after reflecting on the Committee's conversation at its last meeting about the proposal to convert a College-owned house into the offices of the Mind and Life Institute, he continues to have concerns. The Dean noted that any house that is made available to the organization would revert to the College after the period (which would most likely be five years, as this is the expected term of Professor Zajonc's presidency of the institute) designated in the lease. The house could then be used once again for faculty housing and/or to meet the College's ongoing need for space for short-term visitors, such as Copeland Fellows, and/or other institutes that Amherst may wish to host. Professor Ratner suggested that, before offering the house to the Institute, the Dean consult with the Housing Committee. The Dean said that he would be happy to do so.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended February 16, 2012

The seventeenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, February 6, 2012. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Martin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with President Martin sharing her impressions of meetings with alumni that she has had during her recent travels on the College's behalf. She then turned to the topic of the search for the College's Chief Information Officer, informing the members that she had met with two finalists for the position and that she intends to meet with another candidate soon. Plans call for the finalists to return to campus to offer public talks for the community. The Committee then discussed a personnel matter.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the members that the Lecture Committee has nominated Assistant Professor of Mathematics Tanya Leise to deliver the Max and Etta Lazerowitz Lectureship. The Lazerowitz Lecturer, a member of the Amherst faculty below the rank of full professor, is appointed annually, he noted. Professor Leise's lecture is set for Thursday, April 12, at 4:30 P.M., in the Alumni House. Continuing with his announcements, the Dean asked for clarification from the members about whether they wish to invite all or a subset of the proposers of the Five College Architectural Studies major to meet with the Committee to discuss the proposal. The members agreed that, since it would likely be challenging to coordinate a meeting with all of the proposers because of schedule conflicts, a time should be found that would be convenient for the colleagues who would anchor the program at Amherst, Professors Gilpin and Long. Professors Clark, Courtright, Rosbottom, and Kevin Sweeney, as members of the Amherst College Architectural Studies Advisory Committee, should also be asked to attend the meeting at that time, their schedules permitting. Professor Hewitt suggested that it would be informative for the Committee to have a broader conversation about the relationship between the liberal arts and professionalism. Dean Call agreed, noting that some of Amherst's peer institutions have been expanding their conceptions of the liberal arts and broadening their curricula as a result.

Continuing with his remarks, Dean Call explained that, as noted in [its letter to the Committee of Six](#), the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) had recently approved the use of online and hybrid courses for transfer and make-up credit, on a limited basis. The Dean said that the CEP had agreed that the Registrar and Class Deans should have the authority, which they should employ "sparingly," to approve the use of online and hybrid make-up courses when "absolutely necessary." The Registrar will also be asked to review courses taken by transfer students "with care, but without special focus on whether they took place in physical classrooms." Permission of both the Registrar and Class Deans will be required for granting credit for online and hybrid courses as credit for make-up courses. Professor Ratner wondered how many requests for credit for courses of this type are pending; he suggested that the number of online and hybrid courses that have been used for credit be tracked, and the policy evaluated, after a year. In addition, Professor Ratner wondered if the Registrar should be asked to try to determine, prior to authorizing that particular courses can be taken for make-up credit, whether the courses are online or hybrid courses. The Dean said that he would ask the Registrar to do so, while noting that assessing the nature of courses might be a challenge for some courses. Professor Loinaz asked if online and/or hybrid courses will be designated as such on students' transcript. Medical schools do not accept credit for such courses, and, at present, he said, the practice is to inform medical schools that none of the courses that are noted on Amherst students' transcripts is an online or hybrid course. The Dean said that he would ask the Registrar if there are any plans to note on students' transcripts whether transfer and/or make-up courses are hybrid and/or online courses. Professor Basu asked about the department's role in assessing whether

Amended February 16, 2012

credit should be awarded for these courses toward a major. The Dean responded that, as is the case with courses that are taken as part of study abroad, online and/or hybrid courses will not be credited toward a major without a department's approval. The Registrar, as she sometimes does in the case of courses that are taken abroad, may also seek the advice of departments when determining whether these courses should be accepted for College credit.

The Dean next informed the members that a student, who is working with the Office of Advancement on a program to increase student awareness and appreciation of the role that alumni play in creating their Amherst experience, has contacted him about informing the Faculty of this program and seeking faculty members' participation. The Dean said that it is his understanding that one of the initiatives involves a week-long educational campaign this spring. The members agreed that an announcement could be made at the next Faculty Meeting that information about the program would be available in the Converse lobby, and that Advancement staff would be available to answer questions. The members next reviewed a thesis and transcript of a student who had received a summa cum laude recommendation from a department and whose overall grade point average was below the top 25 percent but within the top 40 percent of the class. Under the honors guidelines, the student qualified for a magna cum laude degree. The members voted unanimously to forward a recommendation for a degree magna cum laude to the Faculty.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Umphrey asked the Dean for his impressions of the all-day workshop for faculty in their first three years at the College, which had been held just before the start of the Spring semester. The Dean's office and the Office of Foundation and Corporate Relations had co-sponsored the event. Dean Call expressed his gratitude to senior colleagues, including Professor Umphrey and Professor Loinaz, who came forward to organize and participate in the various sessions, which were attended by sixteen tenure-track faculty who are in the early stages of their careers, and eight senior colleagues. Issues addressed included work-life balance, research plans, internal and external funding, the evaluation of teaching, and review for reappointment and tenure. The Dean expressed the view that the workshop had been very well received and had helped to bring to the forefront some of the unmet needs of newer faculty and to connect them with the colleagues and other resources that can be of the most help to them. As an outgrowth of discussions at the workshop, it is his intention to provide senior colleagues, some of whom may be in departments that have not had new colleagues and/or reappointment or tenure cases for some time, with more information about procedures for mentoring and evaluating tenure-track faculty. A chairs meeting is a possible venue for providing this refresher about procedures. In addition, a number of follow-up workshops are being planned in February and March for tenure-track faculty, Dean Call said.

Discussion turned to the upcoming long-range planning process. President Martin noted, and the Committee and the Dean agreed, that, at the outset, it will be important to try to define what Amherst is, what it should be, and how it might respond and change to meet internal and external needs and pressures. This process will enable priorities to be set and goals to be established, which will help determine the foci and structure of the planning process. The intention is for the plan that emerges to help guide the College in integrated ways for the next five to ten years, President Martin commented, noting that the College will celebrate its bicentennial in nine years. At the President's request and to inform the development of the plan, the members discussed the ways in which Amherst College is unique and what distinguishes it from its peers, as well as the challenges the College may face in coming years. Professor Ferguson expressed the view that Amherst is part of a dying breed; it must take an active role in forging the character of the liberal arts in today's world, and in the world of tomorrow, as other small liberal arts colleges with fewer resources move away from a traditional liberal arts model

Amended February 16, 2012

and/or do not survive, he argued. Professor Ferguson expressed the view that, in the coming years, an Amherst education may become more difficult to justify to students and their families. President Martin commented that the liberal arts model is becoming more and more attractive abroad, for example, in China; she feels that it will become important for Amherst to explore linkages with institutions in other countries. The Committee agreed that the College should find ways to convey that the liberal arts tradition, with its emphasis on thinking critically and creatively, analyzing problems from multiple perspectives, and digesting and integrating vast amounts of information across domains, will provide the best preparation, in ways that pre-professional training can't, for students who will live in an information age. Recognition of the value placed on the liberal arts abroad may stimulate more interest in the liberal arts in this country, which at this time is moving in the direction of favoring the utilitarian, President Martin noted.

Continuing the discussion, the members agreed that it will be important for Amherst to become more explicit about what it does. Among the attributes that set Amherst apart are the following offerings and characteristics, the Committee noted: a Faculty that is made up of teacher-scholars; opportunities that are available to students to engage directly and in multiple ways with active scholars; an intimate learning environment with small classes and personal attention; an emphasis on and attentiveness to teaching, and a culture of innovative pedagogy; and a rigorous and demanding educational experience. It was agreed that meeting students' interests, which shift over time, will require building flexibility into the curriculum to accommodate new fields; the College will need to find ways to do so that are true to the values and approaches of the liberal arts, the Committee noted. Professor Umphrey suggested that it will be important, for example, to clarify the role of experiential education at Amherst. She further noted that campus activities (e.g., the student newspaper or student government) and engagement in organizations within the community could be structured and presented as models of civic culture for students and could serve an important role in preparing them for lives as engaged citizens. Dean Call agreed, commenting more generally on the importance of strengthening the ways in which education beyond the classroom, including experiential education and opportunities for students to engage in research, is integrated with the curriculum. Professor Basu agreed, commenting that Amherst has tended to focus inward, and that it will be important in the years to come to balance that approach with one that cultivates worldliness in students by supporting public, externally-oriented engagement. She argued that students would also benefit if more emphasis were placed on designing programming (e.g., in the areas of residential and social life) that enhances in intentional ways the broader fabric of intellectual life by forging links between formal and informal settings for learning at Amherst. President Martin agreed and commented that a number of students have spoken with her about their feeling that there is a lack of community and intellectual vibrancy on campus. Professor Basu suggested that, perhaps, students need more explicit guidance and structure from the College in order to take advantage fully of all that is available to them at Amherst and within the Five Colleges. President Martin concurred.

In the context of a brief discussion about sustaining a climate and experience of academic rigor at the College, the members discussed the challenges posed by grade inflation. President Martin noted that grade inflation can have the effect of diminishing the rigor of the academic experience Amherst offers and students' motivation to achieve. Professor Basu agreed, while informing the President that a number of initiatives have been implemented in recent years to increase the Faculty's awareness about grade inflation. For example, on an annual basis, each faculty member is now provided with his or her individual grade distributions, and for purposes of comparison, the aggregated averages of his or her department(s), the traditional divisions, and

Amended February 16, 2012

the College as a whole. President Martin thanked the members for the helpful discussion and suggested that the Dean and she develop a preliminary outline of the planning process, which they would then share with the members at a future meeting. The members agreed that this would be a good approach.

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended February 17, 2012

The eighteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, February 13, 2012. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Martin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with President Martin reporting on the damage that Johnson Chapel had sustained as a result of extensive flooding that had occurred because of a pipe breaking on Sunday evening. The President said that she had been informed of the situation soon after it had happened and that the Dean, the Treasurer, and she had gathered at her house to call faculty members whose offices had been affected by the incident. They had also consulted with Ms. Mosgofian, Associate Registrar, about the relocation of classes that were scheduled to be held in Johnson Chapel.

Continuing with her remarks, President Martin informed the members that engineers have been evaluating whether rooms and ceilings in Johnson Chapel sustained structural damage and trying to identify the precise cause of the water damage. At this point, she said, it appears that a plaster ceiling in an office on the third floor had given way, falling upon and bursting a sprinkler pipe below. Significant flooding and damage occurred during the short time period that had elapsed between the pipe break and water service being shut off. Much of the flooding occurred at the west end of the building, she noted. President Martin said that the engineers are not only assessing every ceiling in Johnson Chapel, but all similarly constructed ceilings in other campus buildings, in an attempt to prevent a recurrence of this type of event. As a result of the damage to the building, twenty-five faculty members have had to vacate their offices to facilitate restoration efforts; most of these colleagues, as well as the English department office, have been relocated temporarily to Frost Library, while some colleagues have moved to other offices on campus. The President noted that students who have these professors as advisors have been notified of these new office locations, and students taking classes in Johnson Chapel had been informed of their new class location. President Martin said that, for the next few weeks, access to Johnson Chapel will be limited to facilitate clean-up and repair work, which has already begun. College staff, as well as a document recovery and restoration service and a moving company are helping those who sustained water damage to books, papers, computers, and other materials. Professor Loinaz asked when Johnson Chapel had last undergone significant renovation. Dean Call said renovations had occurred in 1995. The President noted that, interestingly, structural engineers had been engaged within the last six months to examine Johnson Chapel, but had not identified any problems with the building. Professor Umphrey asked what more colleagues could do to help faculty who had been affected by this accident. The Dean noted that Bryn Geffert, Librarian of the College, had asked faculty colleagues whether they would share their carrels. President Martin, while offering high praise for the extraordinary efforts and timely response of facilities staff during this challenging situation, noted that this episode has served to reinforce her intention to review emergency preparedness procedures, with the aim of making enhancements and providing additional training on a college-wide basis. It is her hope, she said, that each department will also ultimately have an emergency plan in place. The President said that plans were under way to strengthen and expand procedures in this area well before the events of the weekend; a report on emergency preparedness procedures had been presented to the Board at its winter meetings, and discussion had followed, she commented. Professor Loinaz asked if there is a faculty committee that plays a role in planning for emergencies. The Dean said that a number of committees currently have some oversight over different aspects of emergency planning. In addition, perhaps the newly created college-wide compliance committee will become engaged in these issues.

Amended February 17, 2012

Under “Announcements from the Dean,” Dean Call informed the members that the Faculty Housing Committee had discussed the proposal that the College rent office space to the Mind and Life Institute. The committee had agreed that the College should accept the offer of a faculty member, who is entering phased retirement, who would like to allow his house, which is owned by the College, to be rented by the organization during Professor Zajonc’s presidency of the Mind and Life Institute. The Dean next noted that Professor O’Hara, on behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising, has requested an extension beyond the March deadline that the Committee of Six had set for the ad hoc committee’s report. The Dean noted that the ad hoc committee has said that it will have just completed its data collection in March. Its members feel that they will not have enough time for the “reflection and analysis this important job deserves” by the time of the deadline. The ad hoc committee expects that it will finish its work by the end of the Spring semester, Dean Call reported. The Committee agreed to grant their request up to the end of this academic year and that next year’s Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and Committee of Six should consider the report in fall 2012. The Committee then approved the minutes of its meeting of January 23 and agreed to review electronically drafts of the minutes of the meetings of January 30, February 6, and February 13 by the end of the week.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Umphrey asked if the President plans to consider questions surrounding College communications as part of the envisioned long-range planning process, or whether enhancing communications would be considered as a project separate from that process. In either case, she wondered whether the President would welcome faculty input about this topic. President Martin said that, outside of the planning process, she would like to explore ways to enhance external and internal communications and would welcome the advice of the Faculty about ways to do so. Professor Loinaz, who had inquired at a previous meeting about the possibility of increasing the energy efficiency of the College’s rental units, next asked if the Dean had looked into this matter. Dean Call said that plans are in place to engage an energy consultant to review the entire inventory of rental properties at the College and to develop designs and strategies to make these properties more energy efficient over time. Doing so will lessen the cost burden on the faculty who occupy units for which they pay the cost of utilities. At the conclusion of this study, the College will determine which measures can be implemented in the near and long term, based on the availability of capital funds. The Committee then turned briefly to personnel matters.

Discussion returned briefly to the topic of mentoring tenure-track faculty members. The Committee discussed some mentoring models at other institutions that might prove useful at Amherst. Professor Ferguson expressed the view that there can be pros and cons to putting formal mentoring programs in place. He argued that it is essential that tenure-track faculty take ownership of their trajectories, are active in their pursuit of advice from senior colleagues, and consider carefully their mentors’ suggestions and make use of the advice that they judge to be valuable. Having senior colleagues at Amherst, inside and/or outside the department serve as mentors, as well as asking senior colleagues in the candidate’s scholarly area from the Five Colleges or other institutions to do so, can be fruitful, several members noted. The Dean said that, in the past, he has provided support for tenure-track colleagues to work with mentors at other schools and noted that this approach has been beneficial. He has informed tenure-track faculty of this possibility and is happy to continue to provide support for colleagues and their mentors to meet at Amherst and/or at the mentor’s home institution. President Martin said that, in her experience and according to research that has been done on mentoring, the most effective approach is to make a mentoring team available to tenure-track colleagues. Such a team can comprise members of the candidate’s department, other faculty and non-faculty colleagues outside the department but within the institution, and faculty at other institutions. Professor

Amended February 17, 2012

Loinaz suggested learning more about best practices for mentoring. The Dean said that his office has been gathering this information and that he would be pleased to share with the members what has been learned. He noted that another model involves having a senior colleague at the institution oversee a mentoring center. Tenure-track colleagues can turn to that individual for advice and for the allocation of resources. Whatever model is adopted, it is important that the advice that is given be consistent, Dean Call said. Professor Basu, who noted that it will be important to consider whether mentoring programs should be left to departments or accomplished through a combination of college-wide and departmental programs, asked if further discussion of mentoring could be put on the Committee's agenda. The Dean said that he would be happy to include this topic on this spring's agenda.

The Dean next presented a nomination for an endowed professorship. The next step will be for the President to recommend the nomination for this professorship to the Board, Dean Call noted. The Dean said that the President and he would bring nominations for additional named professorships to the Committee later in the term.

The President next discussed with the members her assessment of Amherst's administrative structure and recommendations surrounding possible enhancements to it. She shared with the Committee a draft of a letter that she planned to send to the Faculty ([the final version of which is appended here](#)). In the letter, President Martin presented her thoughts about the administrative structure of the College; the possibility of adding a Provost to the ranks of the senior administration; possible responsibilities of such a position and its role within the senior administration; and possible ways that a Provost could work both to innovate and to relieve pressures on overburdened offices within the College. She informed the members that she envisions working with the Faculty to define the position more precisely and asked the Committee for its feedback about the ideas and plans conveyed in the letter. The members were generally supportive of the proposal to develop a Provost position, given the understanding that the Dean of the Faculty would continue to report directly to the President, and advised the President to share further details of the proposal with the Faculty, in order to have an informed dialogue. It was agreed that the best way to provide information and generate discussion would be for the President to send the letter, incorporating feedback from the Committee and the Senior Staff, to the Faculty in advance of a Faculty Meeting. The members decided that a Faculty Meeting should be held on February 21 for the purpose of discussing the College's administrative structure.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Loinaz asked if the addition of a Provost would constrain the faculty salary pool. The President explained that the salary pools for faculty and administrators are separate, and she noted that the Treasurer, Peter Shea, has told her that the College can afford to add capacity without affecting its commitment to faculty FTE or salary increases. Further, she envisions using the administrative line already approved and funded for a Chief Diversity Officer for a Provost who, in addition to his or her other responsibilities, would lead efforts to promote diversity in the Faculty and staff and make the strength of the College's diversity central to an Amherst experience. President Martin said having a Provost with college-wide responsibility coordinate this work, rather than relying on a Chief Diversity Officer whose purview is more limited, will be the most effective approach, she believes.

Professor Umphrey asked if a vote by the Faculty would be needed to create a Provost position, noting that the *Faculty Handbook* includes ([II, B., 2.](#)) descriptions of some members of the administration. The Dean said that the creation of such an administrative position is within the purview of the President; faculty votes are not needed to add a description of the position to the *Faculty Handbook*. If the Provost were to serve, ex officio, on any standing faculty committees, votes of the Faculty would be required to revise the membership of those



Amended February 17, 2012

committees. The President said that a Provost, with the Faculty's approval, could potentially become an ex officio member of the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR). The members agreed that, should a Provost be added to faculty committees, the members would review the *Faculty Handbook* language and propose new language, subject to the approval of the Faculty, where needed. The Committee then reviewed the draft agenda for the Faculty Meeting of February 21 and voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward it to the Faculty.

The Committee next discussed briefly the [proposal for a Five-College Sustainability Studies Certificate Program](#), which has been endorsed by the CEP. The members agreed that the questions that they had developed previously ([see minutes of January 23](#)) should be forward to Professor Dizard, who could share them with the other proposers. Discussion turned to the impact of Five-College certificates, more generally. The Dean reported that, while Amherst students regularly earn certificates in International Relations and Latin-American and Caribbean Studies and have also participated in the certificates in African Studies, and Culture, Health and Science, Amherst students, by and large, have participated only rarely in the other certificates. Professor Umphrey asked if participation in the certificates has resulted in substantial costs. For example, has it become necessary to add faculty positions to sustain any certificates? The Dean said that the costs have been modest and have largely taken the form of support for organizing committees for certificate-related activities. These costs are divided among the Five-College institutions, he noted. Professor Umphrey said that, given that there are no apparent costs associated with the certificates, as a general matter, she would support Amherst's participation in these programs because they offer interested students educational experiences that appear to benefit them.

Discussion turned to inquiries by Professors Sarat and Friedman about the College calendar. In December, Dean Call noted, Professor Sarat had written to the Committee of Six to request that the College's calendar for the Spring term, as voted by the Faculty in the last academic year, be re-examined by the College Council and possibly reconsidered by the Faculty. Professor Sarat suggested that this step be taken in light of Smith College's decision not to start its Spring term earlier than has been typical in order to align it with the Spring start of the University of Massachusetts, as Smith had initially said that it would. In January, Professor Friedman had requested ([see appended email](#)) that the Committee of Six, in consultation with the College Council, take up the issue of the timing of Spring Break in the College calendar. He noted that Spring Break this year falls after the eighth week of classes, "breaking with the tradition of it following the seventh week." Professor Friedman expressed the view that, since the break is often used by thesis students to complete their research before beginning to write their theses, the current schedule (and the one anticipated for the next academic year) reduces by a week the time available to students to write theses. He asked whether it might be possible for the College to find some way to move the break back to its traditional time in the semester. The Dean noted that in recent years Spring Break has consistently occurred after seven weeks of class in the spring, while noting that he recalls a number of spring semesters in the late 1980s and 1990s when the break occurred after eight weeks of class. Thus, there has been some variation over a longer period of time, depending on the start date of the term and also the effort to coordinate Spring Break week across the Five Colleges. He pointed out that, for the benefit of students, the agreement among the Five Colleges to retain the same Spring Break has held firm, even as other changes to the spring calendar have occurred. Professor Ratner said that he feels that shifting spring break by one week would not necessarily impinge upon the quality of theses; admittedly, students would have to adjust their efforts devoted to experimentation vs. writing during that week. Professor Umphrey agreed, noting that it seems best to retain the calendar, as voted, for a period of time before making changes. Professor Loinaz suggested that the concerns

Amended February 17, 2012

raised by Professors Sarat and Friedman be forwarded to the College Council, for the purposes of information. The Committee agreed noting that colleagues who have concerns about the calendar could share them with the College Council.

The Committee next discussed the online Workplace Harassment Program. Some Committee members had viewed the online video about this subject in advance of the meeting. Professor Ratner, who had done so, wondered if there might be a less time-consuming and more relevant way of conveying this information to faculty. Professor Umphrey said that the video does convey some useful information about legal reporting requirements. Professor Basu, agreed, noting that, given the liability issues and the absence of a better tool, it seems prudent to encourage faculty to view the video. If the video were more relevant to the Amherst/academic experience, it would be more helpful, she said. The Committee agreed that department chairs, in particular, should make every effort to view the video and that new faculty should be asked to view it as part of the orientation program for new colleagues. The Dean agreed to discuss this training program with the Faculty as part of his announcements at the February 21 Faculty Meeting.

The meeting ended with a brief conversation about the possibility of regularizing long-term visiting appointments at the College for scholars who have tenurable credentials. The Dean explained that the proposal is to bring up for tenure, through the regular process for senior hires, a small number of individuals who have occupied visiting positions at Amherst, have strong records of scholarship, and have been making valuable contributions to the College for many years. The colleagues in question are considered to be highly productive scholars who have demonstrated excellence in teaching, and their departments have recommended them for tenured positions. The Dean noted that, before turning to the cases in question, the CEP has decided to consider the question of whether to allocate FTEs for this purpose after the committee receives FTE requests this spring, in order to gain a sense of the number of FTEs that would be available. The Dean noted that, at present, because of the number of retirements and the expansion of the Faculty, the College is in the rare position of not being overly constrained by the FTE count. President Martin expressed the view that the positions in question should be outside the FTE count in any case. For this reason, she argued, the count should not be determinative when considering the proposal to tenure these individuals. With little time remaining, and Professors Basu and Umphrey noting that they have questions about this proposal, the members agreed to continue its discussion of this issue at a future meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended March 14, 2012

The nineteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, February 20, 2012. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Martin, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

President Martin did not have any announcements, and the meeting began with “Announcements from the Dean.” Dean Call informed the members that the Chief Information Officer (CIO) Search Coordinating Committee, which he chairs, encourages colleagues to attend the upcoming talks (February 23 and 28) by two finalists for the position. The committee has asked each candidate to share his/her vision for technology in a liberal arts college environment.

Dean Call reported back to the members about Registrar Kathleen Goff’s responses to questions that had been raised during the Committee’s discussion ([see the minutes of February 6](#)) of the new policy regarding the use of online and hybrid courses for transfer and make-up credit, on a limited basis, which had recently been approved by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). The Registrar had stressed that, only under extraordinary circumstances, and only in consultation with the Dean of Students, would permission be granted for students to take hybrid or online courses. She had informed the Dean that only one student has requested permission to take an online course since the CEP approved this option. In that case, permission was denied; no student has been approved to take an online course to date. The Registrar said that she had not considered posting the online course notation on students’ transcripts, when applicable, but that she can do so. Ms. Goff stressed that all courses approved by the Registrar are for general credit; students are informed that they need the additional approval of their department(s) to apply any course credit toward a major. Conversation turned briefly to a personnel matter.

The Committee, the President, and the Dean next discussed possible areas of responsibility for the proposed Provost position, why the position is needed, and its potential benefits for the College. Conversation began with the Committee considering whether for the Faculty Meeting it would be useful to provide the Faculty with an organizational chart of the administration as it is currently constituted, as well as a chart that would show how the structure might be re-imagined if a Provost position were to be added. President Martin said that she would prefer discussing the structure without showing charts. The current chart is dense and detailed and would not be a useful way to inform discussion, in her view. President Martin said that it would not be productive to formulate a chart of any new structure at this time, both because consultation has not yet taken place with those who oversee areas that might have new reporting lines, and because the process of determining the shape of the position is in its earliest stages.

Professor Ratner asked whether the current organizational chart could be simplified, and Professor Loinaz felt that there could be value in presenting organizational charts for present and envisioned structures. Wondering what questions might be answered by organizational charts, Professor Umphrey expressed a preference for having the Faculty Meeting discussion without them. Professor Ferguson agreed, commenting that a discussion of the larger issues, most critically the Provost’s relationship to the Faculty, would be preferable to focusing on details; he expressed the view that charts might provoke a conversation that would focus on the latter rather than the former. President Martin agreed and discussed with the Committee possible areas of the College for which a Provost might have oversight. Before any decisions are made about the reporting lines for the new position, President Martin said that she would prefer to have the Provost in place, so as to benefit from his or her input and further consultation with the Faculty.

Professor Basu next asked whether the President had plans to consult with the staff, as well as the Faculty, about the position. President Martin said that she wants to discuss the Provost position with the Faculty first, but that she plans to communicate with staff about the

Amended March 14, 2012

shape of the position, once a process has been adopted to define it. The President reiterated that she envisions the Provost position as having a College-wide role, with responsibility for strategic planning, budget, and the integration of programs and initiatives that span the traditional boundaries of students, staff, and faculty. Professor Hewitt said that she has sensed some anxiety among the Faculty about whether funding this position might prevent the College from fulfilling goals in other areas. President Martin said that she has proposed that the Provost, whom she envisions leading efforts to promote diversity in the Faculty and staff and to make the strength of Amherst's diversity central to the College's experience, be funded through the administrative line that has already been approved for the position of Chief Diversity Officer. President Martin stressed the importance for any president, herself included, of assembling a team that will enable the president to develop ideas, engage in planning, seize opportunities, and implement initiatives most effectively.

Continuing the conversation about the structure of the administration, President Martin noted that the areas of information technology and assessment, and the intensification of procedures, have put additional pressures on the Dean's office. Establishing a Provost position, and, possibly, increasing staffing in the Dean's office, would help meet the increasing demands in these and other areas. Professor Basu asked about the impact that the Provost position might have on faculty governance and the position's relationship to faculty committees. The President responded that she envisions that the Provost would participate in faculty governance through his or her service on some faculty committees, for example, the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR). A change in the membership of any standing committee of the Faculty would require a vote of the Faculty, she noted. Professor Basu asked whether the President had gathered comparative information about administrative structures. Responding that she had done such research, including consulting directly with the presidents of three liberal arts colleges, the President said that she had found that a Provost's functions are different on every campus. She expressed the view that an argument for a Provost that would be based on such comparisons would be a weak argument for the position, and that the College should focus rather on Amherst's needs. President Martin commented that a Provost position could be viewed as an experiment, with a Provost hired for a particular period, for example, three to five years, with the possibility of renewal, following an evaluation of the position. Some members felt that it might be challenging to attract the best candidates if the position had a term.

At 4:20 P.M., the Committee was joined by the members of the Amherst College Architectural Studies Advisory Committee (Heidi Gilpin, Associate Professor of German and Chair of European Studies; Thom Long, Five-College Assistant Professor of Architectural Studies; Carol Clark, William McCall Vickery 1957 Professor of the History of Art and American Studies; Nicola Courtright, Professor of the History of Art; Ronald Rosbottom, Winifred L. Arms Professor in the Arts and Humanities and Professor of French and European Studies; and Kevin Sweeney, Professor of American Studies and History) for a conversation about the proposed interdisciplinary Five-College major in Architectural Studies. Professor Gilpin thanked the members for reviewing the proposal with such care and thoroughness, and the advisory committee said that the Committee of Six's discussion ([see minutes of February 6](#)) had raised good questions and had already prompted the proposers to refine the proposal. Noting that the proposal for this major had emerged after more than twelve years of dialogue and experimentation across the campuses of the Five Colleges, Professor Gilpin stressed that the new major would present an exciting opportunity for Amherst students.

Continuing the conversation, Dean Call asked what the advantages would be for Amherst students of having a more formal structure for the study of architecture, since such study has been occurring more informally. Professor Long noted the benefits of moving away from the

Amended March 14, 2012

current ad hoc approach and toward a structure that would enable students to undertake the study of built environments through a program that has been designed with vision and intention. Professor Courtright said that Amherst students would be enriched by a major that would offer coherence and intellectual and creative direction and depth. Professor Clark commented that some Amherst students develop an interest in architecture fairly late in their time at the College, often because they happen upon a course that excites them about the subject. If the College were to offer a program with weight and a formal identity, students would likely begin their studies of architecture earlier in their academic careers, she noted. In addition, at present, students from the institutions (Mount Holyoke and Hampshire) that have adopted the major are given priority in the courses for the major, particularly the necessary studio courses; as a result, Amherst students regularly cannot gain access to the courses that are among the most critical for them to take if they wish to study architecture. Several members and the President wondered whether adding the major at Amherst would ensure that there would be space in these classes for Amherst students. The advisory committee expressed confidence that this would indeed be the case and that slots would be available for Amherst students majoring in Architectural Studies.

Professor Basu asked whether the Advisory Committee would consider initially offering a Five-College certificate in lieu of a major in Architectural Studies. Professor Clark said that, in essence, through ad hoc means, a certificate has been offered for a number of years. The need now, the advisory committee argued, is for a program of study that is more substantive and intentional. Continuing, Professor Long noted, and Professor Courtright concurred, most certificates are in subfields within larger fields. Architecture is a major field in its own right. Professor Courtright commented that the major would be staffed by Five-College faculty in a rich array of disciplines. She noted that these colleagues enjoy collaborating with one another and share a vision for the study of the built environment and an approach that is consistent with the liberal arts.

Professor Umphrey asked the members of the advisory committee about their view that additional resources would not be needed to mount the major. Returning to the topic of offering priority to majors, she wondered whether it might become necessary to add courses, and faculty to teach them, in order to ensure the necessary access, particularly if the major became popular. Dean Call said that he also wondered if additional resources would be needed. Professor Long responded that, if it became necessary to add courses/faculty, the burden of providing these resources would be shared among the campuses. He said that the goal would be to develop, in a well-planned and strategic way, a curriculum for the major across the campuses, noting that students would also take the pre-requisites for the major across the campuses. The chairmanship of the major, which would be for two years, would rotate to Amherst every six years. The advisory committee envisioned that an academic coordinator would likely be needed for about five hours a week, at least initially.

Stressing the flexibility that would be a hallmark of the major, Professor Long commented that there would be a variety of paths through the major, depending on a student's interest, and that faculty would help students develop a program of study that would meet their needs within the major. Professor Clark commented that the major is not intended to prepare students to become architects, but would take a humanities-centered, liberal arts approach. Credit toward the major will not be given for technical courses offered by the university, though students could take them if they wished. Professor Gilpin said that the major would comprise four required foundational core courses that would provide a balance between artistic practice and the theoretical and historical, five electives, and one semester of capstone or two semesters of honors thesis work. The major would have a structure similar to that of the Film and Media Studies major. There would be sufficient flexibility within the major to allow students to take some of

Amended March 14, 2012

the courses as late as their senior year, she said. President Martin asked whether there would be so much flexibility that a lack of coherence might be a result. Professor Gilpin responded that flexibility would be a strength of the program, in her view, and that the faculty who will participate in the major will ensure that there is coherence for each student. Five-College faculty who teach architecture courses, who already meet twice during the semester for purposes of discussion and collaboration, would continue to meet at least twice a semester to oversee the major and the progress of individual students.

Professor Clark noted that the proposal for the major is a Five-College proposal, and it should be seen as a generic document that includes elements that would not be a part of the Amherst major; Amherst faculty would oversee the major at the College and would ensure that the program of study undertaken by Amherst students would be consistent with their needs and the College's expectations. For example, Professor Gilpin noted, she does not envision that Amherst students will choose to participate in UMass's five-year master's program. She also explained that an affiliation with the New York Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies would not be a central part of the major at Amherst—there are also many other study-abroad programs, including Cornell's architecturally-focused program in Rome, in which Amherst students have long participated—though it plays a prominent role for Hampshire students. It was noted that the Smith faculty has decided not to offer the Five-College major formally, but to participate fully in the curriculum of the major, and prioritize a major's access to Smith courses in architecture and landscape studies, even pledging to offer a new introductory course.

Dean Call suggested that, before the proposal for the major is brought to the Faculty for consideration, the advisory committee should provide the Committee of Six with more information about how the major would be integrated into Amherst's curriculum and how it would be shaped and structured on our campus. The committee might seek to answer the following questions in this document: Why a Five-College major? What role will Amherst faculty members have in the major? Why do Amherst students need this major and how would they benefit? Stressing that the goal of the major is not to prepare students in technical ways for architecture school, but, rather, to provide them with a curriculum that will allow them to think deeply, broadly, critically, analytically, and in interdisciplinary ways about the built environment, Professor Sweeney noted that Amherst students regularly are admitted to architecture school without the major, while commenting that students who wish to go to architecture school would have enhanced opportunities to develop a portfolio if the major were to be adopted, thus ensuring access to studio courses. This information would be shared with the Faculty as a cover letter that would accompany the Five-College proposal for the major. The Advisory Committee agreed that doing so would be useful and that today's conversation would help the committee think further about Amherst-specific issues within the Five-College major. Professor Rosbottom noted that Amherst students have shown a great deal of interest in architecture and the built environment and that the College should want to serve students' needs. Courses that were taught as part of the Urban Imagination, an initiative funded through the President's Initiative Fund (PIF), were quite popular, he noted. Professor Umphrey asked why, given what sounds like considerable student interest, an architecture major solely at Amherst is not being proposed. What is the benefit of the Five-College approach? Professor Gilpin noted that this option had been considered, but the already existing wealth of Architectural Studies faculty throughout the Five Colleges made an Amherst major far less compelling. She also noted that, unless Amherst participates in the Five-College major, Amherst students will continue to lack access to the courses offered at other campuses, which are vital to ensure a comprehensive program of study.

Amended March 14, 2012

Continuing the conversation, Professor Long emphasized the richness of the Five Colleges as a consortium, noting that each campus, including Amherst, has something unique to offer—encompassing everything from medieval architecture to material culture. Amherst, he noted, has the only digital architecture lab in the Valley. Smith has particular strengths in studio and landscape studies, and Hampshire is strong in studio and also has a faculty member who focuses on architectural history and theory. Professor Umphrey said that, in the context of this discussion, and more broadly, the question of what should drive curricular change is an important one. It was noted that Amherst chose not to participate in the Five-College Film major and to offer its own Film and Media Studies major because of differences in how Amherst faculty envisioned the curriculum. Professor Sweeney commented that, in the case of the proposed architecture major, the faculty involved share the same vision for the major and collaborate extremely well. Professor Umphrey asked how many Amherst students are currently majoring in the new Film and Media Studies program. Professor Gilpin responded that the current number of Amherst Film and Media Studies majors is low: A total of nine majors (one senior, five juniors, three sophomores). She anticipates that the number of Amherst Five-College Architectural Studies majors would be similar, in line with the numbers of Amherst students who have focused on Architectural Studies in their interdisciplinary, art, or other majors in the recent past. Professor Basu, noting that the major depends on shared curricular commitments among Five-College faculty, wondered how the campuses will collaborate in making new hires in the future. She noted that, among the Amherst proposers, several colleagues are on phased retirement. Professor Gilpin responded that the departments involved in the major at each campus have agreed that, when structuring new positions and making hires, when possible and applicable, a focus in the built environment, and filling in the curricular “gaps” within the major, will be an area of emphasis. Amherst Advisory Committee members, she continued, have already been including Architectural Studies interests in recent FTE and short-term hires in their departments. Professor Clark noted that the Department of Art and the History of Art has offered new courses in architecture and design history, from introductory to advanced, and has plans for two, or possibly three, new courses next year. Professor Umphrey commented that this approach would have implications going forward, as departments and the College would need to think about the allocation of FTEs carefully in order to mount this collaborative major. The Advisory Committee left the meeting at 5:30 P.M. The Committee of Six agreed that it would ask the Architectural Studies Advisory Committee to revise and resubmit the proposal. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended March 26, 2012

The twentieth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by Dean Call in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, February 27, 2012. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. President Martin participated in the meeting via speaker phone.

The Committee discussed briefly the Faculty's response to the proposal that a Provost be added to the administration. The members agreed that, based on the discussion at the Faculty Meeting of February 21, the Faculty was supportive of moving forward with this position, with some colleagues expressing the view that considering a different title for it might be desirable. President Martin said that she had been pleased with the Faculty's response to the proposal and would be open to alternative titles. Professor Umphrey asked how the Committee of Six could be most helpful at this point in the process and inquired whether the senior staff would be consulted as the position is shaped. President Martin responded that she plans to develop a draft job description and to share it with the Committee of Six and the senior staff, though she anticipates working most closely with the Committee to define the position, as the Faculty requested. The President explained that, since the job description is still at a stage of formation, it would be helpful if the Committee could first consider the question of the title. Professor Umphrey expressed the view that the title of Dean of the College, which had been proposed at the Faculty Meeting, often is the equivalent of Amherst's Dean of Students position. She feels that giving the position that title might lead to some confusion about the role of the individual. Dean Call agreed and noted that, at other institutions, the Dean of the College is the chief academic officer, functioning as the Dean of the Faculty. Professor Ratner was of the impression that the responsibilities associated with the title of Dean of the College vary. If so, he would favor calling the position Dean of the College, as long as that title does not result in miscommunication of the role that is envisioned for the job at Amherst, he said. Professor Ferguson expressed a preference for the title of Provost, as he feels it is most commonly associated with the functions of the position, as President Martin has articulated it. The President said that she looks forward to continuing the conversation about the position at the time she shares the job description with the members. Conversation turned briefly to a personnel matter.

The Committee next returned to a discussion of the issue of regularizing long-term visiting appointments at the College for scholars who have tenurable credentials. The Dean has been discussing with the CEP the possibility of bringing up for tenure, through the regular process for senior hires, a small number of individuals who have occupied visiting positions at Amherst, have strong records of scholarship, and have been making valuable contributions to the College for many years. The colleagues in question are considered to be highly productive scholars who have demonstrated excellence in teaching, and their departments have recommended them for tenured positions. The CEP has decided to consider the question of whether to allocate FTEs for this purpose after the committee receives regular FTE requests this spring, in order to gain a sense of the number of FTEs that would be available. The Dean reminded the members that, at present, because of the number of retirements and the expansion of the Faculty, the College is in the rare position of not being overly constrained by the FTE count. Dean Call explained that funding for the positions in question is presently available in the budget, since the individuals are already being paid by the College in their current roles. The positions could be kept outside the FTE count or another approach could be taken, the Dean said. At present, he explained, faculty members who serve as administrators and have reduced teaching loads, or do not teach at all, are counted in the faculty FTE count. The Dean, President, and Dean of Students are counted as full faculty FTEs. The two Associate Deans of the Faculty, the Director and Associate Director of the Writing Center, and Dean of New Students are also counted as full faculty FTEs, even



Amended March 26, 2012

though they each serve half-time as administrators. The Provost position will bring the number of faculty who serve as full-time administrators to four. When those four full-time positions are combined with the five positions for faculty who serve half time in administrative roles, there will be 6.5 faculty FTEs devoted to administration. Since the size of the faculty salary pool is determined, in part, by the faculty FTE count, including all faculty-administrators in the faculty FTE count has enabled the Dean to sustain the faculty salary pool at a higher level. The faculty FTE count is thus higher than it would be if these positions were outside the count, and the salary pool that is available for distribution to the Faculty is greater. (It should be noted that the administrative salary budget pays the administrative portion of the salaries of faculty-administrators.) With the creation of the Provost's position, it may be time now to raise formally the faculty FTE cap to account for these 6.5 FTEs. If the long-term visiting positions under discussion (which would count as 1.5 FTEs) are regularized as tenured positions and shift into the faculty FTE count, at the same time the Provost's position is added and the FTE cap is raised by 6.5, the net effect would be to give the CEP more flexibility when it considers the number of FTEs available for allocation moving forward. The Dean said that he had not yet discussed this approach with the CEP but has plans to do so.

Continuing the discussion of procedures that might be put in place to regularize the positions, Professor Umphrey asked if the Committee would be provided with teaching evaluations as part of the envisioned tenure reviews. The Dean said that he would propose soliciting retrospective letters from students who had been taught by the individuals in the last three years. Professor Umphrey expressed some concern that appointments for tenured positions might be made without the vetting that is intrinsic to a national search. She noted that a national search is required for teaching positions at the College, including visiting positions. The Dean said that he is almost always in favor of having national searches and has required that this process be followed for new visiting and tenured or tenure-track faculty hires. However, he has thought a great deal about what process would make the most sense in these and other unusual circumstances, and has come to the conclusion that the tenure review, which is the most thorough evaluation the College conducts and which includes an evaluation of a candidate's scholarship by outside experts in his or her field, would provide a high degree of external vetting of the candidates. The Dean noted that regularizing long-term visiting positions has been one of his priorities as Dean. In most circumstances, regularization has been accomplished through Senior Lecturer appointments (a designation that might not be attractive to the individuals in question, who are accomplished scholars as well as teachers). Requests for Senior Lecturers, which have originated in departments, have been brought before the CEP, Dean Call said. Once the position has been allocated, he has required that a national search be conducted. The Dean noted that, in the majority of cases, the department has hired the person who was already here. So, while he had considered whether national searches should be part of the process for considering long-term visitors with tenurable credentials for tenured positions, he had felt that since the tenure process itself was the College's most rigorous mode of assessment, a national search with a very strong internal candidate would not serve to add much additional value as a vehicle for vetting candidates. In addition, if a position is (purposefully) structured to represent the needs and niche that are being filled by the individual, that structure might be unusual and might end up limiting the applicant pool, Professor Ferguson offered.

Professor Basu asked what might happen if departments put forward these individuals for tenure and received outside letters from external reviewers that raise questions about the quality of the candidate's scholarly work. Could the process be halted before its conclusion? If so, could such a tenure candidate become a Senior Lecturer? Alternatively, could a long-term visitor who stands for tenure and receives a negative decision be permitted to become a Senior

Amended March 26, 2012

Lecturer, instead of being required to leave the College after a terminal year of teaching, as is ordinarily the case with a tenure denial? Professor Ferguson felt that the option of remaining at the College as a Senior Lecturer should be a possibility for individuals in these circumstances. The Dean said that, perhaps, if a department assembles a tenure dossier for an individual and solicits letters, and then finds that the letters raise concerns that might put the case in jeopardy, there could be a conversation with the Dean before the case proceeds to the Committee of Six. Under those circumstances, perhaps the case would not go forward, and the individual, if he or she wished, could remain at the College as a Senior Lecturer. In order for the person to assume this position, the department would first have to make a request to the CEP for a Senior Lecturer. A national search would then need to be conducted, he said. The Dean expressed the view that it should only be possible for an individual to have one opportunity to be considered for tenure, whether his or her case ultimately came before the Committee of Six or not. President Martin said that she feels strongly that it should be up to departments to assess the strength of any case for tenure. This could be done by reaching out to colleagues in the field in informal ways to get an assessment, for example. The President said that she would not be in favor of offering the option of halting a case once it has been brought forward, and/or allowing an individual to become a Senior Lecturer if tenure is denied. Some members agreed. Professor Hewitt asked if the colleagues under discussion would be asked to serve on faculty committees if they received tenure. The Dean said that once tenured, these individuals would have the same responsibilities, including College service, as any tenured faculty member.

Professor Umphrey expressed some concern that allowing departments to bring visitors up for tenured or tenure-track positions, without requesting an FTE through regular processes and without a national search, would enable “end-runs” around the tenure process. Professor Basu said that she had similar worries about developing mechanisms for visitors, who are brought to the College through a process that is largely departmental, to cross over into permanent positions, without the vetting that is otherwise required at College-wide (via the CEP, Dean, and President) and national levels (via a search). Professor Ferguson said that, while the process for requesting and hiring visitors, which is authorized and overseen by the Dean and does not involve the CEP or the President, is less rigorous than the procedures for making a tenure-track hire, if the individual is later brought up for tenure, that review will be rigorous. The Dean noted that he has made it a rule that no visiting appointment can be regularized into a Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, tenure-track or tenured position without the department first making a request to the CEP. The Committee agreed that the questions under discussion are vexing and are made more complex when a long-term visitor is the spouse or partner of a tenured or tenure-track faculty member. Professors Umphrey and Basu stressed that they understand the importance and complexity of finding ways to support the careers of partners/spouses of faculty. Professor Umphrey expressed the view that a Senior Lecturer appointment, resulting from a process that would involve a request to the CEP for the position and a national search, is one attractive model for regularizing visiting positions, when departments wish to do so. The Committee agreed that the issue of spousal hiring will take on increasing importance in the years to come because of the large amount of hiring that is anticipated over the next decade, in particular, because of faculty retirements.

Professor Ratner commented that tenuring scholar-teachers (when they have the necessary credentials) who have served the College well as visitors for many years might be the best option for those who are already here, during a time when FTEs are relatively plentiful. However, he said that he suspects that faculty would be less willing to have FTEs used for this purpose if similar circumstances arise during a time when FTEs are scarce. The Dean agreed, commenting that one of the reasons he had chosen to use the Senior Lectureship model for regularizing

Amended March 26, 2012

positions earlier, was that only a small number of FTEs had been available. He noted that no system will be perfect, but said that his goal is to develop a process that will help make decisions that are best for the College, and which will treat individuals fairly. He explained that, if there is a tenure review for the individuals under discussion, the outside letters would provide information about the candidates that is external to the College. Having such a perspective would be critical for ensuring that the evaluations of those with whom departments have had long relationships would be objective and based on a full range of evidence.

Professor Umphrey, who said that she knows that the Dean has implemented a rule that visitors not teach at the College for a period of more than three years, asked Dean Call if he anticipates having visitors remain at the College for more extended periods and whether the rule has been applied to spouses/partners of tenured or tenure-track faculty who teach at the College. Dean Call replied that it is his hope that, in the future, individuals will not teach in non-regularized positions for extended periods (beyond three years) and that an equitable process will be in place for regularizing long-term visiting appointments, should they occur. He said that it has been his practice to allow spouses/partners of faculty no more than two, two-year appointments as visitors. By the time the second appointment concludes, it would be his expectation that a decision would be made about whether the individual and the department wish to move the individual into a regularized position. Often, he noted, the two appointments give an individual sufficient time to explore tenure-track options at other institutions. Some faculty spouses/partners have ended up moving into such positions, he noted. At the conclusion of the conversation, the Dean thanked the members for helping to think through this complex issue.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Umphrey returned to the Dean's suggestion that he might propose to the Board that the FTE count be raised to account for the faculty FTEs currently devoted to administrative responsibilities. Given that he may use some of those FTEs creatively vis-a-vis long-term visitors, she urged him to consider using the rest, or some portion of it, for course release for faculty members serving on or chairing major committees, and perhaps chairs of large departments. Professor Umphrey noted that at present, there is little College recognition of the extra burdens placed on faculty who serve in these ways, and that Amherst's approach to committee service is an exception to common practice in this regard. Professor Basu agreed and pointed out that the workload for faculty in these roles has increased significantly over time. She suggested that a discussion of this issue be placed on the Committee of Six's agenda, while recognizing that this topic might be considered as part of the long-range planning process, as well. Professor Ratner wondered whether this might be a moment, with the upcoming addition of the Provost to the administration, to consider whether the responsibilities of the Committee of Six should be divided between two committees, with one committee serving as the tenure and promotion committee and the other assuming the other duties of the executive committee of the Faculty. Perhaps the Provost could be an ex officio member of the latter of these two committees, he said.

The Committee next reviewed a draft of a Faculty Meeting agenda for March 6. The members agreed that there was not sufficient business to have a meeting. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended March 26, 2012

The twenty-first meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Thursday, March 8, 2012. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Under “Announcements from the President,” President Martin noted that the senior staff and she are preparing for the Board of Trustees retreat, which will be held March 29-31 in New York. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended March 26, 2012

The twenty-second meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, March 12, 2012. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Under “Announcements from the President,” President Martin noted that the senior staff and she are preparing for the Board of Trustees retreat, which will be held in New York from March 29 through March 31. She informed the members that the retreat will focus on admissions, the make-up of the student body, and students’ experiences at Amherst. Cornell University sociologist David Harris, Senior Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Cornell, will present national data on diversity, including a brief history of Supreme Court decisions on affirmative action, and will lead a discussion with the Board. President Martin noted that Professor Harris studies socioeconomic and racial disparities in the United States. She said that he will be joined in the discussion by Professor Ferguson, who will describe the innovations in curriculum and teaching that have occurred within the Department of Black Studies. President Martin informed the members that Amherst data will be presented on the following four aspects of diversity that Dean Harris will introduce: the changing composition of Amherst’s student body over time; academic achievement; the campus “climate” beyond the classroom; and how much Amherst students interact and what they learn in the process. How the classroom and student life outside the classroom work together will be examined and questions, including the following, will be discussed: does our evidence point to “achievement gaps” of any sort? What have we done to address variations in preparation where they are relevant? Have these programs worked? What investments would make a difference? Conversation will also focus on the co-curriculum and the question of how Amherst can take greater advantage of students’ diverse backgrounds. Initiatives at Amherst and at peer institutions that offer evidence of enriching students’ experience may be reviewed, President Martin explained.

Conversation turned to the topic of whether or not there is an “achievement gap” at Amherst and, if so, what form it takes. Is there, for example, a relationship between a student’s level of preparation when he or she arrives at Amherst and that student’s choice of major, and his or her academic success (as measured by G.P.A.)? Particular majors (chemistry and physics, for example) may attract a higher proportion of students with the highest academic reader ratings. President Martin said that she would like to explore over time whether there is any achievement gap based on race/ethnicity and/or socioeconomic status. She noted that retention and graduation rates do not shed much light on these questions, as the rates are very high for all groups. President Martin commented that G.P.A. and standardized test scores cannot account for all of the differences in performance among groups at institutions across the country. It seems clear that the experience that students have on campus can have an effect on their performance, she said. President Martin commented that, for example, some athletes at Amherst perform better than their test scores and G.P.A.s would predict, suggesting that there is something about their experience at Amherst that helps them do better than expected. Athletes’ success might be attributed to the extra support and mentoring that they receive and the expectations that are placed on them for academic success. Athletes arrive at the College with structures that are in place that guarantee them mentors/coaches and teammates/friends, and they are required to develop study/organizational skills in order to do well, so that they can participate in their sport. President Martin suggested that it might be useful to explore what kinds of support systems could be offered to students other than athletes that would enhance their overall success.

In regard to the Board retreat, President Martin explained that Dean Call would summarize for the Board the academic support programs that have been put in place at the College over the

Amended March 26, 2012

past three decades. While a good deal has been accomplished as a result of investments in programs on the academic front (e.g., students now persist through particular introductory courses in which they may not have been successful before support systems were put in place), there has been less attention paid to developing programs in the area of student life to support Amherst's more diverse student body. The President stressed the need for enhanced staffing in the Dean of Students Office, which she considers to be significantly under-staffed, commenting that the Dean of Students has little time for planning because he must be engaged so heavily in the day-to-day. She noted many students' sense of dissatisfaction with the sense of community at the College, according to survey data. Professor Ferguson expressed the view that integrating the curricular and the co-curricular more fully could serve as a source of comradery among students. He offered the examples of the Multicultural Center and the Center for Community Engagement as potential vehicles for connecting students with one another, the larger community, and the curriculum in innovative and engaging ways. Professor Ferguson suggested that there are two tracks/experiences at Amherst—one set of courses that are taken by the most “golden,” most accomplished, best-prepared students and another grouping of courses that are taken by less well-prepared students. The members agreed that it would be important, as part of the Board discussion, to explore how students navigate the open curriculum and to examine the paths that students take through Amherst's curriculum.

Professor Basu stressed the importance of determining where the achievement gap may lie. She suggested that less well-prepared students often take large classes, in which it is possible for them to “hide,” and select majors based on whether they feel that they can succeed, rather than based on their interests. The ability to teach more classes with smaller enrollments, perhaps through capping more courses, would be helpful in this regard, she noted. Continuing, Professor Basu explained that it often can be difficult to recognize that students are experiencing challenges in a course until they hand in their first writing assignment. Some students speak well in class but may have poor writing skills, she noted. Some students who are feeling overwhelmed by a course, or may be facing other challenges, such as emotional problems, hand their papers in late, if at all, because they are struggling. Professor Basu said that, although students may be having academic difficulty, it may not be readily apparent, because they may be receiving grades that are not reflective of their abilities. She suggested that, if there was less grade inflation at Amherst, the achievement gap would be less disguised and more pronounced. Professor Umphrey commented on the tension that exists at Amherst between grade inflation and the Faculty's desire to ensure that students are successful. President Martin thanked the Committee for its insights, which she said would be informative for the Board and for the upcoming planning process.

Conversation turned to student culture and the sense of community on campus. Professor Ratner noted that the number of hours that students spend studying outside of class has dropped nationally, and he wondered if there was any variance among groups in terms of time spent studying. Professor Ferguson noted that it appears that not many students do readings beyond what is required for their classes. Professor Umphrey expressed the view that many students are interested in leadership and seem to spend a good deal of time participating in co-curricular activities, organizing and running events. The Committee wondered if the intellectual style of Amherst students has changed over the past decade. Some members conjectured that students may be doing less work because of grade inflation. Professor Ferguson noted that, within Black Studies, there is less grade inflation, and rewards (grades) are aligned with effort. Students seem to feel more of a sense of accomplishment, and appear to put in more effort, as a result, he feels.

The Committee next discussed concerns about gender relations on campus and incidents of sexual assault, which are being reported with greater frequency, it appears. The members

Amended March 26, 2012

suggested that the cultures of residential life and some athletics teams may play a role in these incidents. President Martin expressed concern and said that she intends to get more information about procedures that are in place for addressing such assaults and the enforcement of these procedures, and also plans to explore strategies that will enhance communication with the College community about issues of sexual harassment and assault, as well as other topics.

Discussion turned to the responsibilities and possible reporting lines of the new senior position within the administration. President Martin asked first about the title, and most members preferred the title of Provost, rather than Dean of the College, as this title is frequently used elsewhere to refer to what Amherst College calls the Dean of Students. The title of Provost will convey the duties of the position and will be important for recruitment, the members agreed. President Martin said that she envisions the position as providing long-range strategic planning across offices and serving as a bridge between the academic and the co-curricular, integrating programs and managing resources across domains. The Committee discussed the relationship between the Dean of the Faculty and the Provost. President Martin explained that the Dean is the Chief Academic Officer of the College and will continue to oversee faculty hiring, development, promotion (including tenure), and department budgets. The Provost's responsibilities will encompass planning and the budget, diversity across domains, and the oversight of a number of administrative departments, some of which currently report to the Dean and/or the President. Both the Provost and the Dean will report to the President, she noted. Professor Umphrey asked what personnel will be needed in the Provost's office. Professor Basu said that, while she is in favor of adding the Provost position, she has some worry that a significant number of additional administrators may be needed to support the large portfolio of responsibilities envisioned for the Provost. President Martin said that she envisions an associate provost for diversity and special projects, as well as an administrative assistant, supporting the Provost. The need for additional staffing may emerge over time, but these are the positions that she foresees at present. Professor Ratner asked the President when she plans to discuss the Provost position with the members of the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR). President Martin said that would do so soon. The Committee then turned to personnel matters.

The Committee 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 reviewed [the responses that Professor Dizard had provided to the Committee's questions about the proposal for the Five College Sustainability Studies Certificate Program](#). Professor Umphrey noted that the certificate will rely heavily on advisors to establish the parameters of the certificate, and she wondered whether there would be consistency in advising across the Five-College institutions. She also commented that Amherst students would have to take a large number of courses at other Five-College institutions to satisfy the requirements of the certificate. It was noted that Amherst students may not take courses at other Five-College institutions in their first semester and may take no more than two per semester thereafter. Professor Hewitt suggested that, because of the number of courses that would be required for the certificate, perhaps Sustainability could become a sub-major within Environmental Studies. President Martin noted the potential problem of students having a less diverse curriculum if they double major, a point that had been raised in recent conversations with members of the Faculty. Professor Hewitt responded that, for their majors, some departments welcome students who want to double major and purposely keep the number of courses that are required for the major on the modest side for this reason. Her own department, French, has many double majors among its majors, she commented. Dean Call said that it is his

Amended March 26, 2012

understanding that Amherst has roughly the same proportion of double majors as many peer institutions, including some that have distribution requirements and others that have relatively open curricula. The members noted that some students may feel encouraged to double major when they learn that, with just a few more courses in a particular area, they would complete a second major. Members of the Committee expressed a diversity of opinion about the desirability of double majors. Professor Hewitt expressed the view that students would take a less diverse curriculum if departments that have fewer required courses for the major increase the number of required courses, as students would continue to double major and would then take fewer courses outside two majors. The Committee noted that there has been some discussion about establishing minors at the College, which would have fewer required courses and might satisfy students' desires to have formal credentials in more than one field.

Returning to the discussion about the certificate, Professor Ratner noted that he was not persuaded that the substance of a special topics course that evolved from an internship experience would necessarily end up being the equivalent of an advanced course. It was agreed that it would be up to the instructor to ensure that this would be the case. The Committee agreed that Professor Dizard's answers to their questions allayed their concerns, and they asked the Dean to request that Professor Dizard incorporate those responses into the Amherst catalogue language for the certificate, and provide the revised copy to the Committee for review. In addition, the Committee felt that it would be helpful to have a cover letter for the Faculty that would describe the ways in which the Amherst form of the certificate will differ, in practice, from the Five-College, more generic proposal.

Conversation turned to the need to develop college-wide learning goals for inclusion in the five-year reaccreditation report that the College will submit in January 2013 to the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEAS&C). Professor Griffiths has discussed this issue with the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). To inform the Committee of Six conversation, the members had been provided with [Professor Griffiths's report to the CEP about the learning goals project](#), as well as a [letter from the CEP](#) itself (both are appended via link here). The CEP notes in its letter to the Committee that "Amherst's institutional learning goals are, to a substantial extent, already described in the Mission Statement that the College adopted in 2006-2007. Rick Griffiths, who is coordinating the Reaccreditation Steering Committee, has proposed a modest change to the College Catalogue that would replace the current list of six advising areas with language that references the Mission Statement and that should meet the reaccreditation association's expectations concerning goals for general education." The CEP requested that the Committee of Six forward to the Faculty Professor Griffiths's proposed revision to the following College Catalogue language, which also includes the revised description of the First-Year Seminar program voted by the Faculty in 2009: (The new language is in bold face. College Catalogue 2011-2012, pp. 71-72.)

#### THE LIBERAL STUDIES CURRICULUM

Under a curriculum adopted in 1996, the first-year students are required to take a First-Year Seminar. These courses are planned and taught by one or more members of the Faculty as a way to introduce students to liberal studies through a range of innovative and often interdisciplinary approaches. The subject matter of the courses varies, as do the capabilities they seek to encourage. ~~These range from writing, quantitative skills, scientific reasoning, oral presentation, and argumentation, to performing, creating and contemplative learning. All seminar instructors share the goal of helping students develop an analytic approach to the course material. Through these classes, first year students are exposed to the diversity of learning that takes place at the~~



Amended March 26, 2012

College. Small groups of students work closely with professors in a collaborative atmosphere and immerse themselves deeply in the course's particular subject matter. Typically, informed discussion is a major component of a first year seminar. **All courses have an enrollment limit of 15 students and provide discussion-based classes, writing-attentive instruction with frequent and varied assignments, close reading and critical interpretation of written texts, and careful attention to the analysis of argument in speech and writing.** The courses offered for 2011-12 are described on pages 78-88.

Amherst's liberal studies curriculum is based on a concept of education as a process or activity rather than a form of production. The curriculum provides a structure within which each student may confront the meaning of his or her education, and does it without imposing a particular course or subject on all students. Students are encouraged to continue to seek diversity and attempt integration through their course selection and to discuss this with their advisors. Under the curriculum, most members of the Faculty serve as academic advisors to students. Every student has a College Advisor until he or she declares a major, no later than the end of the sophomore year; thereafter each student will have a Major Advisor from the student's field of concentration.

~~As student and advisor together plan a student's program, they should discuss whether the student has selected courses that:~~

- ~~• Provide knowledge of culture and a language other than one's own and of human experience in a period before one's lifetime.~~
- ~~• Analyze one's own polity, economic, order, and culture;~~
- ~~• Employ abstract reasoning;~~
- ~~• Work within the scientific method;~~
- ~~• Engage in creative action – doing, making, and performing;~~
- ~~• Interpret, evaluate, and explore the life of the imagination."~~

**As preparation for life-long learning and engagement with the world as articulated in the College's Mission Statement, and for mastery of one or more areas of knowledge or artistic creation through a major, students in consultation with their advisors should select courses that enable them to**

- develop fundamental capabilities such as written and oral expression, quantitative reasoning, and proficiency in using information resources;**
- achieve breadth of understanding through study in the natural sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, languages, and the arts.**

The members expressed great thanks to Professor Griffiths for his efforts. Professor Umphrey wondered whether the minimalist approach of making modest changes to current language, rather than thinking broadly about general and institutional goals and using the reaccreditation report as an opportunity to consider the curriculum broadly, serves the College well. It was noted that logistical constraints are playing a role in the proposal to take a modest approach. The timetable for development of general and institutional learning goals and the upcoming long-range planning process are not in sync, for example. Professor Hewitt commented that departments seem to be making excellent progress on developing goals for their majors, which is promising. Dean Call noted that Professor Griffiths's proposal to modify the current Catalogue language to develop general education goals, and the mission statement as the basis of institutional goals, would enable the College to meet the requirements for the five-year report. This approach would also provide the opportunity for fuller consideration of general education and institutional goals before the decennial review in 2018 and serve as a starting point

Amended March 26, 2012

for future conversations. Professor Loinaz noted that the CEP has endorsed the modest approach and seems to support having a broader conversation later, as the Dean described. President Martin expressed some concern that the goals, as proposed, are generic and do not reflect what Amherst is and what the College does. She argued that the goals could convey in richer and more descriptive language what is distinctive about Amherst and what distinguishes the College from other liberal art colleges. Dean Call agreed, but expressed concern that there would not be sufficient time for the Faculty to define the goals by the deadline for the five-year report. Professor Ferguson commented that designing and agreeing on goals as a collective would be challenging, and he expressed the view that articulating goals represents nothing more than an exercise to meet requirements that are being imposed on the College. President Martin noted that NEASC has conveyed to her that the College should develop goals that reflect the institution and that Amherst will find useful. Professor Umphrey agreed that articulating goals should be meaningful, while recognizing that there may be insufficient time for the type of process that would be needed to unfold. She wondered whether building from the current Catalogue language in broader and fuller ways might be possible as a compromise to the minimalist approach that is being proposed. Professor Ratner said that, if the language below is proposed, he favors removing the “and” between “natural sciences” and “mathematics” and adding a comma after “sciences” to indicate that students should achieve breadth in both the natural sciences and mathematics, among the other divisions. When tracking students course-taking, math and science should be assessed as separate categories, he noted.

- **achieve breadth of understanding through study in the natural sciences, and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, languages, and the arts.**

Professor Umphrey expressed concern that “institutional research scaffolding” might be built around the goals being proposed for the purpose of assessment, which would make them more difficult to alter going forward. She questioned whether the Faculty would want students to have these particular goals in mind when selecting courses. Dean Call said the goals, as proposed, would allow data on students’ course-taking patterns to be tracked, which would be helpful in reporting to NEASC. Professor Basu noted the challenge of putting forward learning goals for an open curriculum and favored having some ambiguity expressed in the goals. President Martin reiterated her concern about taking an approach to the goals that would be generic. President Martin and Professor Umphrey suggested that the Faculty be presented with both the proposed revision to the current language, as well as a proposal for fuller goals that are more reflective of the institution. The members wondered whether there is a requirement that the language presented to NEASC be identical to the Catalogue language, as more flexibility would be possible if the goals could be described more fully for NEASC. It was agreed that the Committee should meet with Professor Griffiths to discuss both the constraints and the possibilities.

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 11, 2012

The twenty-third meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, March 26, 2012. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with “Announcements from the President.” President Martin noted that she had recently discussed with the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) plans to add the position of Provost to the administration; the CPR had been receptive to the proposal and expressed its support for moving forward with a search, she reported. The President informed the members that the College has engaged the search firm of Isaacson, Miller, which had assisted with the search for Amherst’s President, to work on the search for the Provost. She plans to share a description for the position with the Committee soon and looks forward to receiving the members’ feedback.

President Martin next informed the members that the College had been approached by a donor who, along with a small number of others, wishes to provide the financial support to renovate Pratt Field and Neuhoff-Lumley Track and to replace DeBevoise Fieldhouse. The President explained that the project had already been a priority of the athletics department before the proposal came forward and that, if not for the generosity of the donor, it would have been necessary for College funds to be dedicated to the project. The fieldhouse, she noted, is no longer a safe or adequate space, and the project, as envisioned, would replace it with a 15,000-square-foot new space that would be designed to be flexible and to accommodate men’s and women’s teams for fall and spring sports. The new fieldhouse would include locker spaces, medical treatment and equipment rooms, and restrooms. There would be a team video, meeting, and alumni gathering room as well, President Martin noted. The project would also provide a second multi-use, all-weather playing surface (replacing the current natural-grass Pratt Field) for seven varsity teams, as well as club and intramural teams, and improvements in visibility, lighting for evening practices and games, landscaping, access, and seating (the track would be inside the stands and the track and field would be lowered slightly to improve spectators’ views). President Martin explained that the project would also enhance the space for tailgating and ease congestion, and she said that the number of home seats in the stands (though not the overall number of seats) would be increased. Traffic flow would be improved, and the number of cars would be reduced when games were not under way, as students would no longer drive to practice using Hitchcock Road, Orchard Street, or Woodside Avenue, since vehicles would access the new fieldhouse from Northampton Road.

After meeting with the donor, President Martin said that she had agreed that, if a number of conditions were met, the project would likely be able to move forward. She outlined these conditions for the Committee. Consultation with the Committee of Six would be required, as would the support of the Board of Trustees. The College would have full control of all aspects of the design process, and any designs would need to retain the essential aesthetic characteristics of the 121-year-old Pratt Field and the surrounding topography. To this end, it had been agreed that the size, scale, and material palette of any new Pratt Field would be very similar to the historic field. In addition, as part of the renovation, the track would need to be redesigned and rebuilt so as to meet International Association of Athletics Federation standards, which would allow Amherst to host track meets once again (the current track cannot be used for competition since the grandstands are on the inside of the track), President Martin said. Finally, the project would have to be fully funded by donors whose gifts would not detract from other College priorities. President Martin explained that, since it now appears that all of these conditions will

Amended April 11, 2012

be met, she intends to discuss the project with the Board at its meetings on March 29 and to share preliminary designs with the Trustees, noting that, in January, she had informed the Board about the possibility of moving forward with the project. Now that the improvements seem to be a realistic possibility, she had decided to inform the Committee of Six about these plans. After providing the outline of the project, the President showed the members the preliminary designs, which they agreed are impressive and in keeping with the present aesthetic.

Continuing the conversation, President Martin said that the goal would be to complete the project by August 2013, so that the new facilities could be in use for the 2013 athletic season. To do so, the final design, permitting, and approval process would have to be completed this spring. She noted that Suzanne Coffey, Director of Athletics, and Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services, would meet with neighbors in the area of the field in small groups to review the project, offering information on lighting and landscaping, in particular. The lights that are being envisioned for the field are of a sophisticated design that would focus light only on the field, effectively limiting the amount of light that would spill over. The schedule for when the lights would be on for practices and games would be shared, as would some options for landscaping which could shield the neighbors' views of the field.

President Martin next discussed with the members the possibility of establishing a humanities center at the College. She noted that Dean Call had developed a strategy, which includes making use of space within the Frost Library, that could make it possible to launch such a center relatively soon, perhaps by the fall of 2013. The Dean explained that this year's faculty recruitment process will result in the appointment of four scholars who are in the early stages of their careers to post-doctoral positions at Amherst for next year, as well as the appointment of a pre-doctoral Five College Fellow at the College. These five young scholars will join two colleagues who will be in the second year of their postdoc at Amherst. With this cohort of colleagues, it may be possible to orient the humanities center around a theme, to support both the research and teaching of current Amherst faculty, as well as to foster diversity within the Faculty—by bringing scholars to Amherst early in their careers and supporting their research endeavors in myriad ways, among them offering opportunities for participation in a humanities center and reduced teaching loads. The Dean explained that having six to eight such scholars on campus and involving other visiting colleagues, for example Copeland Fellows who come to the College for a year to explore a common theme, would provide the foundation (and, in the case of the Copeland Fund, additional financial support) for a substantive program.

Continuing the conversation, Dean Call noted that the recent temporary move of members of the English department to Frost Library, which had been necessitated by a flood in Johnson Chapel, has resulted in some interesting observations. It has become clear that the library has been enriched through hosting colleagues from English, becoming more of a hub of the intellectual life on campus, and that many aspects of the arrangement have worked quite well. In addition, seminars are being held in the "Friendly Reading Room," and the new library café is being enjoyed by many and has become a new place for members of the College community to congregate on campus. The Dean said that, as a result of this series of events, it seems clear that the library, at least for an initial period, would be a viable location for a humanities center. Bryn Geffert, Librarian of the College, has expressed enthusiasm for hosting the center. Dean Call said that it is his hope that, when the English department returns to Johnson Chapel, plans for a humanities center could move forward, a process that he envisions would take seven months or so. In response to questions about the level of support that is

Amended April 11, 2012

available for post-doctoral positions, Dean Call responded that there is currently funding available from the Mellon-Keiter endowment to support three post-doctoral positions at a time (each appointment is for two years). He has gathered support for an additional three postdocs, in addition to support that might be used from the Copeland Fund and discretionary funds. The Dean said that he would anticipate that, to support a sufficient cohort of post-docs for the center on an ongoing basis, additional funding would need to be raised. Funding sources could likely be found, he believes. The members discussed how best to move forward with a center. Would the Committee of Six or another faculty group help develop the center, for example? Professor Hewitt suggested that colleagues who are exploring this year's Copeland theme, which is concerned with the future of the humanities, could contribute in helpful ways to the planning for the center. Professor Basu asked if the possibility of creating a center that promotes interdisciplinary research and teaching both in the humanities and in the "soft" social sciences has been considered. She noted that area studies departments, in particular, are in need of support for research, as external support for these interdisciplinary endeavors has been significantly reduced in recent years. Professor Hewitt noted that colleagues from Political Science have been among those participating in the Future of the Humanities Copeland Colloquium, as their research is interdisciplinary and can have a humanities focus. President Martin said that no decisions have yet been made about any parameters for the center, including any intellectual or field-based boundaries. She said that she would welcome proposals for the center, including the idea of incorporating the social sciences. Professor Loinaz asked if there might be a lack of coherence if the social sciences became part of a "humanities" center. Professor Hewitt expressed the view that moving in such a direction would not necessarily result in a lack of focus.

Professor Ferguson commented that he favors establishing a center and believes that doing so will be a way of knitting faculty together through their teaching and scholarship. The Committee agreed that an Amherst humanities center could be developed on an intellectual model that would not be discipline-based, but that would emphasize the intersections of knowledge. Such a center would have the potential to be innovative and to benefit faculty and students, the members agreed. A focus on the ways that teaching and research inform and strengthen one another should also be a hallmark of the center and would encourage elevated conversations about pedagogy that would not necessarily be rooted in fields, Professor Ferguson commented. Professor Basu said that, in addition to providing a space in which to discuss teaching, she would welcome the creation of an enhanced environment for research that a center could provide. Professor Hewitt commented that she has found the discussions that have taken place as part of the Copeland Colloquium this year to be energizing, noting that these conversations have focused on broad intellectual issues that are not field based. President Martin said that it would be her hope, if the Faculty support such an initiative, to approach granting agencies for funding for such a center, including for post-doctoral fellows. Another project for which external support might be pursued, she said, is the development of first-year courses that build on the First-Year Seminars' emphases on writing and discussion, furthering in specific ways the academic foundation that would enable Amherst students to better navigate and take fuller advantage of the open curriculum.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call discussed with the members anticipated senior hires that have resulted from this year's faculty searches, and the process and schedule for tenuring them this spring. There may be additional senior hires, he noted. The Committee then nominated colleagues to serve on ad hoc tenure committees. Dean Call said that

Amended April 11, 2012

he was delighted to report that Gayle Barton has accepted the appointment of Chief Information Officer (CIO) at the College and that, pending Board approval, she will start work at Amherst on July 1. The members then voted to approve the minutes of February 27.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Ferguson asked whether the President and the Dean had considered whether it would be possible to provide course reductions for members of the Committee of Six, and for other faculty who assume substantial administrative and service burdens. Dean Call said that course reductions have been granted to members of the Committee of Six on two occasions because of the large number of tenure cases that were to be reviewed. Professor Ferguson expressed the view that reducing by one course per semester the teaching load of members of the Committee of Six would facilitate the work of the Committee more generally. He said that he has found that teaching and/or scholarship must be sacrificed to meet the demands that the Committee imposes. Professor Hewitt said that an alternative would be to divide the work of the Committee between two committees. Professor Umphrey asked what the avenue would be for making a proposal for a course reduction for members of the Committee of Six. Professor Basu noted that she has raised this issue before and is also unsure of how a solution should be pursued. She commented that the work of the College is distributed inequitably, with some colleagues assuming more of the burdens of chairing departments, overseeing searches, and serving on major committees than others, with a cost to the individuals' ability to pursue their research. Dean Call asked if the members were proposing that only members of the Committee of Six be eligible for course reductions or whether course reductions should be offered for other responsibilities with substantial workloads, such as chairing the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), for example. President Martin said that course relief is an administrative issue with a number of implications, among them funding. She expressed the view that the Committee of Six has a vast workload and said that she would support course reductions for its members. Professor Umphrey said that she would like to make a formal request that the administration consider the question of course relief. The President said that the issue of course relief, as a general matter beyond providing it for members of the Committee of Six, should be a part of the long-range planning process. She said that she would ensure that this question would be part of that process. The members next reviewed a draft agenda for a possible Faculty Meeting for April 3 and agreed that there was insufficient business to have a meeting.

At 5:00 P.M., Associate Dean Griffiths joined the meeting to continue the discussion about the need to develop college-wide learning goals for inclusion in the five-year reaccreditation report that the College will submit in January 2013 to the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEAS&C). Associate Dean Griffiths began the conversation by noting that, at this point, two-thirds of departments have submitted learning goals for their majors. He has been impressed with the thoughtfulness with which these goals have been developed and articulated, and gratified by departments' responsiveness to this project, he said. Associate Dean Griffiths noted that college-wide goals are on two levels (combined in some institutions): institutional goals address the lifelong and social impact of the whole college experience. These goals are aspirational and should be derived from the mission statement. By contrast, the general education goals are more narrowly academic and should be more operationally oriented, he said. The Faculty voted such goals in 1977 and revised them slightly in 1993 as a recommendation about six areas of study that students and advisors should consider. This advisory has fallen out of use, and since 1998 the College has been on notice from NEAS&C about the need to adopt and use meaningful goals, Associated Dean Griffiths noted.

Amended April 11, 2012

These goals need to be communicated to students explicitly and publicly, and they need to be constructed in a way that will enable students' progress toward achieving them to be measured and assessed, Associate Dean Griffiths noted.

The Committee wondered if two proposals for Amherst's institutional and general education learning goals should be brought to the Faculty. One could be the approach that has been suggested by Associate Dean Griffiths and endorsed by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), which would represent a modest change to the College Catalogue that would replace the current list of six advising areas with language that references the mission statement and that should meet the reaccreditation association's expectations concerning goals for general education and institutional learning goals. The other proposal might make use of richer, more aspirational, and more descriptive language to articulate fuller institutional and general education goals that are more reflective of the institution. Professor Ferguson noted that a good deal of less generic and more aspirational language is embedded in the department's learning goals, which is positive. Dean Call wondered if commonalities could be extracted from departmental learning goals to form a basis of general education and institutional learning goals. Some members of the Committee expressed support for this approach. Associate Dean Griffiths discussed with the members the challenges of adopting more intricate and numerous learning goals and, more significantly, he said, of making use of such goals and capabilities—and of assessing whether progress is being made on meeting them. He offered examples of peer institutions that have developed elaborate institutional learning goals, but have found, on a pragmatic level, that they cannot make use of the goals as part of their advising process. These institutions have faced challenges in assessing whether students are making progress toward such goals and/or whether students are developing identified capabilities as a result of their experiences at their institutions. Associate Dean Griffiths stressed that the revision to the Catalogue language that he has proposed, while minimalistic, would be viable, could be used in advising, and would enable the College to meet the requirements for the five-year report. Fuller consideration of general education and institutional goals will be needed before the decennial review in 2018, he said, but such a process will take time and would probably require that a curriculum committee be formed. In terms of adopting more aspirational and lyrical language for the goals, Professor Griffiths noted that sometimes sparer more concrete language is preferable, particularly for general education goals that must address capabilities (e.g., breadth of study and writing and quantitative skills) that NEAS&C requires. He offered as an example the Faculty's revision/reduction of the description of the First-Year Seminar (The new language is in bold face below and appears in the College Catalogue 2011-2012, pp. 71-72). The new compressed language has proven to be more helpful in guiding faculty who teach the seminars and in assessing students' learning, he noted.

#### THE LIBERAL STUDIES CURRICULUM

Under a curriculum adopted in 1996, the first-year students are required to take a First-Year Seminar. These courses are planned and taught by one or more members of the Faculty as a way to introduce students to liberal studies through a range of innovative and often interdisciplinary approaches. The subject matter of the courses varies, as do the capabilities they seek to encourage. ~~These range from writing, quantitative skills, scientific reasoning, oral presentation, and argumentation, to performing, creating and contemplative learning. All seminar instructors share the goal of helping students develop an analytic approach to the course material. Through these classes, first-year students are~~

Amended April 11, 2012

~~exposed to the diversity of learning that takes place at the College. Small groups of students work closely with professors in a collaborative atmosphere and immerse themselves deeply in the course's particular subject matter. Typically, informed discussion is a major component of a first-year seminar.~~ **All courses have an enrollment limit of 15 students and provide discussion-based classes, writing-attentive instruction with frequent and varied assignments, close reading and critical interpretation of written texts, and careful attention to the analysis of argument in speech and writing.** The courses offered for 2011-12 are described on pages 78-88.

Continuing the conversation, Associate Dean Griffiths noted that at the decennial review in 2008, NEAS&C stipulated that the College should have adopted learning goals and should report on the results of assessing them already in the interim report, due in January of 2013. In 2011, NEAS&C introduced a new "educational effectiveness" format for the five-year report, which does not allow for much in the way of narrative and requires an evidence-based and assessment-oriented approach, he informed the members. Benchmarks must be offered, and improvement over time should be demonstrated. It is important to show that there is a commitment to analysis and evidence under this model, he noted. More than half of institutions are now asked to provide additional information on a shorter clock following their decennial reviews, he said. In light of NEAS&C'S recent raising of the standards for learning assessment and for reporting, a major institutional effort will be needed to make a full assessment plan operational by the time of the next decennial review in 2018.

Professor Umphrey asked how the goals that Associate Dean Griffiths had described would be assessed. Transcript analysis, and portfolio review (plans are in place to develop a pilot portfolio review project), surveys, and systematic reports of the strengths and weaknesses in capstone courses are among the tools that can be used, he responded. President Martin expressed the view that, since it is difficult to measure much of what might be articulated in institutional goals, it would be best to make them full and aspirational. She commented that, in her visits to departments, she has learned first-hand that there is evidence of curricular and pedagogical change across departments, noting that this and other information of this sort will be articulated and reported. The President suggested that learning goals for general education should be derived from what the College works hard to do (in regard to the curriculum, teaching, involving students in research, etc.), thereby making the goals reflective of the institution. Professor Umphrey expressed some concern about the possible implications of adopting the goals that Associate Dean Griffiths had described, noting that she would worry that the goals might come to serve as the basis of how advising would be done at the College in ways that don't speak to the way Faculty teach.

President Martin commented that the institutions with which NEAS&C is concerned differ greatly from one another, but that the accrediting agency has only one set of standards that apply to all. In her view, the goals that Amherst develops must be specific to the College, meaningful, and must represent Amherst's unique strengths. The Committee discussed whether the goals might be seen as providing a guidepost to students for navigating the open curriculum and for their advisors. Professor Ratner commented on a proposal that had been made at one time that, at the conclusion of their first and second years at the College, students could be asked to reflect on their education during the year that had just concluded and to write a summary of what they felt that they had learned. Such a summary could then be discussed with the student's



Amended April 11, 2012

advisor. Professor Basu suggested that energy be devoted to developing goals, incorporating them into the advising system, and assessing student progress toward them. The Committee thanked Dean Griffiths, and he left the meeting at 6:25 P.M.

In the time remaining, the Committee discussed whether the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising may be considering how to integrate learning goals into the advising process at the College. Professor Ratner said that he understands that the advising committee is focused on the more structural aspects of advising. The Committee asked the Dean to request information from the committee about whether they have focused on the implications that their discussions might have on learning goals. He agreed to do so.

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 25, 2012

The twenty-fourth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in the her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, April 2, 2012. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The members first discussed the Faculty Committee on Student Fellowships' nomination of three recent graduates of the College for Rufus B. Kellogg University Fellowships. The Dean asked if the Committee felt that it would be permissible for the students to be informed now that they would receive the fellowship, which support graduate study, pending the approval of the Faculty and the Board of Trustees. The members said that they would have no objection. The Committee raised some questions surrounding the apportionment of the funding, and the Dean agreed to ask for further information about how the funds would be distributed among the recipients.

The Committee next reviewed drafts of the Dean's letters to department chairs and candidates concerning reappointment and tenure that are sent to department chairs and candidates each spring. The members discussed possible refinements of the reappointment procedures, agreeing that it would be helpful for the Committee of Six to have additional information that could enhance the feedback that the members could provide about candidates' progress as scholars. The members agreed to stress in the letters to chairs of departments with candidates for reappointment the importance of ensuring a common understanding of plans and prospects that would help tenure-track members build their scholarship. The Committee noted that letters should convey to departments that they should place emphasis on reviewing and vetting candidates' scholarship and on sharing their assessment of the trajectory of the candidate in regard to scholarship, as they do with teaching, with the Committee of Six. The department's expectations about the candidate's scholarly productivity by the time of the tenure review would also be important to include. The Committee felt that it would be helpful if the candidate were invited to share with the Committee of Six the statement about scholarship and teaching that he or she is required to provide to the department as part of the reappointment process, or another statement that the candidate might prepare specifically for the Committee of Six. The members agreed that not only would this information inform the Committee's deliberations, but it would be valuable for the candidate.

Continuing, the members concurred that it would be beneficial if departments, in their departmental letter, provide a summary of any concerns that may have been shared with the candidate about teaching and/or scholarly progress. It was agreed that the department should also comment on how the candidate may have responded to this feedback, describing, for example, new approaches and/or adjustments that he or she may have implemented.

The members discussed the need to improve the substance and format of teaching evaluations, including how students' responses might be better organized, as well as the possibility of incorporating a numeric scale for responses to some questions. Professor Ratner suggested organizing students' responses by grouping them by question. The possibility of offering departments two or three templates for teaching evaluation formats and questions, from which they could choose, could be helpful to the Committee of Six. Carefully developed forms with greater commonality would assist the members with comparisons of teaching records across cases. Professor Ferguson suggested that the Committee might read a random sampling of evaluations, rather than the full set of evaluations. Professor Umphrey saw difficulties with taking such an approach. Dean Call expressed the view that it would be helpful if the tenured faculty who are reading teaching evaluations also saw evaluations of their own teaching regularly. Doing so could be helpful to senior colleagues in calibrating how the teaching evaluations of tenure-track colleagues are interpreted, he noted. Some members of the

Amended April 25, 2012

Committee agreed. Professor Loinaz commented that some tenure-track faculty have told him that they find it helpful when senior colleagues who have served on the Committee of Six offer their perspectives on the substance of teaching evaluations and how the Committee of Six might view them. The Committee agreed to have a broader conversation in the future about the issue of teaching evaluations.

Turning to the topic of annual conversations between department chairs and tenure-track faculty, the members stressed the importance of ensuring that these conversations occur each year and are meaningful. It was agreed that the Dean should send departments an annual reminder of the need to have the conversations. Professor Basu commented that, since the chairmanship rotates frequently among departmental members, it is helpful for chairs to keep notes of the conversations in the department's files so that future chairs may have access to them to inform themselves about past conversations and feedback that has been given to a tenure-track colleague. The members felt that it would be helpful to develop a set of best practices for chairs, perhaps creating an "online toolkit."

At the conclusion of the discussion about the reappointment process, the members agreed to draft a motion to bring to the Faculty to revise the relevant section of the *Faculty Handbook* (III., D., 4.) so as to offer candidates for reappointment the option of submitting a single letter to their department(s) and the Committee of Six, which would become part of the reappointment dossier, or a letter to his or her department(s), which would not be shared with the Committee of Six, and a separately composed letter for the Committee of Six. This letter to the Committee of Six would also be shared with the department and would become part of the reappointment dossier. In either case, candidates would be asked to address their teaching experience at the College, the present state of their scholarship or creative work and their aims and plans for the future, and their engagement in College life. The letter or letters would serve as the basis for a conversation between the candidate and tenured members of the department/s before the department meets to finalize the reappointment recommendation. It was noted that, when the Faculty voted in 2005 to require candidates for reappointment to write a letter as part of the process, it had been agreed that the letter would be for the department only and would not become part of the reappointment dossier.

President Martin next offered a summary of what had transpired at the meetings and retreat of the Board of Trustees, which had been held in New York March 29-March 31. As she had noted earlier, the focus of the retreat was admissions, the make-up of the student body, and students' experiences at Amherst. Cornell University sociologist David Harris, Senior Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Cornell, provided the Board with national data on diversity, including a brief history of Supreme Court decisions on affirmative action, and led a discussion with the Board, which had been informative and very well received. Amherst data were presented on the following four aspects of diversity that Dean Harris had introduced: the changing composition of Amherst's student body over time; academic achievement; the campus "climate" beyond the classroom; and how much Amherst students interact and what they learn in the process. How the classroom and student life outside the classroom work together was explored, as were questions about whether the evidence that had been gathered to inform the retreat points to "achievement gaps" of any sort. The President said that there are indications that subtle gaps in achievement among students from different groups exist at the College, and that exploring ways of further supporting students could increase their success, particularly if students want to pursue certain fields of study or particular paths through the curriculum, for example the courses needed to fulfill premedical requirements. A good deal of conversation at the retreat had focused on the co-curriculum and the question of how Amherst can take greater advantage of students' diverse backgrounds. Initiatives at Amherst and at peer institutions that

Amended April 25, 2012

offer evidence of enriching students' experience were offered, President Martin explained. Much of the discussion also focused on the composition of the student body, and some Trustees wondered whether there should be more representation from the third and fourth quintiles of income, which they saw as representing the middle class, generally. President Martin noted that income does not take wealth into account and thus may not be the best measure when trying to gain a sense of the socioeconomic profile of families with college-age children. Dean Call said that he has done a quick analysis of the student body's income distribution. About eight hundred students, who do not receive financial aid, represent families in the top income quintile. The remaining one thousand or so Amherst students, who receive financial aid, (so information on their families' financial profile is available), are fairly evenly distributed across income quintiles.

Continuing with the summary of the retreat and meetings of the Board, President Martin noted that Tom Parker, Dean of Admission and Financial Aid, shed light on the admission process at the College. As part of his presentation, Board members had been asked to fill out a portion of the Admitted Student Questionnaire that is given to all admitted students. The Trustees were asked to make comparisons between Amherst and a small group of peer institutions as part of their responses. The Board's answers were then analyzed by the College Board, which provided a report of the results as an aggregate the next day. The exercise suggested that Board members, as revealed by their responses, are very proud of Amherst College. Admitted students, while rating Amherst highly, had a greater range of responses when comparing Amherst to peer institutions, President Martin commented. Conversations with the Trustees at the retreat also demonstrated that they are supportive of initiatives that promote curricular innovation and are receptive to proposals that the College develop strategic plans for student life and communications. The President said that the information gleaned from the retreat, including the sense of support for particular strategies and initiatives, will be among the many and varied factors that inform the process of setting priorities for the anticipated long-range planning process. President Martin also noted that the Board had been enthusiastic about plans to renovate Pratt Field and Neuhoff-Lumley Track and had reviewed preliminary designs at the retreat. She said that she was pleased to report to the Board, and is now delighted to share with the Committee, that the project will be fully funded by new gifts from donors who are not prospects for gifts to our academic priorities.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call asked the members to review a draft agenda for a Faculty Meeting for April 17. The Committee agreed that there was insufficient business for a meeting. Dean Call next reported back on discussions that he had had with Professor O'Hara about the work of the Ad Hoc Advising Committee. Professor O'Hara, co-chair of the committee, had informed him that its members are not focusing on the question of how to integrate learning goals into the advising process, as they do not see that specifically as part of their charge. Instead the committee is concentrating on ways to enhance equity among advisors in terms of the number of advisees for which each faculty member is responsible, and on enhancing the quality of advising and the relationship between students and their advisors. The Dean said that the Ad Hoc Advising Committee may offer a preliminary report during the Commencement Faculty Meeting. The Dean noted that Associate Dean Griffiths has made revisions in the language that he had provided to the Committee about learning goals. Dean Call informed the members that the new proposal would be provided to the Committee for discussion at the April 16 meeting.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Basu asked if the President and the Dean had learned if there had been a response to Dean Hart's email addressing the issue of sexual assaults on campus and whether efforts have been made to determine how pervasive assaults are on campus. President Martin and Dean Call said that they have not yet had the

Amended April 25, 2012

opportunity to discuss the responses to the email with Dean Hart, but said that they intend to do so. Dean Call noted that administrators have been receiving Title IX training about best practices and responsibilities in addressing sexual misconduct and other issues, and that he has found this educational initiative to be most helpful. President Martin said that the Senior Staff and she would be reviewing current policies and procedures in regard to sexual misconduct.

Continuing with “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Umphrey noted that she had read in the local press that the Little Red Schoolhouse would be permitted to continue operations in its current location for the next academic year and wondered about that announcement’s relation to plans for the new science center. President Martin noted that a shift in the construction schedule had made it possible for the school to stay on campus in its current facility for the 2012-2013 year only. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 25, 2012

The twenty-fifth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in the her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, April 16, 2012. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with “Announcements from the President.” President Martin noted that the Senior Staff and she will be reviewing the procedures that are in place for addressing incidents of sexual misconduct. She said that she is aware of the concerns about this issue that are being expressed by some students and wants to develop a fuller understanding about the College’s procedures, before considering possible changes. The President informed the members that she had recently attended a performance of The Women of Amherst’s “If These Lips Could Talk,” which had been inspired by Eve Ensler’s *The Vagina Monologues* and had focused on women’s experiences at Amherst, including experiences of sexual assault. President Martin had found the performance “compelling,” she said. Professor Basu noted that she and other members of the Faculty who are members of the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies plan to meet informally with some of the student-performers to discuss the issues that had been highlighted in the performance.

Continuing with her remarks, President Martin informed the Committee that representatives from Isaacson, Miller, the search firm that will be assisting the College with the search for the Provost, will be on campus in late-April or early-May to discuss the position and gather impressions that will inform the development of a position description. The President said that it is her hope that the Committee of Six will participate in these conversations with the firm. The members said that they would be happy to do so.

The President next informed the members that the Dean and she had attended an event for Trustees, campaign volunteers, and donors on April 11 at the American Museum of Natural History in New York to celebrate the accomplishments to date of the Lives of Consequence campaign. The gathering was an opportunity to recognize the achievement of raising \$425 million in support for financial aid, faculty and curricular support, and student enrichment opportunities, as well as to showcase the next phase of the campaign—Creating Connections. During this phase, Amherst will continue to focus on these priorities, as well as on support for the construction of the new science center. Professor Loinaz asked if there are plans to raise funds for student research as part of the campaign. President Martin said that support for student research is one of the campaign goals.

Under his announcements, Dean Call reported back to the Committee about the apportionment of funds for next year’s recipients of the Rufus B. Kellogg University Fellowships. The Dean noted that the fund’s endowment has performed well and that approximately 20 percent of the fund’s income now supports a fellowship for a student to do graduate work at a German university. Because the fund’s endowment has grown, it is now possible to award fellowships to cover the cost of graduate school for two additional students. He has learned that the award to attend a German university is around \$15,000 per year, because the fees are lower than those at most graduate schools in other countries, and that the other two awards are for approximately \$27,000 per year. Dean Call next informed the Committee that, as it does each year, the Committee of Six would be meeting with the Board of Trustees during its Commencement meetings, most likely on Friday, May 18. The Committee turned briefly to personnel matters.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Loinaz noted that, for some time, a number of colleagues, himself among them, have been serving on an informal advisory committee to the Mead Art Museum. When the group last met, the question arose as to whether the faculty members involved should receive credit for their service. He noted that the group

Amended April 25, 2012

meets at least once during each semester. Dean Call said that he would be pleased to have his office note service on the committee by those faculty members who serve. Adding a Mead Advisory Committee as a standing committee of the Faculty would require a vote of the Faculty, the Dean noted. Professor Loinaz thanked the Dean for his willingness to list the advisory committee as an ad hoc faculty committee. The members turned to personnel matters.

The Committee next reviewed its proposed revisions to the Dean's letters to department chairs and candidates concerning reappointment and tenure that are sent to department chairs and candidates each spring and approved the letters. The Dean noted that the letters will include a comment that, if the Faculty approves any changes to reappointment and/or tenure procedures that would take effect in 2012-2013 as a result of any motions that the Committee of Six may decide to bring forward in May, the procedures outlined in the letters would be adjusted to reflect the changes. The Committee turned to personnel matters.

The meeting concluded with the members discussing possible language for a draft motion to propose changes to some reappointment and tenure procedures. The Committee noted that, if it is decided that candidates for reappointment should be required to submit to the Committee of Six a letter about their scholarship, teaching, and service, candidates for tenure should also be required to do so. Currently, the candidate's letter for tenure is optional. Dean Call said that his practice has been to encourage all candidates for tenure to submit the letter, as it brings their voice into the process and has been most valuable to the Committee in the past. The members agreed to finalize the language for the motions (one for reappointment and one for tenure) at their next meeting, when the draft agenda for a Faculty Meeting on May 1 would be considered.

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 27, 2012

The twenty-sixth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in the her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, April 23, 2012. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with “Announcements from the President.” President Martin informed the members that, in response to a suggestion by the Employee Council, she will hold an open meeting for staff on May 9, from 1:00 P.M. to 2:00 P.M., in Johnson Chapel to discuss the state of the College. The President said that all supervisors will be asked to permit staff members to attend. Continuing, the President notified the members that time has been set aside at their next meeting to discuss the Provost position with representatives from the search firm Isaacson, Miller. The representatives from the firm will also hold two open meetings for the campus community.

President Martin next discussed with the Committee a cartoon that had been published in the recent issue of *The Indicator*. The cartoon prompted two graduate students at the University of Massachusetts to send the President a thoughtful letter of concern that addressed issues of prejudice and insensitivity toward Native Americans that the cartoon may communicate. The students also noted that the cartoon image and its messages raise questions about the College’s mascot and its association with Lord Jeffery Amherst. President Martin said that the students responsible for the cartoon have drafted a letter of apology, and those who wrote the letter of concern have been invited to submit it for publication in *The Indicator*, with the hope that doing so will generate discussion about the issues raised. The Committee turned to personnel matters.

Professor Basu next offered a brief report about a meeting that had been held over the weekend that had focused on issues surrounding sexual misconduct on campus. In attendance were a small group of faculty members; Charri Boykin-East, Senior Associate Dean of Students and Title IX Coordinator; Gretchen Krull, Assistant Director of Health Education and Sexual Assault Counselor; and around twenty students, most of whom are members of The Women of Amherst who had performed in “If These Lips Could Talk.” The discussion had been candid and far-reaching, and Professor Basu said that some of the survivors of sexual violence on campus had detailed experiences that were shocking and disturbing. The tone of the conversation had been productive and open, Professor Basu commented. The discussions initially focused on the underlying culture and climate at Amherst that may be contributing to sexual misconduct, including issues surrounding students’ excessive alcohol consumption and the role of all-male groups like athletic teams and underground fraternities. Students had expressed concern about a lack of clarity about the College’s procedures for reporting and adjudicating acts of sexual misconduct. Professor Basu said that some students had said that some faculty members may not be aware of the vulnerabilities of survivors of sexual violence, and do not seem to feel that it may be important to make students aware in advance if films and readings might have content of a disturbing sexual nature. It had been noted that some faculty members had seemed dismissive when this issue had been raised previously at a Faculty Meeting, as they had seemed to view this concern primarily as an issue of academic freedom and had not been responsive to making changes to their practices. Currently, the onus seems to be on students to leave class if the content of materials assigned by faculty members makes them feel upset or uncomfortable. Professor Basu expressed the view that ways should be found to facilitate discussions on campus, perhaps most effectively in small groups, about these issues. In addition, it would be important for the Faculty as a whole to focus on these concerns, perhaps as part of a Faculty Meeting. It was noted that efforts such as the athletics department’s Leadership Institute, which is a relatively new initiative, that are designed to educate the student body about issues surrounding gender and sexuality, and other programs that might focus on substance abuse, for



Amended April 27, 2012

example, could be helpful in working toward changing the climate and culture on campus. The members agreed that Orientation provides an initial opportunity to focus on some of these themes with students.

Continuing the discussion, Professor Basu commented that students have raised concerns about a lack of transparency in the process for reporting and adjudicating complaints of sexual misconduct. It was noted that, if cases are settled outside the College's process, because of confidentiality agreements, it is often not possible to know how cases are resolved. President Martin and members of the Committee expressed the view that more information needs to be gathered and made available about the number of cases that are reported and the sanctions that are given. (Later in the meeting, Dean Hart noted that the Dean of Students Office provides information on disciplinary matters, including sexual misconduct cases, to the community each year. In addition, each year the College produces and publishes an annual report containing statistics regarding forcible sex offenses and other serious offenses, in compliance with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act. If a settlement occurs—which most often involves attorneys representing the complainant and respondent—the College may still investigate the matter to determine if there are any concerns about the safety of the student body beyond the individual case, President Martin said.)

The Committee noted that it appears that the current procedures for addressing cases of sexual misconduct have evolved from a system, i.e., the Honor Code, that was designed originally primarily to address cases of academic dishonesty. Tailoring procedures to meet specific needs associated with cases of sexual misconduct would result in improvements to the system, it was agreed. Since Amherst is such a small community, issues of how to maintain and protect confidentiality are salient. Under the current system, when pursuing a complaint, complainants may have to share highly personal and difficult experiences with members of the community who are their teachers, friends of friends, and deans, for example, since faculty, Deans of Students, and students serve on the Committee on Discipline. Members of the committee may even have overlapping roles in the complainant's life at the College, it was noted. A student might find herself or himself in the classroom with a student or faculty member who served on the committee. The members agreed to return to this discussion when Allen Hart, Dean of Students, and Liza Nascembeni, Assistant Dean of Students and Dean of Student Conduct/Title IX Deputy Coordinator for Students, joined the meeting to discuss proposed changes to the Student Rights and Policies section of the *Student Handbook*, which have been approved by the College Council. (See Professor Bosman's [letter on behalf of the College Council](#).)

The members next reviewed [clarifications and draft College Catalog language for the proposal that Amherst participate in the Five College Architectural Studies major](#) that had been submitted by the Amherst College Architectural Studies Advisory Committee (Professors Clark, Courtright, Gilpin, Long, Rosbottom, and K. Sweeney), in response to questions raised by the Committee of Six previously. Professor Hewitt commented that the Amherst proposal does not include requirements that majors take courses in mathematics and science, as the Smith program does. The Committee noted that the major will be flexible and that students may structure a major that has a more technical emphasis, if they desire. Professor Hewitt expressed a general concern that the major might represent a shift toward the pre-professional, a direction in which she worries the liberal arts are moving more generally. Professors Umphrey and Ferguson expressed support for the major's gesture and inflection toward a profession, within a liberal arts context. The members then voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the proposal and College Catalog language to the Faculty and six in favor and zero opposed on substance.

Amended April 27, 2012

The members next reviewed a [proposal for revisions to the College Catalog language within the section on the liberal arts curriculum concerning general and institutional learning goals](#), which had been prepared by Professor Griffiths. With this document, Professor Griffiths responded to questions raised by the Committee when it had reviewed an earlier draft of these goals. There is a need to develop the goals for inclusion in the five-year reaccreditation report that the College will submit in January 2013 to the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEAS&C). (For more information, see [Professor Griffiths's report to the Committee on Educational Policy \(CEP\)](#) about the learning goals project, as well as [a related letter from the CEP](#).) After some discussion and further revisions, the members voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the proposal to the Faculty and six in favor and zero opposed on substance. The members next voted on the [proposal, which included language for the College Catalog](#), that Amherst participate in the Five-College Sustainability Studies Certificate Program, which they had discussed previously. The members then voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the proposal and College Catalog language to the Faculty and six in favor and zero opposed on substance. The members next considered the following motions, which reflect their previous conversations:

**Motion 1: (to inform Committee of Six deliberations)**

To revise the *Faculty Handbook*, III., D., 4. Reappointment Procedures, paragraph 4 (to become effective in the academic year 2012-2013) as indicated in bold caps.

**BY DECEMBER 1**, Candidates for reappointment will each submit a letter to their department/s **DESCRIBING THEIR TEACHING EXPERIENCE AT THE COLLEGE, THE PRESENT STATE OF THEIR SCHOLARSHIP OR CREATIVE WORK AND THEIR AIMS AND PLANS FOR THE FUTURE, AND THEIR ENGAGEMENT IN COLLEGE LIFE. THAT LETTER, OR A MODIFIED VERSION ADDRESSING NON-SPECIALIST READERS, WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE REAPPOINTMENT DOSSIER AND FORWARDED TO THE COMMITTEE OF SIX.** ~~Candidates should address their teaching experience at the College, the present state of their scholarship or creative work and their aims and plans for the future, and their engagement in College life.~~ The letter/S will serve as the basis for a conversation between the candidate and tenured members of the department/s before the department meets to finalize the reappointment recommendation. ~~The letter itself will not become part of the reappointment or tenure dossier.~~ (Voted by Faculty, February 2005)

**Motion 2: (to inform Committee of Six deliberations)**

To revise the *Faculty Handbook*, III., E., 4., d. Rights of Candidates for Tenure (to become effective in the academic year 2012-2013) as indicated in bold caps.

Amended April 27, 2012

d. *Rights of Candidates for Tenure.* Candidates for tenure ~~are invited but not obligated to~~ **WILL** submit letters on their own behalf to the Committee of Six by October 1st. If they wish to comment on the departmental recommendation, they may send written commentary, in confidence, to the Committee of Six by October 15~~th~~.

The Committee voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the motions to the Faculty and six in favor and zero opposed on substance.

The members then reviewed a draft Faculty Meeting Agenda for May 1 and voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward it to the Faculty.

At 5:45 P.M., Deans Hart and Nascembeni joined the meeting. Dean Hart, referring to his [memo of March 9, 2012, to the College Council](#) requesting approval for proposed modifications to the 2012-2013 *Student Handbook*, explained that the changes are needed for a number of reasons. (Two documents are appended via link here. [One indicates the revisions to the current language](#) and the other presents [the revised version of the handbook language with the changes incorporated.](#)) The modifications, Dean Hart noted, will ensure that the College is in compliance with laws governing higher education administration, including Title IX; ensure consistency with current practices; and adjust language in the handbook so that it conforms with best practices in student conduct administration. If the changes are approved, the Dean of Students will be given the ability to establish standards in the future that further the principles of the Honor Code and/or to comply with legal requirements and to make modifications of the student conduct process, as appropriate, to comply with relevant legal requirements and best practices. The Dean of Students would continue to keep the College Council informed of such actions. Having this flexibility will enable the College to respond more nimbly to new requirements, such as those recommended by the Office of Civil Rights.

Continuing, Dean Hart noted that changes are being proposed to the hearing procedures for cases of sexual misconduct, providing a number of new options for complainants and respondents; eliminating the Disciplinary Hearing Officer role, except in complaints on behalf of the College; no longer allowing attorneys to be in the hearing room (they would be allowed to be present outside the hearing room for consultation); increasing the student membership on the Committee on Discipline (the name of which the proposal suggests should now be the Honor Code Hearing Board) from four students to six, since three are needed at each hearing; making available to students a list of trained hearing advisors; keeping a copy of the finding in cases in a confidential file in the Dean of Students' office; and having the Association of Amherst Students (AAS) oversee the election of student members to the Committee on Discipline, including appointing an alternate in the case of a student's resignation. Some small changes have been suggested to correct grammatical errors.

Dean Hart noted that the disciplinary system within the *Student Handbook* has not been revised since 1998. Recommendations of the U.S. Department of Education and its Office of Civil Rights for implementing Title IX regulations have prompted some of the changes currently being proposed, he explained; many peer institutions have also been re-examining their policies and procedures in light of the new recommendations of the Office of Civil Rights. The changes being proposed should aid the College in addressing complaints of sexual misconduct. Dean Hart commented that the College has, in recent years, been focusing greater attention on this issue and has made a commitment to continuing to do so. The creation of the full-time position devoted to student conduct, which is occupied by Dean Nascembeni, who has substantial experience in this area, is a significant step that has been taken, for example. In the past, student conduct was part of the portfolio of responsibilities of one of the class deans.

Amended April 27, 2012

President Martin asked if it makes sense to make the changes being proposed now, since there is a possibility that more significant changes to the system might be recommended after further review of the system. Dean Nascembeni said that the changes being proposed at this time should be implemented as soon as possible, in order to ensure compliance with Title IX regulations. Doing so would not preclude further examination of the procedures. In fact, she said, it is her hope that, from this point on, the procedures will be reviewed with great regularity and that revisions will be made, as needed. Dean Hart noted that, as a trend, the language of the procedures, in accordance with best practices, is moving away from a legalistic, adversarial approach and toward giving fuller access to the process to all parties involved in a complaint. When a discipline violation case is brought forward, what are the procedures for deciding whether it will be heard, Professor Basu asked. Dean Nascembeni said that, when a complaint is received, she meets with the complainant and the respondent. If the respondent takes responsibility and the sanction that is warranted is a one-semester suspension or less, the Dean of Student Conduct can implement the sanction. If the sanction that is warranted rises above this threshold, which is usually the situation for cases involving sexual misconduct, the Committee on Discipline will hear the case. If the respondent disputes the facts presented by the complainant, the case is heard by the Committee on Discipline.

Continuing, Dean Nascembeni noted that, if a student who makes a complaint later withdraws it, the College will continue to investigate the case, if it is felt that there is a risk to the Amherst community that extends beyond the complainant; as part of the investigation, the complainant may be interviewed. The College is constrained, however, in the absence of a complainant, Dean Nascembeni explained. Professor Umphrey asked Deans Hart and Nascembeni how they would re-imagine the procedures if there were no constraints on doing so. Dean Hart noted that, on some levels, he favors having students and faculty participate in the discipline process because the community is then involved in setting its standards and holding its members accountable. At the same time, he said that he wonders whether, because of the difficulty of maintaining confidentiality in such a small community and the overlapping roles of those who are currently involved in the process, a system that made use of individuals who are not involved in campus life, who are objective, and who have been trained specifically for this type of work might be preferable. Dean Nascembeni said that she has explored models used at peer institutions, many of which make use of outside investigators. In relation to the closeness of the community, Professor Basu expressed some concern that the students on the Committee on Discipline are selected by the AAS, as this approach could insert bias into the process. Dean Hart noted that the pool from which students are drawn to serve on the Committee on Discipline is balanced by gender. Dean Nascembeni said that conflicts of interest are often a problem because of the size of the community, which can make it difficult to staff the Committee on Discipline for hearings, at times. This is one reason that the proposal is being made to increase the number of student members on the committee from four to six, since three students are needed at each hearing. Professor Ferguson expressed the view that removing faculty and students from the process and having outside objective parties hear the cases seems ideal, and would likely make it easier to gather the necessary parties on the committee to hear cases. Dean Hart agreed that this idea was worth further investigation, while noting that there is a misperception on campus that the process for addressing complaints is a lengthy one. Complaints of sexual misconduct, when brought to the attention of the Dean of Students Office, are generally heard within thirty days and are concluded within sixty days, he said. He also commented that many of the New England Small College Athletic College (NESCAC) schools have moved away from students and faculty serving on hearing boards for cases of sexual misconduct, instead using boards made up of administrators or letting the Dean of Students

Amended April 27, 2012

decide cases. It was noted that the proposal allows for the Dean of Student Conduct, or his or her designee, to conduct investigations. The designee could be an individual from outside the College community, if desired, Dean Hart noted.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Umphrey asked if the structure of the current process tends to encourage complainants to settle cases, rather than seeking sanctions through the College's procedures. Dean Nascembeni responded that students' misperceptions about the discipline system often lead them not to pursue cases or to settle them outside the process. Unfortunately, students often make comments such as the following: "The College isn't going to do anything anyway" or "The last thing you want is a trial." In response, she tries to explain that the process is a thoughtful and fair one, and that the College takes complaints of sexual misconduct very seriously. President Martin said that it appears that the incentives are high not to go through the process. This suggests that complainants are concerned about what their experience will be and about the ramifications of following through with complaints, such as being exposed as a victim of sexual violence on a small campus. She also expressed concern about inequities in the system, as students from wealthier families can hire attorneys to settle cases, while students with fewer economic resources may be faced with a choice of not pursuing their complaint, or going through a process that they feel may prove to be uncomfortable and challenging to endure.

The Committee discussed possible different models for investigating and adjudicating complaints of sexual misconduct, including having a professional investigator investigate complaints and having a small committee, made up of deans, perhaps (rather than students and faculty), hear cases. Appeals could then be heard, perhaps, by the Dean of Students. Such a system would allow for more anonymity for the students involved. Professor Umphrey expressed some concern that such a system might breed a culture in which incidents of sexual misconduct become shrouded in secrecy, exacerbating a problem that already seems to exist on campus. The President expressed the view that there are ways of educating the community about the presence of sexual misconduct on campus, while also making it possible for the process of adjudicating complaints to be as confidential as possible, in order to protect complainants. With the Senior Staff, and drawing on the expertise of Deans Hart and Nascembeni, President Martin said that she would like to consider whether a new process for addressing complaints of sexual misconduct may be needed, rather than trying to patch a system that was not designed for this purpose. In the meantime, it seems necessary to make the changes being proposed, the Committee agreed. Dean Call asked whether the Committee felt that a vote of the Faculty would be required to implement the proposed changes to the *Student Handbook*. Since the changes are designed to ensure compliance with the law and focus largely on issues surrounding complaints of sexual misconduct and not academic dishonesty, the Committee agreed that it does not seem necessary to draw on the Faculty's expertise, beyond the review of the proposal by the College Council, to implement these changes.

The Committee agreed that the changes could go forward as outlined, with the exception of the proposal to change the name and membership of the Committee on Discipline, which is a standing committee of the Faculty. Doing so would require a vote of the Faculty. It may be possible to bring this proposal to the Faculty in the form of a motion at the Commencement Faculty Meeting. At the conclusion of the meeting and in response to concerns that have been raised about the transparency of the system, President Martin asked that Deans Hart and Nascembeni provide the community with statistics that include the number of cases of sexual misconduct that were settled outside the process. The Committee thanked Deans Hart and Nascembeni for attending the meeting and for their helpful contributions to the discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 P.M.

Amended April 27, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended May 9, 2012

The twenty-seventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by Dean Call in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, April 30, 2012. In addition to Dean Call, Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder, were present. President Martin was absent from the meeting. The Committee turned briefly to personnel matters.

The members felt that it would be helpful to discuss the procedures for considering tenure cases for senior hires. The Dean noted that any changes to the prescribed make-up of ad hoc tenure committees (two tenured members who represent the department(s) of the candidate and two tenured professors from other departments) would require a vote of the Faculty.

At 4:00 P.M., John Isaacson and Ponneh Varho of the search firm Isaacson, Miller joined the meeting to discuss with the members the search process envisioned for the Provost, potential responsibilities of the position, and the qualities and characteristics that would be most desirable in a Provost. Based on what they learn after conversations with the President, Dean, Senior Staff, members of the Faculty, and members of the staff, and from two open meetings (one that had already been held and one scheduled for the next day), Mr. Isaacson and Ms. Varho will draft a position description. The President, the Dean, the Committee of Six, and the search committee, once it is appointed, will review and finalize that document.

Continuing, Mr. Isaacson said that it is his understanding that the position is envisioned as a vehicle for enhancing the College's ability to "make good ideas actionable." The conversation focused on the role that the Provost might play in the realm of strategic planning, as well in facilitating ongoing administrative processes, as well as new initiatives. Mr. Isaacson characterized the nature of the position as being that of a "convener" and emphasized that the envisioned role of the Provost would be a broad one that would extend across the College and bring members of the Amherst community together. Professor Basu commented that having a position that would have as a focus building bridges and strengthening connections and communication among the College's different constituencies would be ideal. Discussion also focused on the necessity of defining the responsibilities of the Provost in ways that do not diminish the role of the Dean of the Faculty, while still relieving the Dean's position of some of its overwhelming burdens in particular administrative areas.

Mr. Isaacson asked what the members felt the focus of the Dean of the Faculty position should be. The Committee agreed that the Dean should primarily be concerned with supporting the Faculty, including ensuring that the Faculty's scholarship and creative work and teaching flourish, and participating fully in strategic planning in academic affairs. A critical role of the Dean should remain overseeing hiring and the consideration of the future composition of the Faculty, the members noted. The Committee felt that the Dean should continue to oversee faculty compensation and other areas of the academic budget. Of course, there would be some overlap with the Provost. For example, the Provost will have responsibility for supporting diversity across the College, which will intersect with faculty recruitment. The Dean should also continue to serve as the Faculty's liaison to the President, the Committee agreed. Several members expressed the view that it will be essential that the addition of the Provost position not result in the creation of an additional layer between the Faculty and the President. Professor Ferguson commented that the Provost and the Dean should have parallel roles in the administrative structure, but that the scope and purview of each role would be different and should be clearly defined.

Professor Basu suggested that the Provost be tasked with considering ways in which the Faculty could be relieved of some of its administrative responsibilities, while maintaining the Faculty's central role in the governance of the College. Thinking about ways to streamline the committee structure might be one approach. If ways could be found for faculty to spend less

Amended May 9, 2012

time on committee work, colleagues would have more time to focus on their scholarship and teaching, Professor Basu said. Professor Hewitt noted that it would be helpful if the Provost plays a central role in campus space planning, with an eye to more strategic planning and coordinated oversight. Professor Umphrey stressed the need for the Provost to play a role in student life and campus culture, helping to build structures to bring students together with one another and to encourage connections among students, faculty, and staff—knitting the College together into a richer brocade. Professor Umphrey commented on the importance of having the Provost work with members of the community to generate and implement ideas, noting that the individual will not be successful if he or she tries to impose ideas from the top down. Professor Hewitt agreed. Continuing, Professor Umphrey said that she thinks the Provost might usefully play a communications role, as well, collaborating with the President and the Dean to advocate for liberal arts education to both internal and external audiences. Professor Ratner emphasized the importance of the Provost working in ways that are highly collaborative, both with the Dean of the Faculty and the Dean of Students, as well as with others with whom he or she will work closely.

Professor Basu asked if there will be a search committee for the position and about the timetable for the search. Mr. Isaacson responded that he believes that there will be a relatively small search committee and that the position description should be finalized within several weeks. It is his understanding that the search would be launched soon after, with interviews occurring this fall and a decision made by early in 2013. Just when the new Provost would start work at Amherst would depend on the successful candidate's current commitments and responsibilities, Mr. Isaacson said. He would expect that the Provost would be in place by July 2013. At the Committee's request, Mr. Isaacson discussed how Provosts at other liberal arts colleges, as well as universities, are positioned within these other institutions' administrative structures. He noted that the responsibilities that have typically been associated with a Provost take on many different forms and often have different titles—for example, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, depending on the institution. At some institutions, the Dean and the Faculty and the Provost positions are combined and held by the same person. Noting the range of preparation among Amherst's students, Professor Ferguson emphasized the importance of having the Provost focus on ways to support the entire spectrum of students, meeting the educational and co-curricular needs of all.

At the conclusion of the conversation, Mr. Isaacson and Ms. Varho thanked the Committee and left the meeting at 5 P.M.

Dean Call next informed the members that he has received a proposal for a potential change to the academic calendar for 2012-2013. The proposal is to change the week during the Fall term when Monday classes are held on a Wednesday from the first week of the term to the October-break week. The timing of the current switch has an adverse impact on those teaching and/or potentially taking a once-a-week Wednesday seminar because, under the current schedule, such seminars meet only once before the end of the add/drop period. Dean Call said he thinks, on balance, implementing the proposal would be a viable solution to the problem. Dean Call has asked Marian Matheson, Director of Institutional Research and Planning, to gather data on how many students who pre-registered in the fall would be affected by the Wednesday once-a-week seminar problem at the beginning of the term, versus being out-of-phase with the other colleges for a day during the post-fall break week. He said that he would also consult with the College Council and the Senior Staff about the proposal. Possible decisions going forward might include: trying the new system this next fall, which would require the approval of the Committee of Six and the College Council, as well as vote of the Faculty at the Faculty Meeting on May 17; referring the question for College Council consideration in the fall and possible adoption in



Amended May 9, 2012

2013-2014; or leaving things as they are, if research reveals that the solution would be worse than the problem. Professor Ratner wondered if the change might interfere with the scheduling of laboratory classes held during the October Break week. The Dean said that he would report back on Ms. Matheson's research at the next Committee of Six meeting. The members said that the proposal sounds viable, but would await the results of the research, and the consultation, that the Dean had described.

The Committee spent the remainder of the meeting making nominations of colleagues to serve on faculty committees for the 2012-2013 year. Dean Call noted that, once the assignments are confirmed for the standing committees of the Faculty, he would share with the Committee suggested nominations for the ad hoc committees. He invited the members to comment on these suggested nominations if they wished.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended May 14, 2012

The twenty-eighth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin at the Lord Jeffery Inn at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, May 7, 2012. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Committee first discussed the structure of the search committee for the provost position and agreed that having three faculty members, one administrator, one staff member, and one student could be a viable model. The members made nominations of faculty members to serve on the committee, and President Martin said that she would consider these and other recommendations and would inform the members about the appointments that would be made to the search committee.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call reported back to the members on the research that had been done by Jesse Barba, Associate Registrar/Associate Director of Institutional Research, to inform decision-making about how to proceed with a proposal for a potential change to the academic calendar for 2012-2013. The proposal under discussion is to change the week during the Fall term when Monday classes are held on a Wednesday from the first week of the term to the October-break week. The timing of the current switch has an adverse impact on those teaching and/or potentially taking a once-a-week Wednesday seminar because, under the current schedule, such seminars meet only once before the end of the add/drop period. At the Dean's request, the Office of Institutional Research had gathered data on how many students who pre-registered in the fall would be affected by the Wednesday once-a-week seminar problem at the beginning of the term, versus being out-of-phase with the other colleges for a day during the post-fall break week. Dean Call said that the number of classes that have meetings on Monday-only and the number that have meetings on Wednesday-only are nearly the same, with only a slight edge to the Wednesday-only classes. However, the proposal might still be an improvement over the current system because the resulting single Monday meeting before add/drop would not occur right before add/drop ends, as the single meeting of classes held only on Wednesdays now does. Under the proposal, there would be two meetings prior to add/drop of classes that meet only on Wednesdays. The Dean suggested that the proposal be referred to the College Council in the fall to think through its implications, with possible adoption in 2013-2014. Dean Call commented that he continues to feel that on balance, the proposal would be an improvement on the current schedule. Professor Ratner reiterated his concern that the change might interfere with the scheduling of laboratory classes held during the October-break week. The Dean said that he would convey this concern to the College Council and ask that its members consult with science departments when considering the proposal. The Committee agreed that referring the proposal to the College Council seems appropriate. The members next turned briefly to personnel matters.

The Committee discussed nominations of faculty members and administrators to serve on a committee that would plan a new humanities/social science center at the College. Professor Basu asked whether the Committee of Six should develop a charge for the committee. President Martin noted that the Dean and she had reviewed and approved a proposal for such a center, so that the committee's role should largely be to consider, with input from the Faculty, how best to implement that proposal.

Under "Questions from Committee members," Professor Ferguson asked the President and the Dean whether they had made a decision on the members' request to grant a course release for members of the Committee of Six on a regular basis each fall. Professors Ferguson, Basu, Umphrey, and Hewitt argued that the release is warranted because of the demands that the workload places on the members, no matter how many tenure cases are under review during a particular year. Professors Ferguson and Basu stressed that the time constraints that service on

Amended May 14, 2012

the Committee impose make it difficult for members to advance their research programs, sometimes for as long as two years (a full term on the Committee of Six). It was also noted that faculty do not choose to serve on the Committee and have no control over when they are called upon to do so. Professor Ratner wondered whether the question of whether course release should be granted ought to be considered after a decision is made about whether the Committee should, perhaps, be split into two separate committees, a proposal that has been mentioned in the past. Under such a structure, one committee would function as a tenure and promotion committee and the other would perform the functions of an executive committee of the Faculty. Professor Loinaz noted that some colleagues with whom he has spoken about the possibility of granting course release to the Committee of Six, some of whom have served on the Committee in the past, have expressed little enthusiasm for granting a course release. They raised issues of equity in regard to other administrative and governance burdens that many faculty members would continue to face without such a release. Professor Loinaz suggested that a discussion with the broader Faculty about the appropriate circumstances for course release is desirable. Dean Call said that he worries about granting course release to the Committee members without regard to the number of tenure cases that are being considered. He commented that, on two occasions course release was granted to the Committee in the past, but only because there were a significant number of cases. He also noted that, when Amherst, as well as peer institutions, moved to a two/two teaching load, it was with the understanding that faculty would not be granted course release for service to the College. President Martin said that she and the Dean would continue to consider this request, and that they would report back to the members with their decision at the next meeting of the Committee.

Continuing with “Questions from Committee members,” Professor Umphrey asked President Martin for her views on Harvard and M.I.T.’s decision to offer courses online for the public. President Martin said that she would like to learn more about the possibilities that Coursera (<https://www.coursera.org/>) might offer for the College. Princeton, Stanford, University of Michigan, and the University of Pennsylvania are using this platform to offer non-credit courses to anyone who wishes to enroll. The President said that she finds the idea of Amherst being involved in this effort to be an intriguing one and that she hopes, to inform herself, to meet with representatives from Coursera to find out more about the platform.

The Committee discussed the experience of the Faculty Meeting held on May 1. The Committee agreed that, generally, the meeting had gone well. Professor Ratner expressed the view that it would be helpful to try to find ways to avoid having language composed on the floor of the meeting. While agreeing as a general matter, President Martin said that she had been impressed with the way in which the Faculty had accomplished the task at hand, coming to a resolution about general education learning goals. Professor Umphrey concurred, while noting that she had some concern about the occasionally breathless pace of the meeting, though content with the outcomes of the meeting’s various motions and pleased that important College business had been efficiently completed, she worried that two significant curricular proposals (the Five-College Certificate in Sustainability Studies and the Five-College Major in Architectural Studies) received no comment from the faculty floor before passage because time was short, and, wondered whether, in the future, the substantive business of the meeting might be completed 15 minutes before the meeting ends, so as to leave time for questions to the administration. President Martin agreed that this would be a sound approach, while noting that it may not always be possible to discuss all matters with equal thoroughness at Faculty Meetings. She observed that many proposals, including those (Five College Major in Architectural Studies and the Five-College Sustainability Studies Certificate Program) that had been approved at the May 1 meeting, undergo several layers of vetting before they come before the full Faculty. The

Amended May 14, 2012

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 to support the awarding of the fellowship to the nominee and to forward the nomination to the Faculty.

The members turned to a discussion of the theses and transcripts of students who had been recommended by their departments for a summa cum laude degree and having an overall grade point average in the top 25 percent of the graduating class. The Dean noted that the Committee had also been asked to review the theses of students who had received summa cum laude recommendations from their departments and whose overall grade point average was likely to land below the top 25 percent but within the top 40 percent of the class, since these students would qualify for a magna cum laude degree under the honors guidelines. The members voted unanimously to forward these recommendations to the Faculty and offered high praise for the quality of the work done by this accomplished group of students.

Continuing the discussion about the theses, the Committee took note that some of the students' transcripts reveal that they have taken a very narrow path through the curriculum, and some members, as well as the President and the Dean, found this lack of breadth to be troubling. They wondered if, under the current system, students are being rewarded with the College's highest honor for not stretching themselves in new ways as they navigate the curriculum. Professor Basu commented that it would be helpful for Committee members to have some general explanation of the expectations for summa-level work, since the Committee is asked to review theses that vary in quality for summa honors. The Committee agreed that it would be helpful if departments were asked to provide letters in which they describe for a lay audience what is distinctive about the thesis that is being recommended and why they judge it to be summa-level work. The members also felt that it might be informative to ask the Office of Institutional Research to examine whether students who have been recommended for summa cum laude honors over the past ten years have tended to have less breadth in their course-taking than those who are not recommended for this honor. Professor Basu wondered whether one factor in the lack of breadth in some students' records is due to their desire to pursue double majors. She feels that advisors should be especially attentive to ensuring that students who double major take a broad range of courses outside their majors. Dean Call suggested that if one major is in the sciences and another is in the humanities or social sciences, there could be more breadth in a student's record than there would be if, say, a student majored in two sciences. Professor Umphrey suggested that more students might take courses outside their comfort zones if there were more courses designed for non-majors, particularly in the sciences, in which they might feel less disadvantaged than they would be if they took courses designed for majors. Professor Loinaz suggested that ensuring breadth in students' courses of study is an advising issue.

Discussion turned to the proposal for a [Five-College Certificate in Queer and Sexuality Studies, which has been endorsed by the Committee on Educational Policy \(CEP\)](#). The members discussed the issue, which was also raised by the CEP, of the current absence of an introductory course taught at Amherst that would be appropriate for the certificate. The CEP noted that "Ensuring that such a course is taught regularly would make it easier for Amherst students to pursue the certificate." Professor Basu commented that there would be some years in which courses offered through Amherst departments would qualify as an introductory course for the certificate. She noted that, when the Five Colleges reviews courses to see if they would qualify for credit for the certificate, they take a rather mechanical approach of checking the title and description of the course to see if the words "queer" and/or "sexuality" are included. More relevant courses that are taught at Amherst would count toward the certificate if these keywords

Amended May 14, 2012

were added to their titles and descriptions, she noted. Professor Basu also pointed out that, currently courses that are described as having a focus on gender would not count toward the certificate. Professor Umphrey noted that Amherst does not appear to offer as many courses as the other Five-College institutions do in the area of queer studies, despite the fact that students have been requesting such courses for quite some time, which for her strengthens the case for this certificate program. The members agreed that the certificate might serve to generate more courses in this field at Amherst, which is yet another argument in its favor. The members then voted six in favor and zero opposed on the substance of the proposal and six in favor and zero opposed to forward it to the Faculty. Professor Basu said that it would be helpful to contact Five Colleges, Inc. to discuss the criteria that should be used to determine which courses would count toward the certificate. The Dean agreed to do so.

The members then reviewed a draft Faculty Meeting Agenda for May 17 and voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward it to the Faculty.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended June 15, 2012

The twenty-ninth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, May 14, 2012. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson (who participated via speaker phone), Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Under "Announcements from the President," President Martin informed the members that Peter Shea, the College's Treasurer, has accepted the position of Director of Finance at The Roxbury Latin School in West Roxbury, Massachusetts, an independent day school for boys. Mr. Shea will leave the College at the end of June, the President said, adding that there will be opportunities to honor him and say farewell. President Martin explained to the members that it will be important to change the title of the position, as the title of Treasurer does not communicate the full range of responsibilities of the position and is outmoded; few peer institutions now make use of it. In order to attract the best applicants, a title such as Vice-President for Finance and Administration, or, perhaps, Vice-President for Finance and Administration/Treasurer, would be preferable, President Martin feels. Changing the position's title, which is named and defined in the bylaws of the Trustees of Amherst College, would be an administrative decision that would require a vote of the Board of Trustees, she noted. References to the position in the *Faculty Handbook* could later be updated. Professor Loinaz asked if the President anticipates changing the titles of other senior administrative positions, and she responded that she does not envision doing so, seeing no need. Professor Ratner asked if the President foresees shifting any of the responsibilities of Mr. Shea's position and if additional positions might be required in the Treasurer's office. President Martin said that she feels it would be best to consider any additions or changes to the structure in the Treasurer's office, if needed, once the new appointment is made. Professor Basu asked if plans are in place to appoint an interim Treasurer. The President said that she has not yet decided what will be needed; she plans to consult with Mr. Shea about plans for his transition.

Continuing, President Martin said that she is finalizing the list of those whom she will invite to serve on the search committee for the Provost position. President Martin concluded her announcements by mentioning that she has had discussions with Professor Zajonc about ways to encourage collaborations between the College and the Mind and Life Institute, which he now heads, that will allow Amherst students to have access to the institute to explore contemplative traditions and their relationship to the sciences and humanities. Possibilities include co-organizing a symposium or conference with the institute. The President also noted that the College is considering hosting a conference that would focus on baseball, examining the sport and its place within American history, and inviting Amherst alumni who are general managers of professional baseball teams and other representatives who work in the field, as well as scholars, to participate.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," the Dean noted the passing of Professor Emeritus of Anthropology Donald S. Pitkin on May 11, 2012, and the members were saddened by this news. He asked the members for nominations for a Memorial Minute Committee for Professor Pitkin. The Dean noted that, as soon as senior grades are in and final G.P.A. calculations are made, he would provide the Committee with information about the nominee for the Woods-Travis Prize and would ask the members to vote electronically on forwarding the recommendation of the nominee to the Faculty.

Continuing with his remarks, the Dean noted that the President and he had approved a proposal from Bryn Geffert, Librarian of the College, to develop an online Amherst College Press, which, Mr. Geffert has noted, will produce publications rivaling those at the top academic presses—created from manuscripts solicited from scholars around the world and subject to the same level of peer review, editing, and design. The press will be open access, and Amherst will

Amended June 15, 2012

make its electronic publications freely available to all—the first liberal arts college to do so. At the outset, the press will publish solely in the liberal arts in disciplines for which Amherst is well known, while also supporting an online open-access version of the *Common* literary magazine. The Committee expressed enthusiasm for the project. Dean Call noted that the majority of funding for staffing the press and other costs is already in place as a result of support that has been provided through the library's endowed funds and savings that have resulted from the reallocation of frozen positions in the library. Professor Loinaz asked about the nature of the eliminated positions in the library. The Dean said that these were staff positions. Due to the changing nature of work within the library, it had been possible to redistribute among current positions functions that had been attached to the eliminated ones. Professor Ratner asked for more specifics about the fields on which the press would focus. Dean Call said that the thought is to begin with underserved fields, primarily within the humanities. It was noted that the *Common* will be affiliated with the new press, and that both print and online versions of the *Common* currently exist. As the Dean mentioned earlier, the press will support an online, open-access version of the literary magazine. Professor Umphrey expressed some concern that the *Common* does not have much of a presence on campus. Professor Hewitt agreed. Dean Call noted that the publication is supported through a subscription model, which may result in less visibility on campus. He said that plans call for examining ways in which the press and the *Common* may work together most productively.

The Dean next informed the members that President Martin and he have decided to grant a single course release annually for members of the Committee of Six, as an experiment, for the next three years. President Martin added that it will be possible for departments to “bank” the course replacement, if they wish, for use after their department's Committee of Six member rotates off the Committee. When departments replace these courses, they will be asked to do so through the use of Five-College “borrows.” Funding will be provided at the Five-College full professor borrow rate, the Dean said. The members thanked President Martin and Dean Call and welcomed this news. Professor Basu asked if course relief for other administrative roles, such as the chair of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) would be implemented. President Martin said that there are no plans to do so at this time; she would like to evaluate the Committee of Six experiment before considering release time for other service, but she said that she is open to considering the implications of course release in other circumstances and for other roles.

The Dean shared a letter regarding the procedures for senior-hire tenure review. The members agreed that these procedures should be reviewed and clarified, with the aim of improving the process. The Dean said that his office would undertake this project over the summer and report back to the Committee of Six in the fall. Since most of these procedures are prescribed by faculty legislation, it would be necessary to bring any significant proposed changes to the Faculty for a vote, he noted. Dean Call expressed the view that, if there were greater clarity and familiarity with what has been a largely unused process for many years, it would be helpful. He agrees that rethinking of the requirements and their purposes is also in order.

Returning to the topic of the humanities/social sciences center, Professor Basu suggested that it would be helpful for the Committee of Six to be provided with the proposal for the center to inform future conversations about it. It has been difficult to make judgments without knowing more about the substance of what has been proposed. Professor Basu noted that a colleague had provided her with a copy of the proposal, and that learning more about it had been informative. She stressed that she supports this initiative, despite her concerns about the envisioned place of the humanistic social sciences in the model being proposed. Professor Hewitt, who is among the proposers, said that the intention has been to create a center that is welcoming and open, rather than exclusionary. Professor Basu suggested that the proposal for the center be shared broadly

Amended June 15, 2012

and that consideration be given to including the humanistic social sciences under the umbrella of the center, as it is further conceived and developed. She proposed that a title such as the Center for Humanistic Inquiry might convey more effectively the desire for a center that will have an inclusive approach. Professor Ferguson asked whether the new entity is to be a center for curriculum and pedagogy, as well as research.

Continuing the conversation, the President responded that she understands that the center is meant to be a research center. She and Dean Call expressed the view that, while there are some intersections between the need for a space in which to focus on and explore curricular innovation and teaching, it appears that it is best to separate that project from the center under discussion. Having too many objectives and trying to meet too many needs with a single center would not be desirable, it was agreed. Professor Ferguson noted that, at present, the College does not create space to have elevated discussions about teaching on a conceptual level. Doing so would be valuable in his view. President Martin and Dean Call agreed. Dean Call said that he sees the need for a teaching center as being parallel to the need for a research center, though there would be overlaps between the two entities. He offered as an example the important role within the research center of providing mentoring, in terms of both scholarship and teaching, to the colleagues in post-doctoral positions, who will form a core of the center. Professor Ratner argued that any structures that are created to focus on curricular innovation and pedagogy should not exclude the sciences. Dean Call noted, on a related note, that, at a “synergy summit” that would be held at the College on May 16, Amherst faculty and administrators would exchange ideas about innovative pedagogical and curricular initiatives that are currently under way on campus, a number of which have been funded through grants. He said that finding ways to bring colleagues together for such discussions is important and valuable. The Committee discussed further nominations of faculty members and administrators to serve on a committee that would plan for the new research center.

The President discussed briefly with the members how best to integrate ongoing and upcoming planning efforts that are focusing on different areas of the College, for example, advising and information technology, into the broader long-range planning effort. The President said that folding ongoing planning efforts into the broader long-range planning initiative will allow planning to progress while the search for the provost is under way and help avoid a duplication of effort once the larger planning effort is launched. President Martin noted that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has agreed to help gather faculty views on a number of key issues facing the College, efforts that will also ultimately inform the long-range plan.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Basu asked if the Copeland Program would continue to exist if funding from the Copeland Fund is used to support a new research center. Dean Call said that it would be necessary to draw on some of the Copeland Fund to help support the center, and that he hopes that programming for the center and the colloquium can be coordinated, when appropriate. Professor Loinaz next asked if thought has been given to how science students’ summer research efforts will be supported, since the College’s recent proposal to the Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI) was not funded. Amherst had received support from HHMI in five out of the previous six grant cycles since 1988, and it was disappointing, but not unexpected that this year’s proposal was not funded, Dean Call said. There has been some speculation that HHMI has decided to place greater emphasis in the 2012 round on underserved institutions, first-time grantees, or teaching training institutions. When the College receives reviewers’ comments next month, more will be known, he noted. Dean Call said that it is likely that there will be enough funding through existing grants to support student research this summer, and next, and that he expects that funding resources from his office will also be used for this purpose. Since the College has sought support



Amended June 15, 2012

from the Mellon Foundation for tutorials and summer research stipends for students in the humanities and social sciences who are currently being supported through the Dean's office, having those initiatives funded for three years through a Mellon grant will allow the Dean to devote more resources to supporting student research in the sciences during the summer. He is also working with faculty and administrative colleagues to explore alternative external funding sources for summer science research. Professor Loinaz asked if fundraising for the new science center will include an emphasis on providing more endowed support for summer research. The Dean said that doing so is a fundraising priority.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Basu asked when decisions about requests for FTEs would be made; Professor Hewitt wondered how many proposals had been submitted. Dean Call said that decisions would be announced soon and that there had been fifteen proposals, including two to regularize long-term visiting appointments. Professor Umphrey asked how many of the proposals had been for replacements. Dean Call said that, of the thirteen regular requests, there had been seven requests for new positions and six for replacements. Professor Umphrey next asked when the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising plans to issue its report. President Martin noted that the committee is asking big questions and considering advising from the ground up. She anticipates that the committee's report will be ready this fall. Professor Hewitt next requested that next year's Committee of Six return to the question of whether students who are being considered for summa cum laude should be expected to demonstrate breadth in the course of study at the College. The Dean said he would add this topic to the agenda for next year. The Committee then turned briefly to personnel matters.

The members reviewed drafts of letters to candidates and chairs about promotion to full professor and approved them. Professor Ratner suggested that, depending on whether the Faculty votes to require candidate letters for reappointment and tenure, it might be appropriate and desirable to require candidate letters for promotion to full professor as well.

The meeting concluded with a discussion of a proposal for an engineering exchange between Amherst and Dartmouth that had been endorsed by the CEP ([endorsement and proposal appended via link](#)). Professor Ratner expressed the view that the proposed arrangement and its written description are excellent and said that he is in favor of the proposal. He wondered why the arrangement for the study of engineering that the College had with MIT was discontinued years ago and if any lessons had been learned from that experience might be helpful in making the proposed arrangement with Dartmouth. He commented that some of the pre-approved courses for the program seem fairly technical—for example, ENGS42, Contaminant Hydrogeology. The subject matter, he noted, seems as applied as some of the courses offered at UMass for the Sustainability Certificate, but the Committee had been assured Amherst's Registrar would not approve all courses for the certificate.

Professor Loinaz responded that former Registrar, Gerry Mager, had informed him that MIT had ended the agreement with Amherst. Professor Loinaz said that he is under the impression that MIT had ended its exchange agreements with all liberal arts colleges at the time. In response to Professor Ratner's question about the nature of the courses, Professor Loinaz acknowledged that some of the courses are a bit technical, while commenting that some of the courses offered at Amherst can be technical, as well—for example, some of the intermediate and upper-level courses in physics. Professor Loinaz argued that, if the applications and technical aspects are vehicles for exploring or elaborating general principles, he does not see any problem. When courses stray toward the purely vocational, he does not feel that Amherst should give credit for them. Since Dartmouth emphasizes the liberal arts in its undergraduate engineering sciences courses, he is not concerned that Dartmouth will offer vocational courses. UMass engineering school, on the other hand, has no particular emphasis on the liberal arts that he can

Amended June 15, 2012

discern, so he evaluates their courses individually, when called upon to do so. He said that he had reviewed courses on the Dartmouth list and picked the courses that looked like they could be offered at Amherst. He shared his list with Professor Friedman (chair of the physics department) to vet it and get the “pre-approval” of the physics department. Professor Friedman pared the list a bit, and Professor Loinaz then forwarded it to Kathleen Goff, the Registrar, with some explanation for each course. Those courses that are now included in the proposal are what she approved (of the list that Professor Loinaz had submitted, the Registrar did not approve courses that Professors Loinaz or Friedman had judged to be on the borderline of perhaps being too vocational). Professor Umphrey wondered why Amherst might move in the direction of forming a connection with a professional degree program in engineering, and what implications approving this proposal might have for other, future proposals attached to professional fields. Professor Loinaz pointed out that the proposal is not novel. Amherst had an engineering exchange with MIT for three decades, and the current proposal only formalizes an option for study at Dartmouth that has been available to Amherst students for many years. He noted that students have always been able to take this curriculum through the Twelve-College Exchange (a reason that the Faculty is not being asked to vote on the engineering proposal), but that formalizing the arrangement will mean that Dartmouth will provide Amherst students with more support, including advising. Professor Loinaz also pointed out that all of Amherst’s peers participate in a program like this one or offer an engineering program themselves. Professor Umphrey said that it would be productive for the Faculty to consider larger questions about Amherst’s relationship to the professions. Professor Basu agreed that having such a discussion would be valuable and suggested that involving the Center for Community Engagement would be helpful, as the center is an important tool for building bridges between the College and professional schools. The members expressed support for the proposal, and it was agreed that it should be adopted. The Committee turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

**Amended June 15, 2012**

The thirtieth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 2:00 P.M. on Wednesday, May 16, 2012. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson (who participated via speaker phone), Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

**Amended June 15, 2012**

The thirty-first meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2011-2012 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 2:00 P.M. on Wednesday, May 23, 2012. Present were Professors Basu, Ferguson, Hewitt, Loinaz, Ratner, and Umphrey, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. The meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty