

Amended September 14, 2012

The first meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, September 10, 2012. Present were Professors Ferguson, Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

President Martin opened the meeting by welcoming new and returning members of the Committee of Six and said that she looks forward to working with the Committee this year. The President informed the members that she will host informal autumn gatherings for faculty on September 28, October 11, and October 24 from 4 to 6 P.M., at the Lord Jeffery Inn. She asked for the Committee's advice about logistics. It was agreed that it might be most fruitful to issue an open invitation to all colleagues to each event, rather than inviting faculty members in small groups for a particular date. There will be no agenda for these meetings, which will be colloquial in nature, with all topics of discussion welcome.

Under his announcements, Dean Call noted that the memorial service in honor of Donald S. Pitkin, Professor of Anthropology, Emeritus, which had taken place the previous Saturday (September 8) in Johnson Chapel, had been lovely. Professor Pitkin, who joined the Amherst Faculty in 1964 and retired in 1992, died on May 11, 2012. The Dean next informed the members that a series of talks relevant to the upcoming elections, with speakers representing a spectrum of political views, is being organized by Professors Arkes and Dumm. The President and he have agreed to provide funding support for these lectures, Dean Call explained. The Dean noted that a faculty member had requested that, on the College's behalf, the Dean approach the Charles G. Koch Charitable Foundation for funding for a series of political talks in the coming election season. The Dean said that he had declined to seek funding from the foundation in this instance and had decided that College resources should be directed to offering a broad series of talks instead. The President and the Dean said that it would be useful for the Committee to have a discussion in the future to consider under what circumstances the College should accept funding from groups, such as the Koch Foundation, that may have a political agenda or that may be seeking a forum to promote a particular set of views and, in particular, whether it is appropriate for individual faculty members to approach such groups for funding for events to be carried out under College auspices. The Committee's general consensus was that the College should not accept funding if unacceptable parameters are set on the use of the support, including advancing a particular political agenda. The members spoke briefly about the topic and agreed to return to it, should the need arise.

Returning to his remarks, the Dean noted that, upon the recommendation of the Faculty Housing Committee, the *Faculty Handbook* language regarding the Enhanced Second Mortgage Plan has been revised to reflect and clarify the policy, which previously had not been explained fully. Dean Call noted that the College's Second Mortgage Plan is not available for refinancing or home improvements. It may be used only for the purchase of a non-College house within a thirty-mile radius of Amherst, Massachusetts. This policy was articulated in a 1998 trustee report that established the program, but the restriction regarding home improvements had not been specifically stated in the *Faculty Handbook* until recently, following a request from the Housing Committee to refer to this point in the description of the program in the *Faculty Handbook*. The [revised language](#) (*Faculty Handbook*, V., c.) is now online. Professor Harms expressed concern that the criterion that house purchases covered under the plan must be in a thirty-mile radius of Amherst may no longer be serving the College well as a recruitment and retention tool, since many faculty members' circumstances necessitate that they live further away

Amended September 14, 2012

from Amherst. She suggested that consideration be given to changing the policy to encompass purchases of homes that are within a reasonable commuting distance to Amherst. Dean Call commented that the Housing Committee had been reviewing housing policies last year, and that the members will continue to do so this year. He said that he would share Professor Harms's proposal with the Housing Committee. Ultimately, decisions about benefits, including housing, are within the purview of the Board of Trustees, the Dean noted, while commenting that it is important to gain a sense of the Faculty's views about this and other benefits. Such views are shared with the Board and inform the Trustees' decision making.

Continuing with his announcements, Dean Call informed the members that, with Professor Hart, former Dean of Students, on academic leave for 2012-2013, Interim Dean of Students Charri Boykin-East, has re-assigned some of the responsibilities within the Dean of Students office. In an effort to provide the class deans with some additional support during this year of transition, Associate Dean Griffiths has agreed to be of counsel to the office in the areas of academic advising and curricular matters this year. The Committee expressed its appreciation to Dean Griffiths for taking on this additional role.

Seeking advice and feedback from the members, President Martin outlined for the Committee's consideration the contours of a possible process, timeline, and set of organizational structures for developing a strategic plan, the approach of which would be aspirational and inquiry-based. She envisions a process that would unfold over a sixteen- to twenty-month period that could begin as early as this month, with the appointment of a Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC), and conclude between January and May of 2014, when the Board of Trustees would be asked to vote on the plan. The President suggested that, as one of the earliest steps, she wishes to confer with the Committee of Six to develop a charge to the SPSC. Framing the questions that will form the foundation of the planning process will be one of the most critical early steps of the process. President Martin noted that the development of a campus assessment plan would also be important for laying the groundwork for the strategic plan, proposing that preparations for such a plan, for which an architectural firm would be engaged, begin in September. The purpose of this plan would be to gain a more informed and nuanced understanding of the potential for the Amherst campus to develop in response to future programmatic initiatives, with the goal of creating a framework that would guide the implementation of facilities projects that may emerge as a result of the strategic plan and other initiatives.

President Martin said that, as early as possible, she feels that it would also be important to appoint a working group, which would include the Interim Treasurer, Chief Investment Officer, Chief Advancement Officer, the Dean of the Faculty, and two members of the Board of Trustees, and to charge this body with analyzing a series of financial models and assessing the implications of making various financial assumptions and/or choices. This exercise would yield data that, like the campus assessment plan, would inform the planning process, as it progresses. The hope would be that the information gathered through the campus assessment plan and the financial analysis would be available by the time the SPSC is in the latter phases of gathering input from the community and working to articulate goals. President Martin offered the view that the overarching goal of the planning process will be to answer the question of what the community wants Amherst to be—considering how the College should evolve over the next three decades, taking into account external pressures facing higher education, and gaining a sense of direction and priorities, and of how best to move forward to realize identified goals.

Amended September 14, 2012

Continuing, the President commented that she envisions the SPSC leading efforts this fall and spring to formulate the overarching questions that will guide the planning process and encourage broad inquiry by the community. To this end, the steering committee may make use of working groups, forums, reports, and other tools to elicit ideas and information. All academic and administrative units of the College, as well as the major faculty committees—the Committee of Six, the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), and the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR)—will be asked to submit responses to the questions. Making use of existing structures (departments, programs, administrative units, committees, etc.) to advance previous planning initiatives has been a successful approach in the past, and one to which the Amherst community is accustomed, President Martin has been told.

Following the information-gathering stages of the planning process, it is President Martin's hope that, by this summer, a subgroup of the SPSC would produce a draft of the strategic plan and develop a process for seeking feedback to it. To produce the draft, the SPSC would follow a process of delving into all of the information that it had received and distilling from it the salient themes and issues. In September of 2013, the College community would be asked to respond to the draft plan, and a campus-wide discussion would be encouraged. President Martin said that it is her expectation that the scrutiny and debate that would surely be a part of the community's vetting of the draft plan will be healthy and will enhance the final plan. The process should result in a shared sense of important issues, a set of priorities to be addressed, and short- and long-range strategies for meeting identified goals. During December of 2013, according to the draft schedule proposed by the President, she and a subgroup of the SPSC would generate a final draft of the strategic plan, which would then be shared with the Faculty, students, staff, and alumni. Depending on how closely the schedule can be followed, the plan would be brought to the Board for approval at either its winter or spring meeting in 2014.

Following the President's summary, Professor Harms commented that it will be important for President Martin to make clear to the Faculty that the intention in engaging the architects to conduct a campus assessment early in the strategic-planning process is not meant to be proscriptive or determinative, if this is indeed the case, but to gain an analysis of the campus that will offer insight into its potential for future development. President Martin agreed that this would be an accurate and important message to convey. She anticipates that it will be January or February before an architectural firm, which will consult broadly with the Amherst community as part of its work, can be hired and begin work on the plan. Professors Hunt and Schneider noted that similar concerns might be raised about the early-stage creation of the financial working group; they expressed the view that it would be important that any financial projections that might be shared at the initial stages of the planning process not inhibit early conversations about vision and aspirations. Dean Call stressed the importance of considering a full range of assumptions as part of the financial modeling process, as it would be critical to have assumptions that are of sufficient breadth to encourage aspirational thinking. Professor Harms wondered if some members of the Faculty might advise having a faculty member serve as a member of the financial working group. Professor Rogowski suggested that the chair of the CPR might be a viable candidate for this role. The members agreed that adding the CPR chair could be helpful. President Martin and Dean Call agreed.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Schneider wondered whether the approach of using existing structures to generate unencumbered, broad, and creative thinking might instead result in groups approaching the planning exercise as an opportunity to solidify and/or expand

Amended September 14, 2012

their turf. Distinguishing this planning process from that of the Advisory Budget Committee (ABC) would be important, he said, as that process devolved into vying over territory and resources. Suggesting that it might be useful to examine models elsewhere, Professor Rogowski proposed that faculty be encouraged to provide information about current debates in their fields to inform the planning process. President Martin noted that the key to encouraging broad consideration of what the College needs as a whole will depend on the questions that are developed to frame the planning process. The Committee agreed. Professor Harms pointed out that, in her experience, the way in which the planning committee is constituted can signal that a planning initiative will have a charge that is broad and comprehensive. President Martin suggested that the SPSC include three faculty members, one administrator, one staff member, one student, one trustee, and one alumnus or alumna. The Committee discussed the pros and cons of this make-up and balance. Professor Hunt commented that it would be important to spell out clearly the role of the SPSC and how the strategic plan will be used and by whom. Dean Call noted that it will be important for a broader level of sharing to take place than has been typical in the past, if the goal is aspirational thinking. The model of having all information flow to a steering committee, which then writes a report, may not be the most fruitful one for the strategic planning process to follow, unless the information gathered is shared broadly and groups are encouraged to suggest synergistic opportunities, he noted. President Martin agreed and said that she assumes that material submitted to the SPSC could be made available online to anyone who wishes to see it. Professor Ferguson stressed the importance of framing the discussion before it starts. He and Professor Schneider suggested bringing speakers to campus to inform the community about the ways in which higher education is changing and how the future of the Amherst model might be considered in this context.

The Committee asked the President to describe the typical shape of a strategic plan. She responded that these documents often begin with a statement about vision, which is followed by an enumeration of internal and external challenges and opportunities facing the institution. Also part of the introductory sections is an articulation of the institution's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the present and future state of higher education. Strategic plans usually end with a list of priorities and goals and a description of how the institution will work to realize them. The members agreed that it would be informative and beneficial to draw on the President's expertise in higher education and asked if she would offer information about the pressures facing higher education, strengths and challenges of the liberal arts model, and predictions about what may lie ahead. She agreed to summarize trends at the Committee's next meeting, to provide the Committee with some articles on this subject, and agreed that it would be helpful to invite speakers to campus who could also address this topic. She then asked if the members would offer their views of some of the pressures facing higher education. In response, the Committee noted the following: the public's frustration with the rising costs of education, the liberal arts college model's struggle for survival, society's emphasis on professionalism and practicality, the pressures posed by online learning and the related issue of defending the value of a residential education, and issues related to technology, anti-intellectualism, globalization, and changing demographics. Professor Hunt asked about the typical length of strategic plans. President Martin said that they are usually ten to twelve pages and often take the form of an outline, without much in the way of narrative. She agreed to provide the members with some examples of noteworthy strategic plans from other institutions.

Amended September 14, 2012

At the conclusion of the discussion about strategic planning, President Martin thanked the members for their helpful questions, insights, and advice. She said that, guided by this conversation, at the Committee's next meeting, she would describe in more detail her view of the different stages of the planning process and their purposes, as well as the anticipated role and structure of the SPSC. She looks forward to continuing to hone the planning process, with the Committee's help. At the members' next meeting, it is also her hope that an initial conversation will take place about the questions that would provide the framework for the planning process.

President Martin next discussed with the members the administration's plans to continue to review and revise the College's practices and procedures to ensure that Amherst continues to provide a safe educational environment. The Title IX Committee (Suzanne Coffey, Director of Athletics; Molly Mead, Director of the Center for Community Engagement and Title IX Coordinator; Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel; Charri Boykin-East, Interim Dean of Students; Gretchen Krull, Assistant Director of Health Education/Sexual Assault Counselor; Denise McGoldrick, Assistant Dean of Students/Director of Health Education; and John Carter, Chief of Campus Police) and the College Council will play important roles in this process, she noted. President Martin noted that the College has engaged an attorney who specializes in Title IX, including cases of sexual assault, and is also working with its regular outside counsel to ensure that Amherst is in full compliance with the requirements of Title IX and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act. There will be a presentation to the Board of Trustees and a set of recommendations offered about this issue during the Board's October meeting, the President noted. Professor Hunt suggested that other institutions in the Five College consortium be consulted about their policies, and noted that in the past some sexual assault cases had followed either from Amherst students visiting other schools or students from other schools visiting Amherst. Professor Harms suggested that, if a review of policies is taking place, it might be useful for the College Council to review the College's policies that address misconduct issues relating to students and faculty, in addition to those relating to students and other students. The President and Dean agreed. President Martin noted that the Board of Trustees has expressed interest in a review of the [College's policy regarding consensual sexual relationships](#) between faculty members and students (*Faculty Handbook*, IV., A., 3. ).

Under "Questions from Committee Members, Professor Harms asked that attention be given to developing ways for faculty in different departments to get to know one another's names and faces better, including faculty who are new to the College. The members asked the Dean to explore whether it would be possible to develop an online system, password-protected, that would enable colleagues to view the photos of the entire faculty. Perhaps, Amherst I.D. photos could be used, and faculty members could opt out of the system if they wished. The Dean said that he would explore such an option and report back to the members. Several members of the Committee of Six recalled that, before the arrival of the Internet, the College had published a photo-directory of faculty, so that this is hardly a new departure.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Rogowski asked about the current status of the Humanities Center initiative. The Dean replied that the Humanities Center Working Group (Professors Epstein, Hewitt, Gewertz, Kimball, Parham, and Sarat, Librarian of the College Bryn Geffert, and himself), which he chairs, has met twice and will soon be touring the library with Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services, and Tom Davies, Assistant Director of Facilities/Director of Design and

Amended September 14, 2012

Construction, to explore the space for the new research center. Dean Call noted that the group's role is to consider, with input from the Faculty, how best to implement the proposal for the center. Current discussions are focusing on 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, and ways to integrate the Copeland Fellows into the center, as well. Professor Hunt asked about the envisioned place of the sciences in the center, stressing the importance of interdisciplinarity and the trend in a number of disciplines toward the blurring of boundaries between the sciences and the humanities. Other members also stressed the importance of taking a broad approach. Dean Call responded that the goal is for the center to take an inclusive approach and that the center's name has not yet been decided, though Professor Basu had offered the suggestion last year of the Center for Humanistic Inquiry and he has been using the moniker, "Hum-Plus" as a placeholder until a formal name is chosen by the Faculty. The Committee encouraged the Dean to seek faculty input at all stages of the process of developing the center, and he said that the working group intends to do so. The group's goal is to prepare a report for the President and the Committee of Six by the end of the semester.

Conversation turned to the ways in which the Committee will work together over the course of the year. The Dean informed the Committee that Assistant Dean Janet Tobin will continue to serve as the Recorder of Committee of Six minutes and that Nancy Ratner, Associate Dean of Admission and Researcher for Academic Projects, will serve as the Recorder of the Faculty Meeting minutes. He reviewed issues of Committee of Six confidentiality and attribution in the minutes, noting that the public minutes should be used as a guide in questions of whether matters discussed by the Committee can be shared with others. Professor Schneider asked if members of the Committee are encouraged to consult with colleagues broadly about issues being considered by the Committee of Six. The members, the President, and the Dean agreed that members are free to do so, and often do, as long as the issue is not a confidential one. The Committee next discussed the circumstances under which it would communicate via email. It was agreed that email would not be used to communicate about personnel or other confidential matters and that, in general, the use of email would be kept to a minimum. The Dean informed the members that there is a secure shared drive that the Committee can use for electronic communication. The Dean next discussed with the members options for a regular meeting time for the Committee of Six, and it was agreed that the Committee would meet at 3:30 P.M. on Mondays, but that the Committee would hold a number of additional times, which would be used, as needed, during the period of tenure discussions. The Dean reviewed with the members a list of possible fall agenda topics for the members, some of which represent issues discussed by last year's Committee that were not resolved. Professor Ratner noted a couple of additional items, and the Dean said he would add them to the list. Three major issues that will occupy the Committee this fall are strategic planning, advising, and diversifying the Faculty. At the next meeting of the Committee, the Dean agreed to report back on the results of last year's faculty hiring. Professor Hunt noted that Assistant Dean Tobin has created a [new faculty hiring web site](#) and encouraged colleagues to make use of it. Professor Ratner said that it would be important for colleagues involved in searches to learn of this site. Assistant Dean Tobin noted that the establishment of the site was noted at the fall department chairs meeting and that a link to it was later sent to the chairs. She agreed to send the link to all Academic Department Coordinators and to ask them to share it with faculty members in their departments.

Amended September 14, 2012

The Committee reviewed a draft Faculty Meeting Agenda for a possible meeting of the Faculty on September 18. It was agreed that the meeting would afford a welcome opportunity for President Martin to make a presentation to the Faculty about the strategic planning effort. After making some revisions to the draft, the members voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward it to the Faculty.

The meeting concluded with a discussion of proposals for the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Summer Stipend Program and approved with great enthusiasm the nomination of two colleagues. The Dean said that he would inform these colleagues of their nomination and would let both colleagues know that the Office of Foundation and Corporate Relations would be available to work with them on their proposals if they wish.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 9, 2012

The second meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 p.m. on Monday, September 17, 2012. Present were Professors Ferguson, Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with President Martin and Dean Call announcing the resignation of an Amherst faculty member who admitted to a serious breach of academic honesty. They discussed with the Committee possible vehicles for communicating with the Faculty as a whole about this matter. The members agreed that there would be no way to constrain discussion of the matter either within or outside the College. Moreover, in light of the fact that the news of the faculty member's resignation seemed likely to reach the student newspaper within a day and was already being aired on social media, they advised that the administration take immediate steps to convey the facts of the case to the Faculty in order to ensure both transparency and fairness. Recognizing the sensitivity of the matter, the potentially divisive effects of uninformed rumor, and the importance for the institution of being open and forthright, the members recommended that the President and the Dean inform the Faculty via email that the faculty member had voluntarily resigned, and the reason for the resignation.

Conversation returned to the development of a strategic planning process. President Martin reviewed with the members a draft of a presentation for the September 18 Faculty Meeting, which she had prepared about the process based on last week's conversation with the Committee of Six, and asked for the Committee's feedback. The members suggested some revisions, focusing first on the make-up of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC) and potential processes for selecting the faculty who will serve on it. The Committee discussed a number of options and considered questions surrounding the balance of representation among constituencies, while recognizing the need to keep the committee from becoming impractically large and unwieldy. It was agreed that the proposed membership of the SPSC should be as follows: five faculty members, one administrator, one staff member, two students, one trustee, and one non-trustee alumnus/alumna. Conversation turned to the most effective method of selecting the faculty representatives and the characteristics that would be desirable to seek in potential members of the SPSC. The members advised selecting colleagues for the committee who are able to think aspirationally and comprehensively, enjoy the respect of the Faculty, and who would not be likely to bring a particular agenda to the task at hand. The Committee agreed that it would propose to the President names of colleagues who meet these criteria. President Martin said that she looks forward to receiving these recommendations and would likely choose the SPSC members from among them.

The Committee next considered the membership of the Working Group on the Financial Model, which is envisioned as including the following individuals: the Interim Treasurer, Dean of the Faculty, Dean of Admission and Financial Aid, Chief Investment Officer, Chief Advancement Officer, Chair of the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) as a faculty liaison, and two members of the Board of Trustees. The role of this group would be to analyze challenges to the current financial model and explore alternatives, review and test the College's current financial assumptions/choices, recommend new revenue sources, inform the planning process as it progresses, and provide the SPSC and CPR with analyses of challenges/opportunities going forward. President Martin asked the members whether they felt it would be important to have additional faculty members as members of this working group. The Committee agreed that, if additional faculty members were added to this group, fewer would be available to participate in other strategic planning working groups, and that the make-up of the Working Group on the Financial Model, as proposed, seems adequate.



Amended October 9, 2012

Continuing with the discussion of the strategic plan, the members agreed that it would be important for Amherst's plan not to succumb to the generic and formulaic content, structures, and language that are characteristic of most, if not all, strategic plans. It will be essential, all agreed, that the document be engagingly written and peculiar to Amherst. Professor Schneider commented that the plan should be as quirky as the College itself. The President, who agreed that the quality of the prose should distinguish the document, suggested that it will be the quality of the ideas that are put forth in the plan that will make it distinct—and evocative of the history and values of the College. At the conclusion of the members' discussion of the planning process, the President thanked the Committee for its feedback and said that she would revise the Faculty Meeting presentation to reflect the members' advice.

Professor Ratner next asked if President Martin intended to update colleagues at the Faculty Meeting about the administration's plans to continue to review and revise the College's practices and procedures to ensure that Amherst continues to provide a safe educational environment, and whether she would also discuss the progress of the searches for the Provost, Chief Financial Officer, and Dean of Students. She responded that she would be happy to do so.

Discussion turned to [the report and recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising](#). Professor Schneider asked what the purpose of the Committee's conversation would be—would the goal be to craft motions to bring to the Faculty, based on the recommendations of the report, for example? Dean Call responded that, to implement some of the recommendations, a vote of the Faculty would be required, as changes to the *Faculty Handbook* would be needed, while a vote would not be required for other recommendations. He suggested that the Committee parse the report with the implementation of the recommendations in mind.

The Committee raised many questions about the approach, underlying arguments, and conclusions of the report. The members were in agreement that they would like to learn more about the Ad Hoc Committee's rationale for proposing such a major overhaul of the advising system at Amherst, and about the benefits for students that might result from doing so. The members expressed the view that it would be productive for the College to consider carefully issues relating to student life and co-curricular education—and the integration of these areas into the advising discussion. The Faculty's role within this broader context should certainly be considered. The Committee agreed that it would be helpful to gain more insight into the report by meeting with the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising. The Dean agreed to convey the Committee of Six's questions to the Ad Hoc Committee and to arrange a meeting between the two groups. The Committee thanked the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising for its hard work, and offered praise for the thoroughness and diligence with which its members examined advising practices at Amherst and peer institutions, as well as their efforts to develop a new plan for advising at the College.

The Committee noted that the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations stem from its support of a model in which “advising is viewed as teaching.” The Ad Hoc Committee has recommended the following: that every student be advised by a single advisor, who is not necessarily a member of the student's major department, and, insofar as it is possible, that each student stay with a single advisor throughout his or her four years at Amherst; the number of advisees per advisor be capped at sixteen; that, in addition to meetings required for course registration, advisors meet for approximately thirty minutes with their assigned advisees at the beginning of each semester and at the end of each semester; that the College designate advising weeks so that faculty and students can schedule their meetings; that, in anticipation of the first meetings each semester, students should prepare a statement of their learning goals and, before their last meeting of the semester, a reflection on their progress in attaining those goals; that advising meetings focus on the articulation of student learning goals and the development of

Amended October 9, 2012

strategies for facilitating progress in the attainment of those goals; that the evaluation of advising should be a component of the processes of reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and all faculty participate in the evaluation of their own advising; that Directors of Studies be available for students to consult about matters pertaining to courses or direction within the major; that the Directors of Studies be responsible for larger numbers of students but in a more restricted fashion; that advising assignments for Directors of Studies take into account the number of majors in the department; that responsibility for overseeing advising rest within the Dean of the Faculty's Office, at an Associate Dean's level, in consultation with an existing committee focused on educational practices, such as the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP); that the model of Orientation advising change from a temporary Orientation advisor to an Orientation Registration Team; that regular advisors meet with their advisees during the first days of the semester, and stay with students as long as possible so that students can have continuity in advising and faculty can have greater equity in advising loads.

Professor Hunt expressed the view that the report's recommendations are counterintuitive. The Ad Hoc Committee on Advising does an excellent job of exploring the problems with the current system, but the solution they propose flies in the face of their own finding, that students actually prefer the advising they get in their majors to the advising they get in the first and second year. She feels that the significant changes to the advising system that are being proposed were not supported by compelling arguments. Other members agreed. Professor Ratner also felt that some of the data presented in the report did not support its recommendations; he noted that the information gathered suggested that students were fairly satisfied with the current advising system, including a large number of students who discussed with their current advisors not only learning goals, but also career paths, graduate school, etc. Professor Rogowski agreed, noting that the data provided in the questionnaire suggest that students and faculty differ dramatically in their views on advising: the report is driven by the notion that advising should involve serious reflection about learning goals within the open liberal arts curriculum; however, "learning goals" ranks only fifth in the list of students' priorities. Moreover, more than 80 percent of the students actually report their overall satisfaction with advising as currently practiced. Perhaps this discrepancy between the perspectives of students and faculty is inevitable and not necessarily a cause for concern. Professor Ratner, who said that he, like the Ad Hoc Committee, sees the value of having students identify learning goals and reflect on their education as part of the advising process, expressed the view that departmental advisors could focus on these areas, without sacrificing major and career advising. In terms of trying to ensure continuity, Professor Ratner noted that leave patterns would make it impossible for many or even most students to have the same advisor during their four years at Amherst; why not make the change—as one likely would be needed—at the time of declaration of a student's major?

Professor Ferguson, like Professor Ratner, suggested that a main objective of the report, despite its broad array of recommendations, seems to be solving the relatively narrow problem of a small number of departments and their faculty being burdened with an inequitable distribution of the responsibilities of advising. In addressing the committee's concern that most of the emphasis of the current advising system is on course selection, Professor Ferguson, said that he often feels ineffective as a College advisor in that role, since he is unfamiliar with many courses outside his own department. Other members agreed. The expanded scope of and attention to advising at other institutions, as reported by the Ad Hoc Committee, seemed laudable but would place extraordinary demands on faculty time and would require expertise that they may not have. Professor Harms disagreed strongly with the proposal that advising become part of the evaluation process for tenure. She also expressed the view that an absence of clarity about

Amended October 9, 2012

advising at the College may affect the Dean of Students search. President Martin noted that, at many other institutions, professional advisors are tasked with some advising roles. On a positive note, Professor Hunt commented that she found the report's proposal that students and advisors write to one another over the summer to be intriguing. She also is supportive of incorporating an emphasis on learning goals into the advising process. Professor Harms noted that having students describe their goals when they arrive, and later asking them how their goals have changed during their time at Amherst, might be a more interesting discussion than focusing on how incoming goals had been met. Professor Ferguson expressed the view that, rather than focusing a conversation on learning goals, he feels that it is more useful to discuss with students how they might traverse the curriculum. He suggested that advising in small groups can be a good approach. Several members wondered why the pilot study on advising, to which the Ad Hoc Committee refers in its report, was not included as part of the documentation.

Continuing with the discussion, Professor Schneider said that, while he sees the benefits of having continuity in the advising relationship, which is an area of emphasis of the report, he believes that students can also benefit from interacting with multiple faculty-advisors during the course of their Amherst careers. He also stressed the importance of allowing advisors to continue to express their personalities as part of the advising process, a quality of the current advising system that might be threatened if the process becomes too mechanical and/or scripted. Departments at Amherst, he commented, have different textures, sizes, and cultures, and it may be difficult to develop a one-size-fits-all approach. President Martin said that it would be interesting to ask faculty how they form the closest relationships with students. She wondered if advising is the best way to build such relationships and what the most effective use of faculty time is in this regard. Professor Schneider also expressed the view that the Director of Studies model could result in a significant duplication of work with that of individual advisors. Professors Harms and Rogowski expressed their concern that the proposals may foster even greater "hand-holding" of advisees, which may not be helpful to students. Professor Rogowski suggested that the more general question arises whether questionnaires (which tend to suggest that what matters is "consumer satisfaction") are the best measure of what intellectual and academic exchange actually happens during the advising process. Professors Harms and Hunt raised the issue of whether or not the open curriculum actually poses particular advising challenges. Professor Ferguson suggested that asking students to read the course catalog and choose a specified number of "cool classes" forms a good basis for an advising conversation.

Professor Hunt asked what was the best way forward. It was agreed that the Dean should convey the Committee's questions to the Ad Hoc Committee. Professor Ratner asked whether and when the CEP would be consulted, especially given the professed notion of advising as a mode of teaching. Professor Ferguson suggested that the problem of advising needs to be considered in a broader context. He would like to see a focus on questions, for example, such as the following: How does orientation provide a frame for a student's experience? What role do faculty play within the larger mesh of advising at the College? In general, he would like to see group structures used and more emphasis placed on peer advising, when it comes to course selection. Professor Rogowski suggested that there seems to be a disconnect between the Ad Hoc Committee's commendable pedagogical aspirations and its more practical considerations. He thought it was odd that the idea that underpins the committee's recommendations, namely that advising should be viewed as a form of teaching, is not addressed in the surveys and questionnaires included in the report. Professor Ferguson noted, generally, that people seem to be happier in a relationship if they declare what they want to get out of it. Satisfaction, in his view, increases if people make a commitment to something that they want. Several members of the Committee noted that, in recent years, there have already been a number of changes to

Amended October 9, 2012

Amherst's advising system. Before making additional changes, it would seem prudent, they suggested, to evaluate the changes that have already taken place.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 5, 2012

The third meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, September 24, 2012. Present were Professors Ferguson, Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with “Announcements from the Dean.” Following up on the Committee’s interest in making a password-protected system available to view photos of the entire Amherst Faculty, Dean Call said that he has learned that, at present, if one is on campus (whether logged in or not to the Amherst website) and types in “professor” in the “title” field of the existing online advanced search engine on the College’s campus directory, a list of all Amherst faculty, with their department(s), is provided. If the directory is accessed when not on campus, photos are not provided unless the user is logged in to the Amherst website. The public cannot access the photos. Professor Harms, who had initiated this discussion earlier, said that, in her view, the directory is an excellent resource for learning colleagues’ names and faces, while noting that she wishes that this resource were more widely known. Professor Harms conjectured that, if more faculty members were aware of this functionality of the directory, many would see it as a tool for fostering greater collegiality—and would feel secure enough with the password protection that the vast majority would not opt out of having their picture in the directory. Professor Hunt stated that, in her opinion, department websites should include photos of all faculty in the department, and she asserted that, at most colleges, the institution takes more pains than Amherst does to make certain that all departments feature the pictures of their faculty on their websites.

After some discussion, the Committee agreed that Gayle Barton, Chief Information Officer, should be consulted to see if it would be possible for faculty I.D. photos to be inserted on departmental faculty listing pages as the default, if a faculty member’s photo does not appear. At present, faculty photos appear on departmental faculty listing pages only if a faculty member has posted a photo on his or her faculty profile page. Currently, faculty members may restrict access to their photos. Photos from the profile pages are the source of the images in the department listings. The members discussed whether the best course might be to contact department chairs to request that faculty post photos on their profile pages, sending along the instructions for doing so, and informing colleagues that the photo would also appear with the person’s name on the department’s faculty listing page. It could be explained that, in the future, if a photo does not appear on a department’s faculty listing page, the faculty member’s I.D. photo would be inserted automatically. Faculty members could later change their photo if they wished. The IT Help Desk and Academic Department Coordinators could provide assistance. Assistant Dean Tobin agreed to contact Ms. Barton and to report back.

Discussion returned briefly to [the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising](#). The members agreed to refine their questions about the document and to share them, along with the minutes of the Committee’s September 17 discussion of the report, with the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising prior to meeting with these colleagues. Professor Harms expressed the view that it could be difficult to frame motions that would make it possible to realize the Ad Hoc committee’s recommendations. The Dean said that he thinks it would be fruitful to have a conversation with the Ad Hoc Committee and to have colleagues present their case, as some of the subtleties of their thinking may not have been conveyed fully in the written report, and a different understanding might emerge. Professor Rogowski said that it would be helpful to know more about the steps by which the Ad Hoc Committee arrived at its conclusions. Professor Ratner stressed the importance of sharing the advising report with the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) before it is deliberated upon by the full Faculty. Dean Call, who agreed,

Amended October 5, 2012

commented that it would be important to learn the views of the CEP and said that he would be in touch with the Ad Hoc Committee to schedule a meeting with the Committee of Six.

President Martin informed the members that she has given a good deal of thought to the responses of some colleagues to the proposed strategic-planning process, as expressed during the Faculty Meeting of September 18. Since the meeting, she has received some additional feedback and proposals. President Martin said that she appreciates and shares the desire to develop a process that will encourage creative, informed thinking, and which will yield a plan that is meaningful, relevant, and representative of Amherst. She will continue to welcome suggestions of approaches and tools that will support this goal. President Martin said that she now envisions four working groups (though there could certainly be more if it is felt that they are needed) that would form the foundation of the planning process, providing information that will inform the broader process for making recommendations and decisions. These groups would have the following foci: student life, pedagogy (and curriculum, perhaps), campus assessment, and the financial model. With the exception of the group focusing upon pedagogy/curriculum and, perhaps, the one focusing upon student life, faculty involvement, at least initially, need not be extensive or burdensome.

The members discussed possible mechanisms and channels for ensuring that the members of the community have ample opportunity to inform the planning process, while limiting the amount of participation that might be required in formalized structures and time-consuming meetings. President Martin said that she is enthusiastic about a proposal that has been made to her by a faculty member that a series of questions about Amherst's future be sent to all Amherst faculty, who would be asked to provide written responses. Each faculty member would write in his/her own style. In this way, groupthink and generic strategic-planning language might be avoided. The purpose of this exercise would be to generate ideas. Professor Rogowski suggested that a planning blog might be another way of gathering the community's thoughts and encouraging dialogue. He noted the importance of involving staff, students, and alumni in the process, in addition to the Faculty. Professor Harms proposed having an intensive one-day retreat for faculty during exam period and suggested that a draft of the plan could be created based on retreat discussions. The Faculty could then be asked to review the draft in the fall. President Martin noted, in a similar vein, that the Senior Staff had discussed the idea of having a series of mini-retreats as a way of generating ideas for the plan. Professor Schneider commented that the President's recent visits to departments would likely be helpful vehicles for informing her about departmental needs. These conversations should inform the plan, and duplication of these efforts should be avoided, he noted. President Martin said that she has learned a great deal from her conversations with departments. She commented that, in the past, she has found that another effective way to gather ideas for planning is to interview a cross-section of faculty (individually and/or in groups) about their research and teaching. If she conducted such interviews and they were videotaped, they could be used for many purposes beyond the plan. For one thing, they could be used to inform wider audiences about the work of the Amherst Faculty.

Continuing the discussion about planning, all agreed that, following the period in which ideas would be solicited, there would be a need for a stage in which ideas would be culled and synthesized. The President, the Dean, and most members agreed that a committee of some sort—smaller, perhaps, than the Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC), as originally conceived—will be needed to guide the planning process and to receive information and ideas from individuals, departments, and working groups. Professors Harms and Hunt stressed that assistant and associate professors should play a major role in the process, pointing out that these colleagues have tremendous energy and familiarity with new directions in their fields and will be

Amended October 5, 2012

the people who will have to live the longest with the results of any strategic plan. It was noted that administrators would also be important sources of vital information about new directions, for example in the area of libraries and information technology.

Professor Schneider reiterated his view that having a committee oversee the planning process could have a deadening effect on the outcome. He commented that the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) put a great deal of time and energy into creating working groups, gathering ideas from all constituencies, etc., but that the plan that resulted from these admirable efforts did not feel authentic. He suggested that President Martin draft a plan and then seek responses from the Faculty. Professor Ratner expressed the view that, despite the hesitations that had been expressed at the Faculty Meeting about moving forward with a phase of comprehensive idea-gathering that would involve a variety of groups and structures, he feels that the Faculty will want to have input and to play a central role in the planning process. Colleagues would not be in favor of a top-down process, he believes. Several members said that it is widely accepted that every president has the right to work with the Faculty and staff to develop a strategic plan. Professor Schneider asked whether one of the purposes of the strategic plan would be to help articulate fundraising priorities. President Martin confirmed that this would be one of the uses for the plan, and Professor Schneider suggested that this information be made more explicit.

The President and the Dean next shared with the members information about conversations that have been ongoing about several models for online courses. President Martin noted that representatives from 2tor had come to campus on September 21 and had met with Dean Call and herself; Jack Cheney, Associate Dean of the Faculty; Gayle Barton, Chief Information Officer, and members of her staff; Shannon Gurek, Interim Treasurer; and members of the CEP and the Faculty Computer Committee. There was also an open meeting for faculty, and thirty-three colleagues attended. Representatives from edX will be on campus on October 3 and will also meet with these individuals and groups and will host an open meeting for faculty.

The President explained that edX is a non-profit organization that was created by MIT and Harvard (later adding Berkeley to the consortium). edX has as its mission providing access to free online courses. No credit is given for these courses. President Martin explained that 2tor is a for-profit organization and offers courses for credit. Students might need to make up a course over the summer and might not live near an institution that would offer the needed course, for example; students might also need to take a particular course while they are studying abroad at an institution that does not offer it, as another example. (It was noted that, last year, the CEP approved the use of online and hybrid courses for transfer and make-up credit, on a very limited basis. The CEP had agreed that the Registrar and Class Deans would have the authority, which they would be asked to employ “sparingly,” to approve the use of online and hybrid make-up courses when “absolutely necessary.” It was agreed that the Registrar would 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 is now required for granting credit for online and hybrid courses as credit for make-up courses.) President Martin noted that institutions that partner with 2tor to offer courses set the policies regarding credit at their own institutions and the ways in which faculty will be compensated for teaching online courses.

There is some urgency about making a decision about whether to join one or both of these organizations, as 2tor is interested in having Amherst become a partner, and edX has invited Amherst, among a small number of leading liberal arts colleges, to become a member of its consortium board. Both organizations would need a commitment from the College relatively soon, if Amherst is to be included in their next announcements of institutions that will be collaborating with them. edX requires a significant financial commitment up front from

Amended October 5, 2012

participating schools, but would invest these funds in the development of Amherst's courses, the Dean noted. 2tor charges tuition and shares profits with its participating institutions and also provides funding to develop courses.

President Martin expressed the view that collaborations that encourage Amherst faculty to experiment with new pedagogical technologies in an online environment could yield innovations in teaching and learning on campus. Since the development of new tools and approaches will occur within these consortia, she sees an advantage in participating in initiatives at this formative stage and in playing a role in shaping and refining them. The President commented that Amherst's relationships to the best research universities have always been helpful, and that the consortia under discussion would provide further opportunities to partner with prestigious institutions of higher learning.

Professor Hunt, who attended the 2tor presentation, thought it was exciting but she was a bit surprised at the company's "gated community" philosophy of online education. Professor Ferguson said that he can see the benefits of offering online introductory courses, in particular, since these courses cover a great deal of information, which can become overwhelming, and often do not afford opportunities for a great deal of discussion. Online versions of such courses could provide students with opportunities to review the content of lectures, and might enhance discussion. Professor Ferguson expressed the view that, if Amherst is to be innovative, it can't suppress new ideas. Professor Rogowski expressed some skepticism about becoming involved in online courses, noting that while the intentions for them may be good, he worries about the outcomes.

Professor Schneider, who attended the 2tor presentation and was disappointed in the substance of the courses that were presented, expressed the view that since online learning has curricular implications, the CEP, the Committee of Six, and the Faculty as a whole should be involved in evaluating partnerships that involve online learning, and the Faculty should be asked to vote on any decisions that are made. President Martin said that, since participation in edX would represent an opportunity for Amherst faculty and would not involve offering credit for online courses to Amherst students, a vote probably would not be required. Professor Ratner said that he had reviewed the *Faculty Handbook* about this very question and had come to the conclusion that a vote of the Faculty would not be required to move forward; the *Faculty Handbook* makes clear the Faculty's authority in the education of Amherst undergraduates, while these online initiatives seem aimed at students elsewhere. Professor Ferguson agreed that a vote should not be required to make technological tools available to the Faculty or to decide whether faculty can teach online courses. He argued that debate could arise if a faculty member proposed a course that would make use of a new online tool, and that the Faculty would then vote as to whether the proposal should go forward. Professor Rogowski said that he fears that experimenting with online courses could lead to a diminishment of existing resources; for example if an organization did not provide sufficient support to mount a course, Amherst's information technology staff—already stretched thin—might be called upon to help with the course, and could become overburdened. Some concern was expressed that tenure-track faculty could be distracted from their scholarship and teaching if they were to become involved in mounting an online course. President Martin said that tenure-track colleagues could be advised to be cautious about participating, and that departments would be expected to provide mentoring in this regard.

The President, the Dean, and most Committee members agreed that edX's mission appears to resonate with Amherst's own more than 2tor's does. This model was seen as presenting fewer complexities than 2tor's, since credit is not offered for the online courses. The fact that the organization is non-profit and is dedicated to providing access to high quality



Amended October 5, 2012

educational experiences on a global scale was also viewed as laudable. Professor Harms expressed support for using online courses as a way to bring an Amherst education to other parts of the world, giving free access to high quality courses. Professor Hunt said she was impressed with some aspects of 2tor's platform but overall found it to be rather unexciting. She felt that the company's painstaking efforts to recreate online what happens in a residential college classroom had ironically limited its reach and creativity. She will be interested to see if edX offers more exciting pedagogical tools, she said. Another member of the Committee pointed out that the 2tor model is most similar to that which is used in a large introductory science course, such as Chemistry 151 and 161 at Amherst, in which there are large lecture meetings and weekly small-group section meetings.

Most Committee members favored the idea of working with institutions of the caliber of MIT, Harvard, and Berkeley in the arena of online course development. It was agreed that the Committee would return to a discussion of online courses after learning more about edX. The members took a vote on the question of whether a decision to join edX would require a vote of the Faculty. The members voted five in favor of a vote not being needed, and one opposed.

The members discussed whether to have a Faculty Meeting on October 2 and reviewed a draft agenda. It was agreed that it would be preferable to have a Faculty Meeting on October 16. Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Schneider said that a colleague was under the impression that Amherst may be considering withdrawing from the New England Small School Athletic Conference (NESCAC). President Martin confirmed that there are no plans to withdraw from the conference. Professor Ratner asked if the President could provide information about what had transpired on September 13, when a rumor had apparently spread among students via social media that a gunman was on campus. President Martin explained that a student had acted erratically during a film screening in Pruyn Lecture Hall, and his classmates seemed to panic, and some called Campus Police, the town of Amherst Police, and the State Police at around 9 P.M. The calls made reference to a gun, but no caller had actually seen one. Campus Police responded and verified that there was no danger after doing an investigation. At 9:45 P.M. an all-school email was sent to alert the community that there was no danger. The student is being evaluated, President Martin commented. Professor Schneider expressed concern about the confusion surrounding the incident. He explained that the Choral Society had been rehearsing and that officials had told the group to remain where it was until given the all-clear. It was a frightening and stressful situation, he has been told. The President noted that, if anyone calls 911, other officials get involved and will follow their protocols, while commenting that every incident is an opportunity to seek improvements in Amherst's preparedness. The goal is to make notification increasingly efficient in the future, she said.

The Dean next provided information to the members about the results of recent faculty hiring and efforts to enhance the diversity of the Faculty. Thirteen tenure-track and tenured (ten assistant professors, two associate professors, and one full professor) colleagues and thirty visitors were hired in 2011-2012. Of the new tenure-track and tenured hires, seven are white (54 percent), one is Hispanic (8 percent), three are Asian (23 percent), and two are Native American (15 percent). Eight of the thirteen are women (62 percent) and five are men (38 percent). Overall, of the forty-three new tenure-track, tenured, and visitor hires, twenty-five are white (58 percent), seven are Asian (16 percent), seven are Hispanic (16 percent), two are African American (5 percent), and two are Native American (5 percent). Four of these colleagues were target-of-opportunity hires. Dean Call noted that the Mellon-Keiter Post-Doctoral positions offer an excellent opportunity for young scholars to experience a liberal arts college environment. These are two-year positions that have a one-one course load. One of these post-docs, a stellar young scholar and teacher, was recommended for a tenure-track

Amended October 5, 2012

position and is included among the thirteen hires above. This colleague will begin her new position in July 2014. This year there are six Mellon-Keiter post-docs. In the future, Dean Call envisions that the Mellon-Keiter post docs will be integrated into the new Humanities Center and that this opportunity will be an excellent recruitment tool. Professor Ferguson expressed some concern that no African-Americans were hired into tenure-track or tenured positions. The Dean explained that there had been excellent African-American candidates in the applicant pools, and that offers had been made to two African-American candidates, one tenured and one untenured. In both cases, the candidates had outstanding competing offers and chose larger Ivy League institutions.

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 10, 2012

The fourth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, October 1, 2012. Present were Professors Ferguson, Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with President Martin informing the members that invitations have been extended to colleagues to serve on the working groups on the Financial Model and Campus Assessment. The President commented that Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services, and she are considering forming a steering group to work with the Working Group on Campus Assessment. Plans also call for forming a group, made up of faculty, to help formulate questions about Amherst's future. The Faculty would be provided with the questions, the responses to which would inform strategic planning.

President Martin next discussed with the members the major themes of the upcoming meetings of the Board of Trustees, explaining that she would share the agenda for these meetings, which are set for October 19-20, with the Committee at its next meeting and would welcome questions. Discussions at the meetings will focus on student life, including issues surrounding Title IX compliance. Attorney Gina Maisto Smith, a partner in the firm of Ballard Spahr who specializes in institutional responses to sexual misconduct and helping clients integrate the requirements of federal, state, and local regulations (including Title IX) with their policies and procedures, will give a presentation to the Board.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call and Assistant Dean Tobin reported back to the Committee about information they had learned from Gayle Barton, Chief Information Officer (CIO). At the members' request, they had asked Ms. Barton whether it would be possible to insert faculty I.D. photos on departmental faculty listing web pages as the default, if a faculty member's photo did not already appear. Ms. Barton confirmed that this could be done. At present, faculty photos appear on departmental faculty listing pages only if a faculty member has posted a photo on his or her faculty profile page. Currently, faculty members may restrict access to their photos. The Dean proposed consulting with the Faculty Computer Committee about how best to move forward with increasing the number of faculty photos on department websites, and the members agreed that doing so would be helpful.

The Dean next reviewed some tenure procedures with the Committee and answered the members' questions. The Committee then set an additional meeting time.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Ratner, on behalf of a colleague, asked the President and the Dean to comment on Standard & Poor's Ratings Services' recent downgrading of the College's bond rating, which Standard & Poor's noted, was based on its concerns about Amherst's debt burden. Noting that Moody's Investors Service opted to retain Amherst's AAA status, President Martin said that Amherst's expected issuance of \$100 million in taxable bonds is what prompted Standard and Poor's to downgrade the rating. She noted that the Board, the Interim Treasurer, the Dean, and she are confident that the College's financial position remains very strong; it was a strategic decision to take advantage of today's very low interest rates as one of the ways to meet the cost of the new science center, the others being internal funds that have been set aside and fundraising. Dean Call noted that taxable debt offers greater flexibility in the use of the borrowed funds than non-taxable debt, and that, presently, there is only a small differential in the interest rates between the two forms. He also pointed out that variable-rate debt is less expensive than fixed-rate debt because of the lower interest rates of the former. President Martin noted that many colleges and universities are taking advantage of the low cost of borrowing funds at this time.

Amended October 10, 2012

Discussion turned to the [Library Committee's proposal](#) that an open-access resolution be brought before the Faculty for discussion and vote. Adopting an open-access policy would provide free and open access to the Amherst Faculty's journal publications. The members agreed that there would be a number of benefits for adopting such a policy. Professor Hunt said that she supports having a faculty conversation about open access, while noting that there are complexities involved. She commented on fears that publishers might raise subscription fees if the College were to adopt an open-access policy. The members agreed that it would be important to provide the Faculty with clear language about what open access would mean in order to have informed discussions. Professor Ratner, who noted that he had participated in conversations about open access as a member of the Library Committee in the past, commented that 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. This is a significant incentive for adopting the policy, he noted. In terms of implementing an open-access policy, he has been told that resources within the library would make doing so possible and would not pose an excessive burden on staff. It has been pointed out that some publishers will not permit authors to retain copyrights. Professor Rogowski expressed concern about the possibility of journals refusing to publish a faculty member's work if it were to be made available via the College's open access policy, particularly if the journal typically retains the copyright for the articles it publishes. Dean Call noted that the faculty member would be permitted to opt out of the open-access policy under such circumstances. 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. On the other hand, he noted that adopting an open-access policy could have a negative effect on academic societies, which often publish journals and rely on the income generated by journal subscriptions. Professor Harms, who expressed indignation over the predatory practices of academic publishing and feels that the current financial model is unsustainable, said that she would support an open-access policy, as long as tenure-track faculty would not face barriers to publishing their work as a result. Professor Hunt commented that she worries about the future of non-profit journals. Professor Harms noted that, since journals provide the avenue for peer review of scholarly work, a critical function, taking a hard line with journals may be challenging. Ideally, she would support a resolution that would express that faculty would not review for or publish in for-profit journals, as she suspects that adopting an open-access policy will not have a significant effect on the way for-profit journals do business. Professor Hunt said that she would view the adoption of an open-access policy as "a shot across the bow" and would hope that this move would have some effect on the journals at which it is directed. She expressed the view that having an open-access policy 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. Providing such access would be consistent with Amherst's core educational mission. Noting that he found some of the wording of the proposal confusing, Professor Schneider expressed the view that it would be helpful to have Bryn Geffert, Librarian of the College, walk the Faculty through the document with special attention to its legal implications. The members agreed that Mr. Geffert and the Library Committee should be asked to make a presentation about open access and to answer questions at the next Faculty Meeting. More conversations about this topic could follow in other formats, for example, open meetings. Ultimately a resolution could be brought before the Faculty for a vote. The members then reviewed a draft agenda for an October

Amended October 10, 2012

16 Faculty Meeting, including the discussion of open access, and voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the agenda to the Faculty.

The members then had a brief discussion about whether or not to identify members when recording Committee of Six votes. Professor Hunt argued for the transparency that doing so would provide and felt that taking this step would make it possible for colleagues to learn more about the members' rationale for voting a particular way. After some discussion, the other members expressed a preference for not attaching names to votes, and by so doing, individualizing opinions and views. They felt it best to work as a committee and not to reduce the Committee's judgments to a collection of individual views/representations. The members then voted five in favor and one opposed to identifying members of the Committee when votes are taken.

At 5:20 P.M. Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel, joined the meeting. Each fall, Mr. Murphy is invited to speak with the Committee of Six prior to personnel discussions to provide general legal advice related to the tenure and reappointment processes. At the conclusion of the discussion and a period during which the members asked questions, the Committee thanked Mr. Murphy, and he left the meeting at 5:40 P.M.

In the time remaining, the members discussed tenure procedures for senior hires. Discussion focused on the make-up and role of the ad hoc committee, and the challenges presented by the timing of the consideration of such tenure cases, which results in the need to gather evidence and make decisions within a highly compressed timeframe. Dean Call noted that tenure cases are assembled once a candidate has accepted an appointment at the College, contingent upon a tenure review. Since searches typically result in the recommendations of final candidates in the spring, the schedule for assembling these cases, including identifying outside reviewers and securing their letters, is very tight, as is the schedule under which the Committee of Six, the President, and the Dean must review evidence of scholarship, teaching, and service. Some members noted that some faculty who have participated in this process as members of a searching department or ad hoc committee have found it problematic and/or confusing. In particular, colleagues have been unsure of the role of the ad hoc committee. Dean Call explained that the ad hoc committee serves as an additional layer of review as part of this very important hiring and tenuring decision at the senior level. He pointed out that the appointment of an ad hoc committee is a requirement for all appointments at the rank of Professor or Associate Professor with tenure, as noted in the [\*Faculty Handbook \(III., A.\)\*](#). The Committee suggested that the process could benefit from some additional review and possible changes. The members noted that reducing the amount of departmental representation on ad hoc committees could be desirable in order to create more separation and objectivity at this layer of review. Rather than having two department members and two colleagues in related fields from other departments, which is the present structure, the members wondered whether there should be one department member and three members of other departments or three members from related fields and an ex officio (non-voting) member of the department. It was also suggested that, perhaps, FTE authorizations and hiring decisions could be made earlier, so that the tenure process could begin earlier. Some members wondered whether departments should begin gathering the scholarly work and other materials of candidates at the finalist stage, in order to get a head start on building tenure dossiers. Another idea that might be considered is videotaping all job talks so that ad hoc committees could review them as one form of evidence of teaching, as teaching evaluations for senior hires are not always available. The Committee asked the Dean to consider these questions and to review the procedures for senior hires, with the aim of improving the process. He agreed to do so and to bring his recommendations to the members and the President.

Amended October 10, 2012

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended October 26, 2012

The fifth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, October 15, 2012. Present were Professors Ferguson, Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with President Martin discussing with the members the agenda for the upcoming meetings of the Board of Trustees, which will be held October 19-20. Discussions at the meetings will focus on student life, including broad discussions about how this area might be conceptualized going forward and issues surrounding Title IX compliance, among them procedures for addressing incidents of sexual misconduct; online learning; and strategic planning, in addition to the Board's regular business. President Martin said that she would summarize the Trustees' discussions for the members at the Committee's next meeting.

Continuing with her announcements, the President informed the Committee that the October 14 meeting that she had organized for students on the topic of sexual misconduct and respect on campus, which was also attended by some members of the Faculty and administration, had been productive and informative. Students had expressed a number of concerns and had highlighted important issues, and a series of action steps had emerged from the conversation. President Martin said that she will work with colleagues to meet commitments that were made to students and to continue the discussions that had begun at the meeting.

The President and the Dean next summarized the present state of conversations, which are ongoing, with edX and 2tor, and about online learning, more generally. They stressed that the College is still in the information-gathering stage in regard to both groups, and that any agreements being contemplated relating to joining these consortia, at this point, would be non-binding. Members of the Committee expressed the view that, before making any firm commitments, it would be informative to obtain a sense of the Faculty—even if faculty votes are not required. President Martin and Dean Call agreed that it would be helpful to gauge faculty opinion. At this early stage, it is not yet clear which steps in the decision-making process would require formal votes, they noted. President Martin suggested that a vote may or may not be required to authorize the College to join either consortium for the purpose of taking part in further planning. However, a faculty vote would clearly be needed, for example, if the College were to offer Amherst students credit for courses taken online. The process for making decisions should become clearer, all agreed, as more is learned about developing and mounting courses with edX and/or 2tor and the relationships that might develop with either group. Professor Ratner asked about plans for the Board's discussion of these issues. Dean Call responded that he had prepared for the Instruction Committee of the Board materials about edX and 2tor, timelines for decision-making about the two consortia, and a summary of campus conversations in recent weeks. The Instruction Committee plans to focus its discussions on online learning and will report on its conversations to the full Board on October 20. President Martin said that she would be happy to share with the Committee the materials that have been prepared for the Board.

Continuing the discussion about online learning, Professor Harms expressed the view that some faculty members might feel that a decision to join any online efforts that would result in Amherst granting credit to students—Amherst students or others—would require a vote of the Faculty. Even if it is argued that there may be some ambiguity about whether such a decision is within the purview of the Faculty, it would be wise to provide the Faculty with an opportunity to vet such a decision. As a point of information, Dean Call commented that, as part of the Inside-Out Prison Exchange Program, in which Amherst participates, Amherst faculty offer classes at the Hampshire County Jail and House of Corrections to both Amherst students and inmates. The College issues a transcript to the inmates, though credit cannot be used toward an Amherst

Amended October 26, 2012

degree. This credit may be accepted by other academic institutions in which a student enrolls. The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) reviews Inside-Out courses, the Dean added. Professor Hunt asked if there is a possibility that the College would join both edX and 2tor. The Dean and the President said that doing so is under consideration, as these models offer very different opportunities for experimentation and learning. The President and the Dean are examining potential agreements to determine if they include any parameters that might prevent the College from joining multiple consortia. Professor Ferguson expressed the view that it might be most helpful, before any decisions are needed about experimenting with online learning, to discuss guiding principles with the Faculty—for example, issues surrounding jurisdiction—rather than to focus on specifics. Dean Call noted that, because the agreements being contemplated are not binding, there will be ample opportunity for conversation with the Faculty before any commitments are made. The members who had voted that a vote of the Faculty would not be needed to join edX agreed that they had come to this conclusion because joining edX does not appear to have curricular implications. If other decisions involving online learning have a curricular impact, then a vote of the Faculty would be needed, they agreed. Gaining a sense of the Faculty's views about different opportunities for online learning would be valuable, even in this early stage, it was noted.

Discussion turned briefly to the Faculty Meeting set for October 16 at 7:00 P.M. (thirty minutes earlier than is typical). It had been agreed that the meeting would end by 9:00 P.M. because the presidential debate would begin at that time. Professor Rogowski wondered if it might be advisable to move to a 7:00 P.M. start time for all Faculty Meetings. The members agreed that it would be worthwhile to consider, but suggested that feedback should be gathered after the October 16 meeting to see if colleagues preferred the earlier time.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call discussed a committee assignment with the members.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Schneider, who had attended the October 14 meeting for students mentioned earlier in these minutes, offered praise to the President for taking a leadership role in addressing sexual misconduct and respect on campus. He asked the President if she would speak further about the meeting. President Martin said that she would be pleased to do so. She noted that she had called the meeting in response to specific incidents of misconduct and lack of respect on campus, to discuss student complaints about the College's procedures for addressing incidents of sexual misconduct, and to explore the role played by the campus climate in these matters. President Martin said that it is her impression that many students appear to be unaware of the changes to procedures that the College has made of late to address sexual misconduct on campus, the continuing review of these procedures, or the attention that is being given to Title IX compliance, another factor that led her to organize the conversation. The President's goal was to increase understanding and to hear concerns. Attendance at the meeting was estimated to be between 150 and 200 people, about 65 percent of whom were women and 35 percent men.

As noted earlier, the discussions that took place at the meeting, and other feedback that she has received, led President Martin to make a number of commitments. At the conclusion of the meeting, it was agreed that one or more student representatives would be added to the Title IX Committee; the treatment of repeat offenders under the College's policies and procedures would be examined; within the next month, a Working Group on Student Life would be formed as part of the strategic planning process, would include one or more students, and would review the status of fraternities; students would be invited to participate in discussions with the Working Group on Student Life; there would be more communication regarding peer advocates as an available resource; there would be a review of the current alcohol policy; efforts would be made



Amended October 26, 2012

to enhance communications between the administration and the student body about the review of procedures that are being developed to address incidents of sexual misconduct; efforts would be made to offer faculty members broader reminders about the use of sensitive materials in class and to make faculty more aware of the experiences of survivors of sexual violence; and staffing at the College in areas relating to respect for persons would be expanded by appointing faculty and additional staff to visible leadership positions in this area.

Continuing with her overview of the meeting, President Martin noted that conversations that focused on issues relating to alcohol policies and the future of fraternities became somewhat conflated with issues of respect for persons. She commented that these areas are, however, intertwined, citing data that indicate an overlap of 80 to 90 percent between sexual assaults and excessive drinking. President Martin said that she is not comfortable with the current ambiguous status of fraternities at Amherst, since they are not permitted to operate on campus as a matter of policy, but apparently have been hosting parties nevertheless. She said that she intends to speak with the leadership of fraternities. The Committee agreed that fraternities may have a negative influence on student life and that their ambiguous status at the College contributes to challenges in constraining their behavior. Professor Rogowski agreed that the “secret” underground nature of fraternities, at present, makes it impossible for the College to have interlocutors with whom the administration can address concerns. Professor Ferguson wondered whether allowing fraternities on campus might give the College greater oversight over them. Similarly, he wondered whether the current policy of not allowing drinking in public might be forcing drinking underground, leading to increasing incidents of sexual misconduct. President Martin said others have put forth this theory, as well. Professors Harms and Ratner suggested that, at the least, the current policy—that fraternities not be allowed to operate on campus, including having social events on campus—should be enforced. President Martin agreed and reiterated that she is not comfortable with the current ambiguous status of fraternities and plans to explore this issue as part of the strategic-planning process. The remainder of 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 November 9, 2012

The sixth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin at the President's house at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, October 22, 2012. Present were Professors Ferguson, Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, Gina Maisto Smith (an attorney and expert in the area of institutional responses to sexual misconduct and sexual assault), and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

It had been agreed, prior to the meeting, that the Committee would suspend its regular agenda and focus its discussions on the issue of sexual misconduct and sexual assault on campus, and the steps that the College has, and is, taking to address these issues. Ms. Smith, who has been acting as a consultant to the College since the summer, was invited to speak with the Committee about Title IX and sexual misconduct law, policies, and practices and the challenges that Amherst faces in this area. President Martin said that, as a result of the College's commitment to putting policies, procedures, and practices in place that will ensure change, adhering to the highest standard in doing so, it is her hope that Amherst will emerge from this difficult period as a model of how institutions of higher learning address these very difficult and important issues.

President Martin discussed with the members the events that had transpired in the aftermath of the first-person account of rape that was published in the *Amherst Student* on October 17, 2012. Most recently, over the past weekend, the Board of Trustees had had conversations about sexual misconduct and violence on campus with the President and ten students—a subset of a larger group of students that had marched in solidarity from the campus to the Lord Jeffery Inn, where the Trustees were meeting. The President had issued [a public statement](#) on October 18, and the Board had issued [a public statement](#) at the conclusion of its meetings. President Martin expressed her admiration for the students for taking the initiative to meet with the Trustees, and for the care and thought that they had given to the series of demands that they had brought to the Board. She summarized these demands for the members and said that she would also do so at the informal meeting that she had called for the Faculty for the next day. The members agreed that informing the Faculty would be welcome and helpful.

President Martin said that, at their meeting with the Board, the students had requested the following:

1. faculty training on treatment of:
  - traumatic/potentially triggering material notification
  - proper and appropriate conduct with students
  - treatment of students going through the disciplinary process
2. that sexual assault cases be out of the purview of the Committee on Discipline;  
that students and faculty be eliminated from decisions on sexual assault cases
3. that two trained sexual assault counselors be hired for the College
4. that the Women's Center be moved to a more central and accessible campus location  
that a qualified Women's Center supervisor be hired to ensure that the center becomes a resource for the campus

Amended November 9, 2012

5. that consideration be given to the resources (see below) that are available for the treatment of survivors and how they function
  - a. Counseling Center  
Review and education of administrators who deal with survivors and consultants in dialogue with students/survivors
  - b. Peer Advocates
6. that race, sexual respect, and gender issues be incorporated into the first-year educational experience
7. that there be a discussion of the unintended effects of the alcohol policy—binge drinking, beer pong, sense of community, etc.

President Martin noted that, in addition to having the meeting for the Faculty, meetings had been scheduled for staff and students (one meeting for first-year students, with whom the President had already been scheduled to have conversations in their dorms, as is traditional, and another meeting with the remainder of the student body), and that Ms. Smith would be providing information and answering questions at those gatherings as well.

Continuing, President Martin explained that, early in her tenure at Amherst, she had identified challenges in the area of student life as an area of focus. Over the summer, she had brought three consultants to the College (Ms. Smith; Lori Berquam, the Dean of Students at the University of Wisconsin, Madison; and Stephanie Pinder-Amaker of McLean Hospital) to evaluate systems, structures, and procedures within student life. Their review confirmed President Martin's own sense that significant changes were needed, and prompted the President to decide that a working group on student life would be one of four working groups that would inform the strategic planning process. President Martin noted that, though the foundation had been laid for bringing the College into compliance with Title IX, and it had been recognized as an area that would be addressed as soon as possible, the current crisis has produced an even greater sense of urgency to accomplish this goal and other issues central to campus culture and student life, more generally.

Since the publication of the *Amherst Student* piece, the President said that she has been very concerned about the stress that is being placed on students, particularly those for whom the descriptions of sexual assault may have triggered post-traumatic reactions stemming from their own experiences as survivors of such violence. President Martin said that she has already taken steps to bring experts in sexual assault to campus to meet with students, as well as faculty and staff. She commented that it is important to have specialists in this area on campus. It is her hope to have them here as soon as possible to help meet the need of students who need help and to hire permanent counselors in the future. President Martin informed the members that she has heard that some students and members of the community have a lack of confidence in the Counseling Center and the Dean of Students office. She emphasized that, while the operations and systems of these entities will be reviewed further and improvements will be made, it is important that students who need services now pursue them through these and other vehicles, particularly at this time, and that trust be rebuilt. In addition, President Martin said that she has been told that students may benefit from a reduced workload or exam schedule at this time to reduce stress; taking such steps is, of course, up to individual faculty, she commented. Students seemed to enjoy the fall festival that she had organized for them on Sunday, which had been planned for some time. It appeared to be a welcome diversion and change of tone on campus,

Amended November 9, 2012

and students said that they greatly appreciated it. President Martin said that she would like to encourage more enjoyable events of this kind for students in the future.

Professor Harms asked about the scale of Amherst's problems in the area of sexual misconduct and violence relative to other campuses. President Martin said that the answer is difficult to know, as the issue of sexual misconduct and assault is often kept out of the public eye. Is there residue of Amherst's culture of male privilege, and does this legacy contribute to the current culture? Perhaps, President Martin said, adding that it is hard to judge. While many campuses experience problems with sexual assault and misconduct, there are structures and procedures that can be put in place to address the causes of these problems, to try to prevent incidents of sexual misconduct and violence, and to address incidents effectively and fairly when they occur. President Martin said that she will soon form a special committee, composed of faculty, students, and staff, to consider recommendations from the Amherst community and outside experts on how best to move forward. The committee will report to the Board of Trustees in January. The Committee said that it would be valuable for the community to learn about specific changes from the President, as they are being made. President Martin informed the members that Suzanne Coffey, Director of Athletics and Title IX Coordinator, and Gayle Barton, Chief Information Officer, are creating (it has since been posted) a [sexual respect and Title IX website](#), which will provide a centralized home for Amherst's policies and procedures in this area. These procedures had previously been presented on thirty-one different locations (web pages and pamphlets) and had not been consistent, she noted. Action steps will be listed and tracked on the site, as well. There will also be a vehicle for submitting suggestions for improvements. (See the [list of actions taken concerning sexual respect and those that are planned on the new Sexual Respect and Title IX website](#).)

Continuing the conversation, Ms. Smith noted that many colleges and universities are now reexamining their policies and procedures in regard to sexual misconduct and assault, and Amherst is not alone in its experience with sexual assault and misconduct on campus. She stressed the importance of having institutions and individuals integrate what she called a three-dimensional labyrinth—developing clear understandings of the law, including the compliance measures that must be in place if an institution receives federal funds; the dynamics of sexual misconduct; and practical applications, which incorporate the values of the institution, and are related to systems, personnel, and resources. Professor Ferguson asked whether incidents of sexual misconduct and assault have increased on college campuses in recent decades. Ms. Smith responded that this behavior is a problem on a national scale that affects people of college age in significant numbers, whether they are college students or not. The number of people affected has not increased, but what has changed is the understanding of the problem and the willingness to talk about it, she said. Continuing, Ms. Smith said that most sexual assaults involving young people are categorized as “non-stranger sexual assaults,” that is the people involved know each other, and typically involve drugs and/or alcohol and a “perfect storm” of other contributing factors (often young people are away from their parents for the first time, are becoming part of new peer groups, are in an environment where there is a lot of partying going on). Many cases involve “word-against-word” situations, which are not black and white, and often would not be adjudicated outside an institutional setting. District attorneys' offices, in Ms. Smith's experience, may judge that there is insufficient evidence to win such cases. Survivors, unfortunately, are left to suffer without justice, in that event. Colleges and universities, because of Title IX, have become de facto courts, she commented.

Some members expressed concern, based on their own experience with students, with the institutional structures that are in place for meeting the needs of students who are facing serious emotional and/or mental health challenges. Other members said that, in their experience, while

Amended November 9, 2012

the Dean of Students office and the Counseling Center have long been starved for resources, the staff are highly professional, and most students have been well served. The Faculty need have no hesitation about referring students there. Nevertheless, all agreed that enhancing resources and examining and improving structures in the area of student life are necessary. President Martin stressed the need for the Counseling Center to expand its hours into evenings and weekends and to provide outreach and educational programming, in addition to individual counseling. Improving case management and strengthening critical management teams will also be an important area of emphasis. Changes in these areas have already started, she noted. Hiring counselors with expertise in sexual assault and misconduct should and will be among the highest priorities in the near term, President Martin said. Professors Harms and Hunt expressed the view that, if sufficient resources were in place, it would be ideal if the Dean of Students office would be able to place most of its emphasis on enriching student life and the general well-being and college experience of most Amherst students, rather than devoting so much time to addressing serious crises. By reconsidering mission, programming, and structures and providing additional training and resources—reimagining the student life area at the College—it is hoped that the Dean of Students Office could return to what is seen by many to be its primary mission, several members agreed. Professor Harms stressed the importance of creating a campus climate in which sexual assault and misconduct would be much less likely, in addition to addressing incidents effectively when they occur. President Martin said that the College is committed to taking such an approach.

Professor Ferguson offered praise for the steps that have been taken already and those that are anticipated. It appears that it will be possible to have real change as a result, he said. Getting through the present problems presents one of the biggest challenges, he imagines. Professor Rogowski said that there is a perception among some at Amherst that there is a culture of silence, and that incidents of sexual misconduct and assault have often been swept under the rug. He stressed the importance of addressing this perception, encouraging the administration to signal a genuine effort to redefine the culture of the College as a whole. President Martin agreed, but noted that her first priority is addressing the immediate challenge of serving the needs of the significant number of students who need help. She stressed that members of the community who are survivors of sexual violence are experiencing a heightened sense of vulnerability.

Professor Schneider asked what the role of faculty should be in the immediate moment. He suggested focusing on the practical. How, for example, should a faculty member respond to a student who shares information about a sexual assault? (Please refer to [sexual respect and Title IX website](#) for answers to this and related questions.) President Martin said that the upcoming meeting for faculty would provide an opportunity to offer information and engage in conversation. She said that she would begin the discussion by sharing information to bring Faculty members up to date, as she had done with the Committee. Ms. Smith would then lead a brief discussion, which would include an introduction, during which she would offer information about her background and current role; a conversation about Title IX, the dynamics of sexual misconduct, and the implementation of campus values, culture and personnel; and an open discussion with the Faculty regarding concerns associated with the practical application of law and policy to faculty members. Ms. Smith reviewed with the members the Faculty's responsibilities under Title IX, the definitions and standards of which apply to staff at the College, as well. She noted that she has been and will continue to work to bring the College's policies and procedures into compliance with Title IX. Training and educating members of the Amherst community about their responsibilities should be ongoing, she noted. The Committee recommended that the President spend part of the meeting reviewing the steps that have been

Amended November 9, 2012

taken over the summer and most recently to address sexual misconduct and violence on campus and to provide support for members of the Amherst community. She agreed to do so.

Professor Rogowski commented that some colleagues have expressed some discomfort to him about the meeting proposed for Tuesday, October, 23, arguing that there should be a proper Faculty Meeting convened instead, because they were concerned that the Tuesday night gathering would be a briefing from above, rather than a space in which the Faculty could deliberate and convey individual responses to the crisis and have an opportunity for dialogue. President Martin said that she envisions the meeting as the latter. Professors Schneider and Rogowski commented that they and a small group of colleagues have been drafting a statement from the Faculty as an expression of support for students. The group intends to circulate the statement and to ask other colleagues if they wish to be signatories as well. Plans call for sending the statement to the *Amherst Student* for publication. Professor Schneider commented that, prior to the unfolding of recent events, he would never have imagined that it would be part of the role of the Faculty to engage in policy questions surrounding sexual misconduct and assault, but he now recognizes that these issues threaten trust and respect within the community and interfere with teaching, the core of what the Faculty does and the central mission of the College.

President Martin said that she feels that a statement from the Faculty would be welcomed by students and the broader community. Any effort that will demonstrate that the College is pulling together on students' behalf, and that will reassure them, will support the healing process. The Committee then thanked the President for her leadership and transparency, and the Board for its support, and expressed confidence in the efforts that are being made to address sexual misconduct and assault on campus. The Committee also thanked Ms. Smith for attending the meeting and for her work on the College's behalf.

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended November 12, 2012

The seventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by Dean Call in his office at 5:45 P.M. on Wednesday, October 24, 2012. Present were Professors Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Ferguson participated via speaker phone. President Martin was absent. The Dean thanked the members for agreeing to meet on short notice and said that he expected that the meeting would be relatively brief. He informed the members that President Martin had a previously scheduled obligation and had asked him to express her regret that she could not attend the meeting.

Continuing, Dean Call explained that President Martin had received a number of requests, principally from students and the Dean of Students Office, for the College to cancel classes for a day. Students are feeling under stress, and it could be helpful for them to have some time and space for dialogue and reflection, during this challenging time. The Dean said that programming would be put in place if classes were canceled. Opportunities for small group conversations and a larger discussion, perhaps led by faculty and experts in addressing sexual assault and misconduct, could be offered, for example. Before moving ahead with any plans, the Dean said that the President and he wanted to get the advice of the Committee of Six.

Dean Call said that, at first, he had thought that Friday, October 26, might be a possible day for canceling classes. However, that Friday is the start of Family Weekend, and some parents are expecting to attend their son's or daughter's classes. In addition, he noted, students who have their families on campus this weekend will likely receive additional support from them. Monday or Tuesday might be better options, he explained. Professor Schneider said that canceling classes would not be his inclination. Based on what he has seen in his classes, he feels that most students are taking solace in being in class. In his view, having classes go on as usual, while encouraging faculty to be sensitive to the needs of individual students who are experiencing significant stress, would be the best approach. Canceling classes might have the effect of prolonging the sense of crisis on campus. However, if President Martin, who has been at the center of the current crisis, feels that canceling classes would be important, Professor Schneider said he would support taking this unusual action. Professor Hunt agreed, commenting that it would not be her preference to cancel classes, while acknowledging that some students are experiencing significant stress. She expressed the view that, if classes were to be canceled, students should not be required to participate in any programming that is developed. Professor Hunt said that she also would not oppose canceling classes if President Martin wishes to do so.

Professor Harms expressed great concern and said that she would be opposed to canceling classes. In her view, additional stress would be created for students, and for faculty, if the academic schedule were to be disrupted. She feels strongly that she can be most helpful to her students, whom she knows well, in the context of interactions that she has with them in class or lab. Canceling classes, in her view, would elevate and prolong the sense that there is a crisis on campus. Professor Ratner asked if there is a sense of how many students are experiencing significant distress. Dean Call said that it is hard to judge, but noted that the Dean of Students Office has reported seeing triple the number of students in distress than is typical. Professor Ratner expressed the view that, while some students, particularly those who are survivors of sexual assault and misconduct, are clearly in great distress, other students, while deeply troubled by what has been going on, are able to function as they normally would. The latter group would probably prefer classes to continue as usual. He, like Professor Harms, expressed concern about disrupting the academic schedule and agreed with the sentiment of the Committee that faculty should be sensitive to the needs of students in distress and accommodate their requests for extensions and other academic adjustments. Professor Rogowski wondered whether the Dean of

Amended November 12, 2012

Students Office, which perhaps has been overwhelmed, as well as the students, would benefit from the break that would occur if classes were canceled.

Continuing with the conversation, Professor Ferguson expressed support for the idea of canceling classes. Since Amherst very rarely does so, taking this step would signal that something so significant has happened that it has become important to set a marker to convey the shift of culture that will now occur. Professor Hunt noted that, if classes were to be canceled in the very near term, there would be little time for planning programming. She also wonders whether the current atmosphere of crisis is the best moment to encourage in-depth reflection. Perhaps, waiting until spring to cancel classes, and organizing programming that focuses more on the larger implications for campus culture of what has transpired, rather than on crisis intervention, would be the best option. Professor Schneider agreed, while Professor Ratner suggested that a date later in the present semester might be preferable to waiting until spring.

At the conclusion of the conversation, Dean Call said that it was his sense that the majority of members were not in favor of canceling classes at this time. Some members would be supportive of doing so in the spring, so that there would be more time to prepare programming, which could be focused on student life and culture. Professor Harms stressed that the steps that have been taken by the Board of Trustees and the President since the summer in the areas of sexual misconduct and assault have set the type of marker that Professor Ferguson described. The members agreed that, if the President feels that it is important to cancel classes, and to do so soon, the Committee would support her decision.

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty



**Amended November 29, 2012**

The eighth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in Dean Call's office at 2:00 P.M. on Wednesday, November 7, 2012. Present were Professors Ferguson, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Harms participated via speaker phone.

The meeting began with President Martin offering highlights of the fall meetings of the Board of Trustees, which had been held October 19 and 20. The President informed the Committee that the Trustees had discussed potential explorations into online learning and principles that might guide Amherst's decisions in this domain. Dean Call, Associate Dean Cheney, and Gayle Barton, Chief Information Officer, had provided information about the different models for online learning that have been proposed by 2tor and edX. The Board had expressed support for the College moving forward with experimentation in the domain of online learning. Professor Ratner asked if a decision had been made about whether to make a commitment to 2tor and/or edX. Dean Call responded that the College has decided not to move forward with 2tor at this time. The company's requirement that its institutional partners offer credit for online courses would require further conversation, and faculty approval, before any commitment could be made, Dean Call said. He is under the impression that the other liberal arts colleges that had expressed interest in 2tor initially also have concerns and are not joining this effort at this time.

Continuing, Dean Call said that there is a good deal of excitement about Amherst making a commitment to edX. Trustee and faculty conversations raised two concerns, and he and Associate Dean Cheney are currently working with edX to address these questions. The first concern revolves around the time needed to develop criteria for the certificates that would be awarded for Amherst edX courses. The leaders of edX have assured him that Amherst would have the time that the College needs to develop the criteria it wishes to use for awarding AmherstX certificates, and a clear sense of what these certificates would mean. The second issue that must be negotiated is whether joining edX will preclude the College from joining other online consortia in the future. Dean Call reported that discussions with edX around these topics have been productive thus far.

The members next discussed the possibility of having a presentation about edX as part of a Faculty Meeting on December 4. The Committee agreed that providing more information to the Faculty about edX would be helpful and that, perhaps, the Faculty could be asked to vote on joining edX at a subsequent Faculty Meeting. Professor Harms suggested that it would be informative to have representatives from edX attend the Faculty Meeting and speak to edX's potential to transform access to education on a global scale. She also thought it would be a good idea to have faculty look at a non-science course, perhaps the Chinese history course that edX has apparently developed. Professor Hunt agreed that this would be an effective approach and also suggested that the Committee of Six propose some criteria for the certificates, as a starting point for discussion. President Martin suggested that it would be informative, and make for a less generalized presentation, to have Amherst faculty who are using online tools as part of their pedagogy, and are particularly interested in online learning, and/or a colleague at another institution who is working with edX on mounting a course, participate in the presentation. The Committee agreed that this approach would be helpful for decision making.

Professor Ferguson suggested that, beyond the Faculty Meeting, it would be beneficial to offer an ongoing seminar for faculty on the subject of online learning, so faculty could learn more about this area. He stressed the need to develop ways to make an argument for the "smart use" of technology—that is online learning in combination with the residential model of a liberal arts education. The argument would be that these technological tools are most effective when paired with a real professor teaching a real class, i.e., to enhance what is being done on campus.

**Amended November 29, 2012**

Dean Call agreed, while noting the additional benefit of expanding access to Amherst's educational model. Professor Rogowski expressed the view that the Faculty would welcome having written materials about edX in advance of the Faculty Meeting.

Continuing with her summary of the Board's discussions, President Martin said that the meetings had otherwise focused largely on issues surrounding student life. Professor Ferguson asked whether the Board had had the opportunity to discuss student life at the College in broad terms, given the sense of urgency around addressing issues surrounding sexual misconduct and assault. President Martin said that the Trustees had focused on issues of sexual assault, but had also discussed a full range of issues relating to student life, more broadly conceived. The President said that she had summarized for the Board the findings of the three consultants (Gina Maisto Smith, an attorney and expert in the area of institutional responses to sexual misconduct and sexual assault; Lori Berquam, the Dean of Students at the University of Wisconsin, Madison; and Stephanie Pinder-Amaker of McLean Hospital), whom she had brought to the College this summer to evaluate systems, structures, and procedures within student life. As she had informed the Committee earlier, this review had confirmed President Martin's own sense that significant changes are needed. She reported that there was uniformity of opinion among the consultants about the need to improve systems and structures in the area of student life. On Friday, the Trustees had had conversations about sexual misconduct and violence on campus with the President and ten Amherst students—a subset of a larger group of students that had marched in solidarity from the campus to the Lord Jeffery Inn, where the Trustees had been meeting. President Martin commented that the students had been measured and thoughtful in their conversations with the Board. Ms. Smith had given a presentation to the Board about sexual assault and Title IX policy and had also reported on her investigations of individual cases of sexual assault at the College. Professor Schneider asked if there are plans in place to provide additional staffing, in the near as well as the long term, for the Dean of Students Office, which seems overburdened. Dean Call noted that, in recognition of the present need, Paul Sorrentino, Director of Religious Life, has agreed to spend a large majority of his time in the near term assisting with case management in the Dean of Students Office. His responsibilities in the realm of coordinating religious life have been redistributed among the other religious advisors for the time being. President Martin said that restructuring and new systems will be put in place following additional reviews of the student affairs area, including the Health Center and the Counseling Center. The President then informed the Committee that the Board had voted to confirm the creation of an Amherst College online press and had scheduled a review of the press in three years.

Discussion turned to impressions of *Speaking to Silence: Conversations on Community and Individual Responsibility*, the day of dialogue held on November 2. President Martin noted that the responses gathered after the November 2 day of dialogue, as well as other feedback provided through the online suggestion box on the sexual respect web site and after special meetings with faculty, students, and staff, are being analyzed by the Office of Institutional Research, which will prepare a summary report. Dean Call reported that attendance at the event had been extraordinary, noting that more than 450 staff members, 150 faculty, and 1,270 students had participated. These figures represent more than 70 percent participation for each of these cohorts. The Dean noted that one of the outgrowths of the day of dialogue was the recommendation that a staff counterpart to the Take Your Professor Out (TYPO) program be established. Dean Call suggested that a program, which could be called Take Your Staff Out (TYSO), be launched soon. He said that he would be glad to co-sponsor the program with Dean Boykin-East and to structure it on the same model as TYPO. Professor Hunt expressed the view that this would be an excellent idea, and the other members agreed. Another proposal that

**Amended November 29, 2012**

emerged is to create opportunities for dialogue in the future among faculty, students, and staff. He noted that it would be possible to build a half or full day of dialogue into the academic schedule, with sufficient notice. A day during Interterm would be one possibility, or opportunities could be found within semesters. Professor Hunt said that, while she had had hesitations about suspending classes for the day of dialogue, she had found it to be a valuable experience. She would favor having additional events of this kind in the future, she commented. Professor Ratner noted Carleton College sets aside time for campus conversation at some point each Friday morning, with dialogue continuing during lunch. This might be a good model for Amherst as well. While not indicating a preference for the format, Professor Ferguson expressed the view that the campus needs to have further opportunities to come together as a community. He suggested that it would be particularly valuable for students to have occasions to reflect on what being part of the Amherst community means, and to recognize that having an obligation to others within the community is a responsibility that they share. Professor Hunt said that it is difficult to come together as a community because the College does not have appropriate spaces to do so, noting that there are issues of space and environment that bear on questions surrounding how the College might build community. Professor Harms and Schneider noted that many colleges and universities have large gathering spaces in their performing arts buildings. Such spaces serve multiple uses, infusing the arts into the campus and providing a place for community gatherings. President Martin agreed that there is a dearth of spaces at Amherst that are conducive to having the entire community meeting. Professor Ferguson suggested conversations be organized around the Honor Code, with the goal of articulating, in a positive way, what it means to be an Amherst student, and associated obligations. Professor Ratner said that his conversations with students have revealed that many students seem to understand their responsibility to respond to and help their peers, as a result of what they heard during the day of dialogue. Agreeing with Professor Ferguson, President Martin expressed the view that the College lacks a positive sense of what it wants the residential experience to be here and reiterated the view that Amherst needs to become more intentional and deliberate in the area of student life. Professor Ferguson suggested that students play a role in developing student life programs and policies as part of the strategic planning process. President Martin concurred. She commented on discussions taking place among students about the risk-averse approach at Amherst and the view that students who want to come together to have fun in ways that might carry a very small risk should not always be discouraged from doing so. In the President's view, an overly prohibitive approach to student life can have the effect, at times, of producing transgressions of a serious kind.

Dean Call asked the members when a meeting should be scheduled with the members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising. It was agreed that the meeting should occur either late in the current semester or early in the spring term, since the Committee would be devoting much of the remainder of its time this semester to personnel discussions. The Dean next thanked the members for their consultation via email about the question of whether to hold Monday classes on Thursday, December 13, so as to recoup the day of classes that had been lost due to Superstorm Sandy on Monday, October 29. Dean Call noted that he had also sought the advice of department chairs on this question, and that most had been in favor of the proposal to hold class. He then described another approach to making up the lost day, which had been proposed by a faculty colleague. The members preferred the plan of having classes on December 13 and following a Monday class schedule. Dean Call said that, while students will be informed that they should expect to attend their Monday classes on December 13, it will, of course, be up to individual faculty to decide whether they wish to hold their classes. The Dean reminded the members that Thursday, December 13, had been scheduled as the first day of a planned four-day

**Amended November 29, 2012**

reading period. Thus, the reading period will now effectively be three days long, and exam period will follow beginning on Monday, December 17, as planned. Since students often make their travel plans early, it was agreed that faculty should be asked to let their students know before Thanksgiving break, if possible, whether they plan to hold class on December 13 or not. The Committee then turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

**Amended November 29, 2012**

The ninth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, November 12, 2012. Present were Professors Ferguson, Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with “Announcements from the President.” President Martin reported that Homecoming events of the previous weekend had gone well and that she would soon be traveling to a meeting of the presidents of New England Small College Athletic Conference (NESCAC) schools. She noted that the Special Oversight Committee on Sexual Misconduct (SMOC), which is being chaired by Professor Hunt, has begun its work. Professor Hunt informed the Committee that the [members of the SMOC](#) bring expertise to their work, as well as dedication to the task at hand. Professor Ratner asked if Amherst’s Clery statistics, and information about how these data compare with the reporting of peer institutions, would be made public. (The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act) is a federal mandate requiring all institutions of higher education that participate in the federal student financial aid program to disclose information about crime on their campuses and in the surrounding communities.) Professor Hunt said these data are public and that, with the help of Marian Matheson, the Director of Institutional Research and Planning, she had reviewed the Clery statistics, as well as National College Health Assessment (NCHA) survey results for Amherst and a set of peer institutions. She commented that the data that are available are limited and imperfect. The Clery figures, which represent reported incidents of forcible sexual assault on campus, suggest that Amherst students report in slightly higher numbers than do students at other schools. However it is important to note, she said, that these are merely reported incidents. By themselves, they say nothing about the actual incidence of forcible sexual assault. The NCHA survey is assumed to be a somewhat more accurate guide than the Clery figures to the true incidence of sexual assault at Amherst and elsewhere, and these data suggest that the frequency of sexual assault at Amherst is about on par with the other schools with which the College compares itself. Professor Hunt observed that Amherst students report 3.5 to four times more incidents on the NCHA survey than in the Clery reports. This in turn suggests that, overall, 25 to 30 percent of forcible sexual assaults at Amherst College are reported, while 70 to 75 percent go unreported. President Martin said that the Clery information would be provided to the Committee. Professor Ratner asked if the SMOC would be trying to gain a sense of whether there is any relationship between athletics and fraternities and incidents of sexual violence and misconduct. Professor Hunt said that this was one of the questions the committee was looking into.

The Committee next briefly discussed whether a vote of the Faculty would be required to implement the following proposal being put forward by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), at the request of the Dean of Students Office (the addition of the bolded sentence in the Catalog text below):

Amherst College students may choose, with the permission of the instructor, a pass/fail arrangement in two of the 32 courses required for the degree, but not in more than one course in any one semester. The choice of a pass/fail alternative must be made by the last day of add/drop at the beginning of the semester and must have the approval of the student’s advisor. **THE CLASS DEAN MAY, ON BEHALF OF A STUDENT, SEEK PERMISSION FROM THE INSTRUCTOR AND THE STUDENT’S ADVISOR TO EXTEND THIS DEADLINE IN CASES OF DISABLING MEDICAL PROBLEMS OR GRAVE PERSONAL EMERGENCIES.** No grade-point equivalent will be

**Amended November 29, 2012**

assigned to a “Pass,” but courses taken on this basis will receive either a “P” or an “F” from the instructor, although in the regular evaluation of work done during the semester the instructor may choose to assign the usual grades for work submitted by students exercising this option. First-year students, who have the privilege of withdrawing from one course without grade penalty, and transfer students, who have the privilege of withdrawing from one course during their first semester at Amherst, must take no less than three graded courses in each semester. (*Amherst College Catalog*, p. 65)

In response to members’ questions about the intent of the proposed change, Dean Call responded that the new language would offer class deans, advisors, and instructors greater flexibility in making use of this option, under the circumstances described. Most likely, the option would be used to help students avoid failing a course. After some further conversation, the members agreed that implementing the change would require a vote of the Faculty. It was further agreed that the proposal would be included on an upcoming Faculty Meeting agenda. The members voted five in favor, zero opposed, with one abstention, on the substance of the motion. They voted six in favor and zero opposed on forwarding the proposal to the Faculty.

The Committee considered when to schedule the next Faculty Meeting and agreed that, when the next meeting is held, it would be instructive to have representatives of edX make a presentation about their model of online learning. Professor Rogowski reiterated his interest in having written materials about edX distributed to the Faculty in advance of the Faculty Meeting. Professor Harms expressed the view that, while joining edX would affect a very small number of Amherst faculty—those who are involved in mounting courses—participating in this effort could make a substantial contribution to extending an Amherst education to people around the globe. She feels that it will be important to keep this emphasis in mind during discussions at the Faculty Meeting. The members agreed that having Amherst faculty participate in the edX presentations, as well as, perhaps, a colleague from another institution who is developing an edX course, would be informative. Professor Rogowski said that it will be important to discuss the \$2 million investment that is required to join edX. President Martin agreed, while noting that these funds would be reinvested in the development of AmherstX courses. Recalling Professor Grillo’s comments at the Faculty Meeting on October 16, 2012, Professor Schneider said that the discussion should also encompass questions such as the following: How would faculty be selected to mount courses and how would they be compensated? Would online courses be taught as overloads or as part of a faculty member’s regular teaching load? How should faculty assess their priorities when deciding whether to offer online courses? President Martin stressed that answers to these and other questions like them will be decided by each institution. Amherst’s Faculty would be asked to consider these and other questions. While the Faculty will develop policies before any online classes are taught, edX does not need to know answers before Amherst makes a commitment.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Rogowski asked President Martin about progress being made on the strategic planning effort. The President responded that the Working Group on the Financial Outlook has been meeting and that the Campus Assessment Working Group will be up and running soon. Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services, is in the process of evaluating architectural firms that will work with the group. This process has been delayed a bit by Superstorm Sandy, as some of the firms under consideration are based in New York and were affected by the storm. Based on recent feedback, this group will be tasked with examining space needs from a student life perspective, in addition to its other work. The President anticipates that the Student Life Working Group will

**Amended November 29, 2012**

be formed by the end of the semester. The work of that group will be informed by comments made by attendees of the day of dialogue and the recommendations of the SMOC. President Martin asked if the Committee felt that it would be helpful to include students as members of the Curriculum and Pedagogy Working Group, which she noted, will be faculty-driven and address issues surrounding online learning, among other questions. The members suggested that faculty, students, and a representative from, perhaps, the Library, Information Technology, and/or a College museum be asked to participate. President Martin asked the members to offer suggestions of faculty and staff to serve.

Continuing with “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Harms asked if any families of Amherst students had lost homes as a result of Superstorm Sandy. The Dean said that he would check with the Dean of Students office to find out. Professor Ratner wondered if efforts should be made to reach out to academic institutions that may have been seriously affected by the storm to see if Amherst could be of assistance. The Dean thanked Professor Ratner for this suggestion and said that he would make inquiries. The Committee turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended November 29, 2012

The tenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, November 26, 2012. Present were Professors Ferguson, Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with “Announcements from the President.” President Martin noted that Robert Romer, Professor of Physics, Emeritus, has asked whether the College would participate in a local effort to mark the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Abraham Lincoln’s signing of the Emancipation Proclamation (the proclamation was signed at approximately 2 P.M. on New Year’s Day, 1863) by ringing the Johnson Chapel and Stearns tower bells on January 1 at 2 P.M. The Committee expressed support for celebrating this historic event in this way. President Martin next updated the members on the searches for the Provost, Dean of Students, and Chief Financial Officer. Good progress has been made on all three searches, she noted, and the search committees for these positions are in the latter stages of identifying and recruiting candidates. President Martin said that she would continue to update the Committee as these searches progress.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Schneider informed the President that he had been asked by some students to sign a petition requesting that the College adopt an investment policy that would preclude all direct investment in corporations engaged in coal extraction and refinement. He wondered if President Martin could offer further information about this issue that would be informative to the Amherst community. President Martin responded that the students who have developed the petition are concerned about the coal industry’s effects on the environment. She noted that the students had met with Trustee Bill Ford ’83, chair of the Investment Committee of the Board, when he was on campus for the October Board meetings. President Martin informed the members that the College has no direct investments in the coal industry at this time. The students are aware of this and have requested that the College adopt a divestment policy that would preclude future direct investment in corporations engaged in coal extraction and refinement. President Martin said that she would be happy to share with the Committee the letter that the students had asked faculty to sign. The Investment Committee will consider the students’ request, but no immediate action is needed. President Martin commented that it would be interesting to discuss, more generally, the use of divestment as an approach to addressing social issues.

Continuing with “Questions from Committee Members,” the Committee briefly reviewed available data (Amherst’s Clery statistics and information about how these data compare with the reporting of peer institutions, as well as National College Health Assessment [NCHA] survey results) on sexual violence on campus. The members agreed to discuss this issue further once the Special Oversight Committee on Sexual Misconduct (SMOC) had completed its work and forwarded its report. The Committee then turned to committee nominations.

Under “Announcements from the Dean,” Dean Call reported back to the Committee on the question of whether any families of Amherst students had lost homes as a result of Superstorm Sandy. Dean Boykin-East had informed the Dean that five students’ families had been affected by the storm. While there had been some loss of possessions, and one student’s family had sustained some damage to their home, there was no loss of life, the Dean noted.

The members next discussed how best to structure the Faculty’s discussions of the following topics: the Library Committee’s open access resolution; the recommendation of the Dean of Students office, which was endorsed by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), to revise Amherst College Catalog language (page 65) to offer students greater flexibility in making use of the pass/fail option, with the approval of their class deans, advisors, and instructors; and opportunities for Amherst to develop online learning tools. The Dean noted that representatives



Amended November 29, 2012

from edX will not be available on December 4 to make a presentation about their model of online learning, and that some time would be needed to prepare materials related to this discussion, which would be sent to the Faculty in advance of a Faculty Meeting to inform the conversation. In addition, he said that further consultation is needed with the Committee of Six, the CEP, the Faculty Computer Committee, and the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR) about a proposal that is currently under development about how policy questions regarding online teaching and learning will be discussed by the Faculty. It would therefore be best to have the discussion about online learning on December 18, Dean Call suggested. After some discussion, the Committee agreed that a Faculty Meeting should be held on December 4, so that the Library Committee could give a presentation on the open access resolution and so the Faculty could discuss the resolution and vote on the CEP's motion. In addition, it was agreed that a Faculty Meeting should be held on December 18. That meeting will focus on online learning and would provide an opportunity for a presentation, and for the Faculty to vote on a process to govern faculty participation in a proposed pilot project. In addition, the Faculty could vote on the open access resolution on December 18, it was agreed. The members voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward a Faculty Meeting agenda for a December 4 meeting to the Faculty. The Committee decided to discuss online learning at its meetings over the next two weeks and to develop an agenda for the December 18 Faculty Meeting. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended December 14, 2012

The eleventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, December 4, 2012. Present were Professors Ferguson, Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The meeting began with “Announcements from the President.” President Martin discussed with the members an incident that had taken place the previous weekend. She explained that someone had carved a racist epithet in the snow that had accumulated on top of a car, owned by an Amherst employee, which had been parked near the Lord Jeffery Inn. An Amherst student, who had become aware of the incident, filed a complaint with the police. President Martin said that the identity of the perpetrator is not known at this time. The President, the Dean, and the Committee applauded the student for taking the initiative to report the incident and condemned the racist act that had been committed.

Continuing with the conversation, President Martin noted that the College has spent a good deal of time this semester addressing issues surrounding sexual assault. She commented that a number of barriers to equity and inclusion at Amherst also need to be addressed, including issues surrounding race and diversity. The President said that she is considering the possibility of a symposium at the beginning of the spring term, which will involve faculty, staff, and students. To provide a forum for the community to express views on this and other possible actions, she is also considering holding an open meeting in the days to come. Offering opportunities for students to engage in dialogue and discussion and to participate in developing a vision for student life is important, in the President’s view. President Martin said that she is also considering establishing a student advisory group, which would include student leaders from a range of organizations and interest groups on campus. The group would meet regularly to bring forward to the administration matters of student concern. The members agreed that the strategic planning process, which will have student life as a primary focus, would also offer opportunities for students to contribute to discussions about student life. President Martin concurred, commenting that it is her hope that, by the end of this semester, a working group on student life would be appointed and charged. The group, which will include students, will actively seek the views of the student body as it develops goals and priorities for the College.

Turning to the related issue of space on campus, President Martin said that she is troubled that students are being placed in conflict with one another over space-related issues. Recent events have demonstrated that the desire to move the Multicultural Resource Center and the Women’s Center to more appropriate spaces is being pitted against the wish for spaces, such as the game room, that offer venues for students to have fun and socialize. The President noted that all of these activities are worthy, and that adequate spaces should be provided for all of them. It has been clear to her for some time that the College does not have sufficient space for student activities and community-building outside the classroom. President Martin said that the Senior Staff and she are exploring near-term solutions until more permanent ones can be implemented. It was agreed that it would be very helpful for the working group on campus assessment, which will play an important role in strategic planning efforts, to have student representation. Among the group’s assignments will be to assess the physical spaces available to students on campus, with the goal of developing more opportunities for intellectual and social exchange.

In regard to issues of multiculturalism and race, Professor Ferguson suggested that students be encouraged to take courses offered by Black Studies and Women’s and Gender Studies (WAGS), noting that dialogues on campus about these topics would be more substantive if this approach were taken, among others. Over the years, he has observed that students often raise concerns about these issues, but do not identify projects that would help Amherst become a

Amended December 14, 2012

community that more fully embraces and celebrates the diversity of its members. Professor Hunt noted that the Sexual Misconduct Oversight Committee (SMOC) has been discussing the curricular approach described by Professor Ferguson, and supports it. Professor Harms commented that it is important not to lose sight of the fact that time and space for dialogue occur within the classroom setting at Amherst.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Rogowski expressed the view that it seems unusual that the identity of the author of a petition ([appended via link](#)), which had recently been shared with the members, had not been indicated. The document, which had been signed by a number of faculty members, requested that the College adopt an investment policy that would preclude all direct investment in corporations engaged in coal extraction and refinement. President Martin said that she has no knowledge about the author but believes that students had developed the petition and had asked faculty members to sign it. Professor Schneider said that this is his understanding as well. Professor Rogowski next suggested that the Committee’s process for making nominations could be enhanced if the members were provided with more information about potential candidates for membership on the committees. He noted that providing such information could counterbalance potentially haphazard choices based merely on name recognition, something of particular importance because of the many new faculty members who have been hired recently, many of whom the senior faculty may not know well. The Dean was asked if he would be willing to make recommendations as a starting point for the Committee’s deliberations. He noted that, since the Committee had most recently been considering only a very small number of assignments for committees that would soon have vacancies because of faculty leaves, the information about potential committee members was less comprehensive than the materials that are provided when the Committee considers a large volume of assignments in the spring.

The members continued their discussion of the College’s investigations into online learning, focusing on a pilot program that will begin this spring and will encompass three to five courses with the edX Consortium over the next few years. Dean Call said that it is hoped that Amherst’s first course with an online amherstX component can be offered as early as fall 2013. He shared with the members a proposed process to govern faculty participation in the pilot, noting that the process had been developed this fall, in consultation with the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR), the Faculty Computer Committee (FCC), and the Committee of Six. Dean Call explained the proposal as follows: Amherst faculty members who participate in the pilot will teach an on-campus course (the Amherst course) and an online version of the same course (the amherstX course) simultaneously. The emphasis of the College’s study will be on incorporating the enhancements of online learning into the on-campus forms of the courses. Amherst faculty members will work with professional developers from edX, making use of edX research on effective teaching and presentation methods, to develop state-of-the-art learning resources for students on campus and off.

Continuing, the Dean said that, under the proposed process, the Committee of Six will review issues that may arise in the course of the pilot project and refer consideration of them to appropriate faculty committees. All proposals to participate in online teaching will include a course description of the corresponding on-campus Amherst course. This course may be a new course or a course that has been previously offered. If possible, the proposal will also describe the ways in which the amherstX course, taught on the edX platform, will be developed, and the ways in which blended learning and other online tools will be used as part of the on-campus Amherst course. In the process under consideration the proposal requires the approval of each

Amended December 14, 2012

participating faculty member's department(s). Once approved by the department(s), proposals will be submitted to the Dean of the Faculty. The Dean of the Faculty will vet these proposals with the CEP, which will offer recommendations on which courses/faculty should be selected. The Dean will make the final decisions about which courses will be offered. Proposals for new on-campus courses that will also be taught online will be approved following normal procedures by departments, the CEP, and the full Faculty.

The Dean also noted the capital expenses associated with the pilot. Amherst will pay edX \$250,000 to develop each course and run it the first time, and \$100,000 to run a course each additional time. One possible model could be as follows:

2013 - 2014	Four new courses, two each semester (\$1 million)
2014 - 2015	Offer the same four courses (\$400,000)
2015 - 2016	Offer the same four courses (\$400,000)
2016 - 2017	Offer two courses (\$200,000)

Additional compensation will be offered during the period of course development, which may occur either during the semester or in the summer, and again during each semester in which the course is being offered (see schedule below as an example). Faculty members will receive a stipend for developing the online course and an additional stipend each time they offer the online course, Dean Call said. Funds will also be provided for two academic interns (undergraduates who generally have taken the course previously) to monitor discussion forums, under the direction of the faculty member.

A participating faculty member would proceed on the following schedule:

First Semester (for courses developed during the academic year)

Teach two Amherst courses that are on-campus only

Work on developing an amherstX course that will be taught in parallel with an on-campus Amherst course in the next semester

Receive stipend for time spent developing the amherstX course

Second Semester

Teach one Amherst course that is on campus only

Teach a second Amherst course on campus

Teach an amherstX version of the second course online through edX

Coordinate with edX staff to update/modify course materials

Receive stipend for overseeing the amherstX course—including directing the student interns

Continuing, the Dean said that it has been proposed that two academic interns monitor discussion forums. Academic interns can provide support (twenty hours a week total, ten hours a week each) at about \$3,000 per course, totaling \$42,000 for the four-course model outlined above. Staff time will be allocated according to College priorities. Information Technology staff time will be planned in consultation with the FCC. To assess the pilot, the CEP will report annually to the Faculty on the project, drawing on the expertise and assistance of the Office of Institutional Research. Included in the report each year will be the FCC's assessment of the

Amended December 14, 2012

support required for Amherst's Department of Information Technology's participation in the pilot. The annual report will be shared with the CPR and the full Faculty, the Dean noted.

The Committee offered some advice about ways to clarify the description of the process to inform a proposed motion about the process. The members agreed that the Faculty should be asked to vote on the motion at a Faculty Meeting on December 18. As part of the presentation at the Faculty Meeting, the members felt that it would be informative to show examples of online courses; to have Amherst faculty who are considering offering amherstX courses offer remarks; and, perhaps, to have a representative from edX, who has been working with a faculty member on developing a course, discuss the process. The members also reviewed a draft of a letter from President Martin and Dean Call that would provide a progress report on the College's initiative to investigate online learning and details about the process for moving forward in this domain, which would be sent to the Faculty in advance of the Faculty Meeting. Members of the Committee stressed that it will be important to convey that the discussion at the Faculty Meeting about online learning is about the process that is under consideration for governing the pilot. The administration, after the consultation already described, has made the decision to undertake the pilot. The Board has authorized \$2 million to support experimentation with online learning, sufficient for the mounting of the three to five courses imagined above.

Professor Rogowski expressed the view that little is known about whether blended learning enhances the experience of students taking courses on campus. President Martin said that studies have shown that making use of technological tools within courses can enhance learning. Professor Rogowski asked if the President would provide some citations for studies that have demonstrated this outcome, and she agreed to do so. Professor Schneider asked how the success of the pilot courses would be judged. He expressed some worry that the expectations for them would be high, since creating them would require tremendous resources and energy. He reiterated the concern, which is shared by some faculty, he noted, that faculty who teach online courses may end up making sacrifices in other areas, such as their scholarship and/or the time that they spend with their students, in order to meet their commitment to developing and teaching online courses. Dean Call said that the model being proposed, teaching the online course as an overload, has been used successfully with Mellon Tutorials. The Dean stressed that the pilot is an experiment, and adjustments can be made to the process as a result of early experiences. Professor Schneider said that he worries that invidious distinctions may arise as a result of the project, and that divisions within the Faculty might be created.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Rogowski commented that he understands the interest in experimenting with online tools with the intention of learning about the ways in which on-campus courses may be enhanced, but he said that he had questions about the purpose and resources associated with mounting massively open online courses (MOOCs). President Martin noted that online learning is seen by many as the biggest experiment in higher education in half a century. She expressed the view that she could not understand any reason why Amherst would not want to be a part of efforts to learn more and help shape teaching and learning in the next century. She commented that one of the many reasons to offer MOOCs is that making courses available to alumni will be a way of keeping them engaged with the College. Professor Rogowski said that his concerns revolved around the idea that Amherst would be reaching out to share its model of education with people around the world through mounting MOOCs. He finds that that approach could be viewed as presumptuous and may strike some as akin to "cultural imperialism". Professor Ferguson disagreed, noting that the education would not be imposed and that there would be no attempts at conversion, but it would simply be made available. The other members agreed and felt that offering MOOCs as a way of sharing Amherst courses with

Amended December 14, 2012

people who would otherwise not have access to them was positive. Dean Call concurred, while noting that the primary focus of the edX experiment will be to improve teaching and learning on campus in courses across Amherst's curriculum. The benefits of MOOCs, which are substantive, are of interest, but the focus will be on campus learning and teaching first.

The members agreed that having an ongoing series of lunches to enable faculty, across disciplines, to share experiences, problem-solve with one another, and discuss the roles of technology in teaching and learning, would be helpful. (It was later decided to convene a faculty seminar, modeled after the successful working group developed for the Mellon-funded research tutorial project, to provide a forum for faculty interested in the development of online and blended learning models.) The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

**Amended December 14, 2012**

The twelfth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, December 10, 2012. Present were Professors Ferguson, Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

Under “Announcements from the Dean, Dean Call informed the members that Associate Dean Griffiths would soon be sending them a draft of the fifth-year interim report to the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC). Dean Griffiths is looking forward to receiving the members’ comments on the document. He plans to send a successor draft, incorporating the Committee’s feedback, to all faculty and staff. The final report will be sent to NEASC in mid-January, Dean Call explained.

The Dean next discussed with the Committee the process for reviewing the tenure case of the new Provost, Peter Uvin, who will stand for tenure in the Department of Political Science. 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 deans of the faculty who stood for tenure upon their appointment. The Dean said that the Committee of Six would be asked to nominate four tenured professors to serve on an ad hoc tenure review committee. The chair of the ad hoc committee would not be a member of the department. A member of the department serving on the ad hoc committee would act as a liaison to the department. 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 directly to the Committee of Six. The tenured members of the department would be asked to write a departmental recommendation, which would be provided to the ad hoc committee and the Committee of Six, and to submit individual colleague letters directly to the Committee of Six. Dean Call noted that Mr. Uvin’s scholarship would be reviewed by the department, the ad hoc committee, and the Committee of Six. It was agreed that it would not be necessary to have outside reviewers evaluate Mr. Uvin’s scholarship and that he should be asked to provide teaching evaluations of courses he has taught in recent years, if possible. The Dean then asked the Committee to nominate the members of the ad hoc committee for Mr. Uvin’s tenure case.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Hunt informed the Committee that a faculty colleague in the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies (WAGS) is contemplating making a proposal to the First-Year Seminar Committee whereby a group of faculty from across the College with expertise or interest in issues of race, sexuality, gender and issues of difference more generally would teach all of the First-Year Seminars in 2013-2014, possibly using a common syllabus that would have as its focus topics surrounding sexual respect, difference, identity, gender, and race. The idea, Professor Hunt explained, is that faculty who are knowledgeable about or have an interest in these areas, would offer the seminars, and all first-year students would be required to participate. Professor Hunt said that every student to whom she has mentioned the proposal has been enthusiastic about it. She added that there is unfortunately a perception out there that faculty have done little in the face of the crises that have racked the campus this past semester, and this idea represents the kind of decisive intervention by faculty that many students had been hoping for. Professor Hunt said that she sees pros and cons to the proposal but feels it is a very interesting approach. Professor Schneider, while applauding the idea behind the proposal, expressed concern that adopting the proposal would mean that other faculty would be prohibited from teaching First-Year Seminars, some of which have already been planned, and which focus on important topics. He noted that the First-Year Seminars, in their current form, offer important introductions for first-year students to fields that they may wish to explore. Professor Ratner agreed, commenting that he does not feel that

**Amended December 14, 2012**

faculty should be precluded from teaching First-Year Seminars focusing on other subject matter; he worried about imposing a narrow choice on all first-year students. Professor Hunt said that the purpose of the seminar would be to intervene early in the experience of all new students as a way of trying to change the culture surrounding citizenship and respect for others at Amherst.

Continuing the discussion, Professor Schneider asked if the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) would be considering the proposal under discussion. Professor Hunt said that as far as she knows the proposal is still at a formative stage, but that she would imagine that it would come before the First-Year Seminar Committee and the CEP. Professor Harms commented that the proposal, which is intriguing, should be considered by the relevant faculty committees, with final approval taking place through faculty conversation and vote. Since this would take some time, it seems hard to imagine that the proposal could be implemented next year, she noted. Professor Ferguson expressed skepticism about the proposal, commenting that it could be difficult for faculty members all to teach the same content. He wondered what the “soul” of the seminar would be, if so many faculty members were involved in constructing and teaching it. Professor Ferguson suggested that another approach would be to offer a course modeled on the work of Howard Gardner, Hobbs Professor of Cognition and Education at the Harvard Graduate School of Education and an Amherst trustee. Such a course could focus on such foundational questions as: How do you want the world to be? How do you want to live? What does respect mean?

Dean Call commented that there is much about the proposal that is commendable, and he admired the idea of using the First-Year Seminar to help change the culture at Amherst. At the same time, he wondered if it proved to be difficult to find sufficiently many faculty to teach the entire first-year class, it might be preferable to assemble faculty who are interested in teaching the seminar and have them offer it to a subset of the first years, using a common syllabus, focused on the substance and issues mentioned rather than trying to initiate a program that requires all faculty to teach the same content in all First-Year Seminars next year. Professor Harms expressed concern that a First-Year Seminar on the subjects proposed, taught to many but not all first-year students, could prove divisive; an all-or-nothing plan might be necessary. President Martin wondered about the option of offering an experience explicitly as an add-on, a half-credit course, perhaps, that would provide opportunities for learning that might include informal discussions with students, faculty, and staff and extend orientation in an intellectually substantive way. Professor Hunt said that she would worry if any required courses seemed to push a particular point of view but that it was perfectly possible to reflect multiple points of view in a class focused on difference. She noted that some students have been stressing to her, especially in the aftermath of the controversy over the resiting of the Multicultural Resource Center, that many Amherst students are ill informed about issues of respect across differences. Confronting students with these issues during their time at Amherst seems like a worthy goal. President Martin noted that some students have also expressed concern about some faculty members’ awareness about issues of sexual respect, identity, and diversity and inclusion. She suggested that it would be informative to ask some students to speak with the Faculty at a Faculty Meeting and to express their views and concerns. Committee members were supportive of that possibility.

Professor Harms expressed the view that it is time to take stock of the needs of the diverse student body that Amherst has assembled, and to develop ways of supporting students and fostering inclusion. President Martin agreed and said that it is critical to make changes that will help all students feel that they belong in the Amherst community and to address the sense of alienation that some students have from one another. Issues surrounding what it means for some students to be viewed as part of a dominant white, middle-class, privileged culture are also of



**Amended December 14, 2012**

concern. President Martin said that she feels strongly that whatever curricular approaches are developed should be intellectually substantive and engaging. She said that she imagines that the CEP would be involved in vetting any proposals that emerge. Professor Schneider commented that President Martin is ideally suited to lead efforts to address the issues under discussion. He expressed admiration for the approach and substance of her convocation speech this fall. President Martin said that she is happy to do her part and that she is committed to working with faculty, staff, and students to build an enhanced sense of community at Amherst and to improve the campus culture and climate. She commented that it is important that whatever approaches are taken, they not be overly prescribed or forced. The Committee agreed.

Discussion turned to plans for the Faculty Meeting to be held on December 18, the subject of which will be online learning. The members reviewed a revision of a letter about the edX pilot project that would be sent to the Faculty in advance of the meeting from the President and the Dean, as well as a draft motion to implement a process and procedures to govern Amherst's investigations into online learning. The Committee also watched a video that showcased some examples of online courses. After some discussion, it was agreed that a preamble to the motion should include a general description of the proposal, and that the Faculty should be asked to vote on the following specific policies and procedures for the amherstX pilot project:

Each amherstX online course offered will be a version of an on-campus Amherst course that is taught in the same semester by the same faculty member(s).

During the pilot project, the Committee of Six will review issues that arise and refer consideration of them to appropriate faculty committees.

Courses will be selected for development as amherstX courses through a competitive proposal process.

Each proposal will require the approval of each faculty member's department(s).

Once approved by the department(s), proposals will be submitted to the Dean of the Faculty.

The Dean of the Faculty will vet these proposals with the CEP, which will offer recommendations on which courses/faculty should be selected. The Dean will make the final decisions about which courses will be offered.

Proposals for new on-campus courses that will also be taught online will be approved following standing procedures by departments, the CEP, and the full Faculty.

Professors Schneider, Ratner, and Rogowski raised the concern that some faculty members may find it hollow that the Faculty is being asked to vote on the procedures for engaging in investigations into online learning, but not on whether the experiment should be undertaken at all. Professor Harms said that it seems clear that it is within the purview of the administration to make the decision to join the edX consortium and undertake the pilot project. Faculty members do not have to participate in teaching online courses unless they wish to do so, and, in fact, only a very small number will participate over the next several years. Professor Hunt agreed and noted that the Faculty is being asked to vote on the processes that will ensure that online courses

**Amended December 14, 2012**

are treated in similar ways to on-campus courses. Voting on the procedures will ensure that the courses will remain within the control of the Faculty, and that standing procedures will not be bypassed. She sees the process and procedures as a substantive issue. Dean Call noted that, while a number of institutions have joined the edX consortium, few of them, if any, have consulted with their faculties about these decisions to the degree that Amherst has.

Following up on Professor Harms's point that the pilot project will involve a small number of faculty, the Committee discussed the ways in which faculty members may be involved in experimenting with online tools, if they choose not to offer a MOOC (massively open online course). Dean Call responded that he envisions that there will be a great degree of flexibility in how experimentation can take place; offering an amherstX course in parallel with an on-campus course is just one approach. The faculty seminar that is being planned will provide a venue for faculty to engage in discussions about experimentation with online learning. In addition, as Amherst's Department of Information Technology learns more about tools and the edX platform through the pilot project, members of the department will work with individual faculty to incorporate technology into their on-campus courses, whether or not the faculty member is offering a MOOC. Professor Ferguson said that he is pleased to hear that these opportunities will be available, noting that, while he does not envision offering a full online course, he would like to be able to experiment with online tools to improve particular aspects of his courses. He said that he can see how an incremental, on-campus approach of this sort could provide a way for the Amherst Faculty to develop a set of useful tools.

Two other issues were raised at the end of the conversation. The Committee, the Dean, and the President discussed whether teaching evaluations of online courses should be considered as part of tenure reviews. It was agreed that evaluations of teaching for the purposes of reappointment or tenure will continue to be restricted to courses that are offered for credit at Amherst College or, in the case of a joint appointment, at another Five-College campus. Professor Schneider then asked if issues surrounding intellectual property have been resolved in regard to amherstX courses. President Martin said that these issues are currently under review, and that she expects that there will be a need to have contracts developed for purposes of protection and clarification.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the members voted five in favor and one opposed to forward the motion to the Faculty and five in favor and zero opposed, with one abstention, on the substance of the motion. The Committee reviewed a draft Faculty Meeting agenda for the meeting of December 18 and voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward it to the Faculty.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

**Amended February 25, 2013**

The thirteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, January 28, 2013. Present were Professors Ferguson, Harms, Hunt, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Ratner participated via speaker phone.

The meeting began with President Martin reporting on the meetings of the Board of Trustees, which had been held January 24-26 in Washington, D.C. The President explained that much of the discussion had focused on issues relating to sexual misconduct at Amherst, including conversations about the reports of the Special Oversight Committee on Sexual Misconduct (SMOC), the Title IX Committee, and attorney Gina M. Smith of Ballard Spahr LLP, who had conducted an evaluation of the College's response to the report by Angie Epifano in spring 2012 that she had been raped on campus during the time that she was a student at Amherst. President Martin thanked Professor Hunt, chair of the SMOC, and her colleagues on the committee for their excellent work, and said that, in her view, the [SMOC report](#) is thorough, informative, and thoughtful. The Board also expressed its gratitude to the committee and Professor Hunt, who had reported to the Trustees at the meetings, as had Suzanne Coffey, chair of the Title IX Committee, and Ms. Smith. President Martin noted that these reports are consistent in their conclusions and in their recommendation that Amherst implement new policies and systems to address and prevent sexual misconduct, including making changes to approaches and structures within the area of student life.

Turning to Ms. Smith's report, President Martin commented that the attorney had concluded, based on an in-depth review of information available, that Ms. Epifano had given a credible account of her experience. President Martin said that she had asked Ms. Smith to assess whether the application of policy and process to Ms. Epifano's report constituted an effective response by Amherst. Ms. Smith concluded that, in this case, the College had not followed policy and procedure in a way that would have provided a timely and coordinated response to Ms. Epifano's report. In her report and presentation to the Board, Ms. Smith noted failures of protocol, coordination, communication, and effective supervisory relationships among staff.

Continuing, President Martin commented that a number of the recommendations of the three reports have already been implemented—in particular, those related to Title IX. Describing progress to date, she noted that, under the leadership of Ms. Coffey, the College's policies, procedures, and protocols have been redrafted by the Title IX Committee, and Amherst now has and follows an integrated response to sexual misconduct and assault. Improvements have been made to the ways in which the College provides support and resources, and conveys information about reporting options. In addition, the Office of the Dean of Students has taken steps to improve its protocols and enhance coordination, President Martin said. Other recommendations are in the process of being put in place, the President reported, while others will require campus discussion, and some will become part of the larger strategic planning initiative that is now in its early stages. The Board of Trustees has requested that meaningful progress be made on the recommendations before its April meeting. President Martin said that she intends to act deliberately and swiftly to meet this goal.

Following President Martin's remarks, the Committee discussed possible timetables for distributing the SMOC report, which would be made available on the College's website in its entirety and without password protection, President Martin informed the members. The President said that she planned to send [an email to all students, faculty, and staff](#) about the report and that she would include a link to the document. In addition, she noted, the Board is in the process of preparing a public statement about the recommendations of the SMOC report and the Trustees' expectations for implementing them. A link to [the Board statement](#), which would be posted on the College's website, would also be included in her email, President Martin said.

**Amended February 25, 2013**

After weighing a number of logistical concerns, the members agreed that the SMOC report should be posted online on Wednesday, January 30, at which time the President's email would be sent to the community. The President asked the Committee to consider whether it would be desirable to hold an open meeting to discuss the report. After considering this question and a number of scheduling options, it was agreed that an open meeting should be held on Tuesday, February 5, at 7:30 P.M., in Johnson Chapel. Professor Hunt agreed to be available to respond to questions about the committee's work and to ask other members of the SMOC to join her. President Martin said that she and the Dean would be present to listen to the community's thoughts about how best to proceed. The President informed the members of her plan to develop a proposal for the sequence and timeline for consideration of key recommendations; she also plans to post responses and suggestions via the [Suggestions and Stories link](#) on the [Sexual Respect and Title IX website](#), as well as other vehicles.

President Martin concluded her remarks by providing a brief summary of other matters that had been on the Board's agenda. She noted that the meetings had been held in Washington, as they are every two or three years, so that the Amherst Board and that of the Folger Library could meet together. Those discussions had been productive and had focused on possibilities for enhancing collaborative efforts and connections between the College and the Folger. The Trustees had noted that the endowment had earned an investment return of 4.8 percent and, as of December 31, 2012, had a value of approximately 1.7 billion, President Martin commented. The Board had discussed issues surrounding the setting of the comprehensive fee, though no decision had been made about the fee, as well as upcoming pressures on the operating budget and ways of addressing them.

The Committee turned next to nominations for a committee and a working group. During the course of these discussions, the issue of whether tenure-track faculty should be asked to serve on major committees and working groups was raised, as there has been a sense at the College that these colleagues should be "protected" from doing so in order to preserve time for scholarship and teaching during their pre-tenure years at Amherst, during which time they are also adjusting to the College. The members agreed that they should discuss this topic at a future meeting.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call noted that the special ceremony that had been held at the College on January 22, 2013, in honor of the unveiling of the portrait of Rose Olver, L. Stanton Williams '41 Professor of Psychology and Women's and Gender Studies, Emerita, had been a very special and memorable occasion. He thanked President Martin for her decision to have the portrait installed in Johnson Chapel. The President agreed that the event had been lovely and commented that she felt that it was fitting that the portrait of Professor Olver be placed in a prominent location in the chapel.

President Martin next updated the Committee on the progress of the search for the Chief Financial Officer (CFO). Some members of the Committee, as well as other individuals and groups on campus, and some members of the Board, had met with three finalists for the CFO position. The President asked the members who had met with the candidates for their feedback, and they shared their impressions. Professor Schneider expressed concern that his response to the candidates had been solicited in the form of a survey, which he found to be a confining format that was atypical at Amherst. President Martin advised that anyone feel free in the future to convey his or her impressions of candidates in whatever format would feel most comfortable. She then noted that good progress is being made on the search for a new Dean of Students, commenting that four finalists would be on campus to meet with members of the community January 30 through February 7. At the end of the conversation, the President thanked the members for their comments. She expressed her enthusiasm for the recent appointment of Lisa

**Amended February 25, 2013**

Rutherford as Chief Policy Officer and General Counsel. Ms. Rutherford will join the College on March 1.

Discussion returned to the report of the SMOC. Professor Hunt distributed the executive summary of the report, which she said would be posted online as part of the document, and reviewed highlights with the Committee. Professor Hunt noted that the SMOC had come to the conclusion that sexual misconduct is no worse a problem at Amherst than it is at other four-year residential colleges—but it is also no better. She noted that, since 2006 Amherst has participated in the National College Health Assessment (NCHA), a survey of college students from institutions of higher learning across the country. In the 2012 survey, just under 5 percent of Amherst women and 1 percent of Amherst men had reported having been penetrated against their will and a larger percentage reported “lesser” forms of sexual misconduct. These numbers closely match those at other four-year residential colleges that participated in the NCHA survey. The fact that Amherst is “average” with respect to the incidence of sexual misconduct is one of the main findings of the report Professor Hunt said. However, she and her committee believed that Amherst should strive to do much better than average. Professor Hunt stressed that the Amherst community is responsible for working together to effect change.

Professor Hunt said that it is clear from the committee’s work that data gathered as part of reporting under the Clery Act, which requires college and universities to report all known cases of sexual assault, along with a number of other types of crime, are largely useless for determining the actual number of incidents of sexual misconduct, because most victims do not come forward and thus their cases are not reflected in the figures. She commented that, whatever other faults there may have been in regard to addressing sexual misconduct at the College, Amherst has, over the course of many years, been responsible about reporting cases under the Clery Act. It has not been “sweeping the problem under the rug.” Professor Hunt added that, while the College has been quite assiduous in reporting cases of sexual misconduct, and some victims of sexual assault reported to the committee that they had been well treated at Amherst in the aftermath of the assault, it is also the case that the College did not respond well to all the cases it knew about. Professor Hunt noted that structural, procedural, and organizational difficulties, and poor emergency management, at the College, rather than maliciousness or ill will, seem to be at the root of Amherst’s lack of effectiveness when it comes to responding to some cases of sexual misconduct. Ms. Smith’s findings were consistent with this view.

Continuing with her summary of the findings of the SMOC, Professor Hunt said that the committee felt that prevention should be a major focus of the College’s efforts. To make such work effective, the SMOC tried to understand the patterns of sexual misconduct at the College—to determine what is happening and what can be done about it. The committee found that patterns of misconduct at Amherst largely conform to those at other colleges and universities, as documented in a number of national studies and surveys. As is true elsewhere, first-year students at Amherst, particularly women, are the most likely group to be victimized by sexual misconduct and most perpetrators are men. In a large number of cases, the individuals involved know each other; sometimes they are or have been in a relationship with one another. Professor Hunt noted that, nationally, three-quarters of the victims of sexual assault know their attacker, and the figure is said to be higher for colleges and universities. One recommendation of the SMOC is that the College should provide more educational programming surrounding behavior within relationships. Continuing, Professor Hunt noted that the committee had found that there is a recurring pattern at Amherst (though it is certainly not unique to this college) in the way some student organizations and social networks assimilate first-year students into their groups. First-year students are often pressed to engage in heavy alcohol consumption and other risky behavior, in a process that resembles hazing. When sexual harassment and misconduct occur,

**Amended February 25, 2013**

victims are sometimes discouraged from reporting what has happened, and group members tacitly or openly take the perpetrator's side.

Professor Hunt said that it is estimated that about 65 percent of cases of rape or attempted rape at the College are not being reported. In considering how the College should intervene to deter behavior that often leads to sexual misconduct, the SMOC recommended that Amherst pay more attention to encouraging healthy forms of mentorship, making use of older students to mentor younger ones, so as to improve the ways in which new students are assimilated into the community. In addition, the committee recommended that there be more inclusive and accountable leadership in student organizations, and better training on how to intervene in social situations that may result in sexual misconduct. Professor Hunt noted that women are less likely to be student-leaders than they were ten or fifteen years ago, and programs aimed at encouraging and supporting them to take on leadership roles should be developed. In addition, Professor Hunt noted that the committee had found that some structural problems with College space may facilitate sexual misconduct and it was recommending that more inviting and open party and community-wide spaces be created at Amherst. The space issue is one among several factors contributing to a rather poor sense of community at the College, according to Professor Hunt. In regard to community, a goal should also be to train students about when to intervene if they see a problem with a fellow student and to develop a student culture that stresses looking out for one another. Another recommendation of the committee is to encourage students to take courses within the curriculum that focus on issues of difference including courses on gender and sexuality.

Professor Hunt commented that it is clear that there is a link between sexual violence and excessive alcohol consumption and that this is a very complicated issue. There was some disagreement within the SMOC about the best approach to take to alcohol policy. In the time available, Professor Hunt reported, the SMOC did not feel equipped to render substantive recommendations in this area. President Martin said that the alcohol policy will be considered within the next six months. The members agreed that a prohibitive approach to the problem of excessive drinking and the related problems of underage drinking will not be effective in isolation. While complying with the law in regard to underage drinking is a responsibility of the College, many have argued that programs that focus on educating students to drink responsibly will likely be more effective. Professor Schneider noted that this conversation surrounding drinking can be as beneficial as a policy change. It was noted that the SMOC has recommended that there be at least one pub on campus, which many consider would be a helpful approach to encourage responsible drinking. Professor Hunt commented that research has shown that many students at Amherst believe that other students are drinking more than they actually are. Professor Harms commented that, just as they should be educated that they are putting themselves at risk if they engage in excessive drinking, students should know that the same is true if they commit sexual misconduct. She stressed that it would be a deterrent to some students if they knew that there would be serious repercussions, including expulsion, if they are found to have committed sexual misconduct. For too many years, this has not been the case, she commented. President Martin said that processes have been put in place to impose sanctions, including expulsion, on those who are found to have committed sexual misconduct.

Continuing with the SMOC's recommendations, Professor Hunt noted that the committee felt strongly that the College needs to improve approaches, coordination, and communication within student affairs, particularly with respect to the Counseling Center, the Health Center and the Dean of Students Office. Actions might include merging some services, improving the ways in which emergencies are managed, the adoption of clear protocols, clarifying the responsibilities of staff, and providing staff with up-to-date training. The SMOC stressed the importance of

**Amended February 25, 2013**

having the Dean of Students office focus more on cocurricular activities and helping to foster a vibrant and healthy student body. The SMOC believes that the office should be engaged in programs that help to build community, including helping to plan fun and ideally college-wide student activities. The feeling that they are not included in the community is more common among students of color and international students, which is a problem that must be addressed. Another related recommendation of the SMOC is that there be more oversight of the ways in which student fees are allocated, in order to ensure a coordinated vision about how best to make use of these fees.

The members thanked Professor Hunt for her work and this overview of the report. In regard to student leadership, Professor Harms suggested that a contributing factor to some of the problems surrounding student leadership and mentorship is that many juniors, who might otherwise serve in leadership roles, study abroad and are not on campus. As a result, less experienced, and in some cases, less mature sophomores end up occupying these positions. She expressed concern that it is difficult to build community when some members have their Amherst experience interrupted by studying abroad for a semester or a year. In regard to the most effective ways to address excessive drinking, the members agreed that the new Dean of Students should be asked to consider this question, and develop a plan, soon after he or she arrives on campus. It was agreed that creating more community-wide, fun events to enliven the social life on campus, as alternatives to events centered around drinking, would help to strengthen the community and enrich the social life for students.

The Dean informed the members of his plans to ask them to nominate colleagues to serve on a vision committee for the library. He said that he would send the members the charge for the committee and a related statement in advance of the next meeting of the Committee of Six. The Dean next explained that, in order to be in compliance under the Public Health Service (PHS) Policies on Research Misconduct (including but not limited to 42 CFR Parts 50 and 93), as well as the corresponding policies on research misconduct of other federal agencies, it has become necessary to revise [the current policy](#), which appears in the *Faculty Handbook*. While the College must make these changes for all research that receives federal grant funding, most institutions apply the same policy when there are allegations of research misconduct involving research that is not federally funded. The members agreed to review the policy and to decide whether the revisions must be approved by faculty vote. Professor Harms expressed the view that they should. The Dean next reported that progress is being made on planning for the Humanities Center, and that the policies and a potential space have been under discussion and will be shared with the Faculty at a Faculty Meeting this semester. A committee (Catherine Epstein, Bryn Geffert, Deborah Gewertz, Leah Hewitt, Justin Kimball, Marisa Parham, Austin Sarat, and himself) has been meeting biweekly since the fall and has identified space (about 5,000 square feet) in the library that can be renovated to house the new center. The proposal would be to create ten offices in the center, as well as a large open area that could be used by faculty and postdoctoral fellows, as well as by students (during off hours). Some books and library carrels will have to be moved to accomplish the renovation, the Dean said. Professor Schneider asked if there are plans to renovate the library substantially or create a new one. The President and the Dean said that a new library is one of the next major academic building projects, but it may be up to ten years before it will be undertaken, because of other pressing facilities needs. The Dean then summarized faculty hires made thus far, as a result of searches that have been completed. He commented that the seven new colleagues that have been hired so far represent a strong and diverse cohort. There are five tenure-line searches that are not yet complete.

**Amended February 25, 2013**

The members next discussed dates for additional meetings. The Dean asked the Committee if it would like to meet early in the semester with the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising. Professor Schneider said that he favors having the Committee discuss the ad hoc committee's proposals once again before such a meeting takes place. He is under the impression that the ad hoc committee may have revised its proposals. Professor Harms suggested that the Dean ask the ad hoc committee to inform the Committee if the proposal has been changed. The Dean agreed to do so. The meeting ended with the Dean asking the members if they felt the Committee should meet with the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), as the Committee of Six has sometimes done annually. The members said that, since the meeting schedule is tight because of travel and the number of personnel cases, it may not be possible to fit in a meeting with the CEP this semester. If there is a pressing issue, the members would reconsider, of course. The Dean said that he would convey this information to the CEP.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty



**Amended February 26, 2013**

The fourteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, February 4, 2013. Present were Professors Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Ferguson participated via speaker phone.

President Martin began the meeting by discussing a recent request to her for College funding that had come from a student group. While endorsing the group's initiative to bring speakers to campus, President Martin expressed concern that the group may be asking for funding to support a fundraiser for an outside political organization. She explained that the group plans to charge admission for everyone other than Amherst students, directing funds raised to the outside organization. One member of the Committee recalled that there may have been fundraisers held in campus venues in the past, but that these events have been fundraisers for College groups. The Committee agreed with the President that, if College funds are provided to support a public event at the College, the event should be free and open to the public. President Martin thanked the members for their advice.

Continuing with her remarks, President Martin noted the expectation of the Board of Trustees that the recommendations of the Special Oversight Committee on Sexual Misconduct (SMOC), of which there are sixty-two, be considered by the administration and by the appropriate bodies at the College, and that revised Title IX policies for the College be adopted by the time of the Board's next meetings, which are set for April 4-April 6. To guide the process of consideration and implementation, President Martin explained that members of the Senior Staff and she have been discussing a sequence for considering each of the SMOC's recommendations and have been identifying College entities that should be part of the process, based on areas of responsibility and oversight. In addition, since some of the recommendations are already in the planning stages or are under way, while other recommendations have not yet been brought forward, the status of each recommendation has been reviewed. President Martin shared with the members a preliminary chart that has been developed to capture this information and to track the progress of implementing the recommendations.

At 3:50 P.M., the Committee was joined by Suzanne Coffey, Director of Athletics, Title IX Coordinator, and Chair of the Title IX Committee. President Martin praised the work of the Title IX Committee, which has been coordinating Amherst's efforts to comply with and carry out its responsibilities under Title IX, including drafting regulations. The President informed the members that she had invited Ms. Coffey to meet with the Committee of Six to review the Title IX Committee's sexual misconduct and harassment policy recommendations, which are still in a draft form. For the College to be in compliance with Title IX, Ms. Coffey noted as an overarching principle that Amherst's policies must be consistent for students, faculty, and staff. She pointed out that most of the policies that the Title IX Committee has drafted are needed to ensure that the College is in compliance with Title IX. There are a few recommendations, however, that will require faculty discussion and, in at least one instance (the consensual sexual relationships policy), a faculty vote. The committee feels that these recommendations are consistent with the spirit of Title IX, though they are not required under Title IX law, Ms. Coffey noted. Professor Harms commented that it might be helpful to offer examples of situations that these recommended policies would govern. Ms. Coffey agreed, noting that plans call for offering such examples in a frequently-asked-questions format, rather than including examples in the Title IX policy itself.

Conversation turned first to the Title IX Committee's recommendation that sexual relationships between students and their employers, supervisors, professors, coaches, advisors, or other non-student College employees be prohibited under all circumstances. The Title IX Committee has also proposed that College employees who supervise or otherwise hold positions

**Amended February 26, 2013**

of authority over others be prohibited from having a sexual relationship with an individual under their direct supervision. Ms. Coffey and the members discussed bringing a motion before the Faculty to strengthen the policy on consensual sexual relationships between faculty members and students ([\*Faculty Handbook IV., A., 3.\*](#)), which had been approved by the Faculty in 1993, so as to fully prohibit consensual sexual relationships between faculty members and students. This policy also appears in the *Student Handbook* as part of the “Statement on Respect for Persons.” At present, the policy “strongly discourages” such relationships and requires faculty members to remove themselves from “any supervisory, evaluative, advisory, or other pedagogical role involving a student with whom he or she has had or currently has a sexual relationship.” Ms. Coffey noted that the Title IX Committee will argue strongly that, while the current policy may have served the institution during a previous era, it is now outdated and is not consistent with the spirit of Title IX law. The members discussed the possible implications of a policy that allows for sexual relationships between faculty members and students, both for the parties involved and for other students who become aware of such a relationship. While agreeing that some of these relationships may have had positive outcomes in the past, including happy marriages, Ms. Coffey said that the Title IX Committee feels that the power imbalance that is at the foundation of these relationships is deeply problematic and can result in negative consequences. Ms. Coffey noted that other schools, colleges, and universities that are now in the process of amending their policies on sexual misconduct are also moving to strengthen their policies regarding prohibited relationships.

After a discussion about the nuances of some of the language used in the proposed revision of the consensual sexual relationships policy, Professor Rogowski asked if the committee is proposing that the policy extend to relationships between faculty members and students after students graduate. Ms. Coffey said that the committee’s proposal is that the revised policy apply only to relationships between faculty members and current students. Professor Ferguson asked if the proposed policy is an attempt to legislate against all sexual relationships at the College in which a power differential exists, as a matter of structure, for example, between tenured and untenured faculty. He wondered if the policy would govern relationships between faculty and administrators. Ms. Coffey said that the intent behind the proposal is to create an equitable educational environment in which sexual relationships are prohibited between those who have an asymmetrical status.

Ms. Coffey next discussed with the members points of emphasis within the policy regarding forms of sexual harassment, noting first that such harassment can occur between equals or between persons of unequal power status. She commented that this section of the policy, in line with Title IX regulations, includes as an example of behavior that might be considered sexual harassment or misconduct the non-academic display or circulation of written materials or pictures degrading to an individual(s) or gender group. This issue is quite different from the use of such materials in the classroom for purposes of analysis and discussion, which is a matter of academic freedom, but the latter does raise some issues of concern. The Title IX Committee, joined by the SMOC, is proposing that instructors offer appropriate and timely warnings regarding the introduction of explicit and triggering materials used in the classroom. The Title IX Committee and SMOC will draft a motion to this effect and present it to the Committee of Six for review and possible revision. If the Committee of Six thinks it appropriate, it will be brought to the Faculty for a vote. Ms. Coffey also commented that this section of the policy includes a prohibition against making a student’s work or an employee’s job more difficult because of that person’s sex, gender identity, or sexual orientation, another requirement under Title IX law.

**Amended February 26, 2013**

Ms. Coffey called the Committee's attention to the reporting requirements for College employees, including Faculty. She noted that it will be important repeatedly to emphasize to College employees—faculty, staff, adjunct faculty, student employees, and student volunteers—the legal requirement to share any report of sexual harassment or misconduct that they receive. Ms. Coffey noted that, in her current role as Title IX Coordinator, she has been in conversations with faculty members who voice some discomfort with the notion that they cannot be confidential resources for students who share reports of sexual harassment or misconduct. The new Title IX policy for reporting will clarify the legal responsibility for mandated reporting.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Hunt agreed that it will be important to continue to educate members of the community about their legal obligations under Title IX, stressing that the policy just described by Ms. Coffey is not meant to be punitive, but to meet the requirement that sexual violence be reported. It does not serve our students or our community to stay silent, President Martin commented, and the Committee agreed. Professor Ferguson asked what the legal penalties are for failing to report an incident of sexual misconduct. Professor Hunt noted that failing to report could result in an investigation of the College by the Office of Civil Rights. Individual employees of the College could also be drawn into legal cases, she added. President Martin noted that failing to report incidents of sexual assault can put students and the community at risk; if the College is not made aware that an incident has taken place, students are not offered the support they need, and information about accused assailants, who may have offended before, is not communicated to law enforcement. When the College receives a report of sexual misconduct, it is shared with the police; law enforcement then determines whether there have been previous reports of sexual misconduct involving the accused. Reporting can allow steps to be taken to prevent an individual from offending again. President Martin continued, noting that once a report of sexual misconduct is received, the Title IX team makes the complainant aware of all of the options and resources available to him or her. Students not only meet with members of the Title IX team, but are also sent a letter documenting what they have been told, as many victims of sexual misconduct can be so traumatized by their experience that it can be difficult for them to take in all of the information that is being communicated to them. If a victim of sexual assault decides to make a complaint, he or she meets with the Dean of Student Conduct to begin the adjudicatory process. The accused is informed of the complaint at that point. One of the College's investigators will later interview both the accused and the victim. The College may decide to launch an investigation, even if the complainant decides not to do so.

In terms of the hearing process, Ms. Coffey noted that students have communicated clearly and consistently that they do not want Amherst faculty members, fellow students, and administrators in the area of student life to be on the hearing board that adjudicates cases of sexual assault at Amherst. The members agreed that this idea makes sense, given the small size of the Amherst community and the high potential under the existing system that complainants and respondents will have to interact with students and faculty who have heard their cases. Ms. Coffey noted that a commitment has been made to students that the current structure of the hearing board will be changed. The proposal for the composition of the hearing board has not yet been finalized, but the format favored at this time is a board of seven members (from which three members would be drawn for each case) made up of individuals with training in sexual misconduct cases. Making use of trained colleagues at other Five-College institutions is under consideration. Trained investigators will be responsible for conducting research and interviews that will inform a hearing board's decision making.

Finally, Ms. Coffey discussed with the members the recommendations through which the Title IX Committee proposes to emphasize the responsibility of all community members to take reasonable and prudent action to prevent or stop an act of sexual harassment or misconduct. In

**Amended February 26, 2013**

particular, she called the Committee's attention to the recommendation that those community members who "choose not to take appropriate actions" may be "in violation of this policy." The sanctions for not taking action have not yet been decided, Ms. Coffey noted. Some members felt that this policy might be difficult to enforce. Ms. Coffey responded that the committee feels that it is essential to make a statement that will reinforce a community value that places importance on bystander intervention as one of many ways the members of the College community exercise collective responsibility for the safety of everyone in our community.

Ms. Coffey asked if the Committee would review the draft Title IX policy and offer feedback and said that she and her colleagues on the committee would welcome the Committee of Six's input. Professor Ratner asked what the timeframe would be to offer a response to the policy. After reviewing the potential dates for Committee meetings and Faculty Meetings, it was agreed that the members would discuss Title IX policy over their next several meetings in February and that Title IX policy would be on the agenda of a Faculty Meeting to be held on March 5, in order to put new policies in place by the time the Board next meets. The members agreed that it will be important to provide the Faculty with information about the redrafted Title IX policy, including explanations of the procedures and roles that relate directly to faculty members, to offer an overall context for the discussion; it will also be important to make clear which parts of the policy require decision making by the Faculty and to direct the Faculty's attention to them. The members agreed that relevant motions should be drafted and brought to the Faculty at the March 5 meeting. The members thanked Ms. Coffey and her colleagues on the Title IX Committee for their important and valuable work, and she left the meeting at 5 P.M.

The members continued their discussion of scheduling. The Committee decided that the March 5 Faculty Meeting should be used principally for a discussion of revisions to Title IX policy that are either required by Title IX or occasioned by the College learning about best practices in this area. It was agreed that March 26 should be set aside as a special meeting date for any follow-up needed to complete the discussion of March 5. This would mean that an April 2 meeting, and possibly an April 16 meeting, could be used for the Faculty's discussion of online learning. The Dean noted that the Board plans to discuss online learning at its April meetings, and that the Faculty's conversation could inform the Trustees' conversation. Professor Rogowski asked whether it would be possible to poll the Faculty about changing the regular meeting time for Faculty Meetings from 7:30 P.M. to 7:00 P.M. The members agreed that the Dean should do so at the next Faculty Meeting. If approved, the new meeting time should take effect in fall 2013, the members agreed. The members then turned to personnel matters.

The Committee next discussed two documents (appended) focused on the future of the library—"Towards a Vision for a New Amherst College Library," which the Dean noted is a synthesis by Bryn Geffert, Librarian of the College, of vision statements for the library that had been developed prior to his arrival, and a [proposed charge](#) for a Library Vision Committee. After some conversation, the members agreed that it makes sense to fold planning for the future of the library into the larger strategic planning process, rather than having a separate visioning committee, and that a working group that includes Mr. Geffert should be established. By including library planning in the strategic planning process, planning for the library can be integrated into planning for other projects, and can be considered in the broader context of the College's needs and priorities. Professor Rogowski commented that including the library in the strategic planning process will indicate the administration's commitment to moving forward with a new library in the future, rather than sequestering the library for separate consideration. Professor Schneider suggested that consideration of the music building also be folded into the strategic planning. President Martin informed the members that she has learned that the new Provost, Peter Uvin, who will guide planning process, has received permission from his current

**Amended February 26, 2013**

institution to begin work at Amherst on a half-time basis starting in April. Initially, it had seemed that he would not start his position at Amherst until August.

Conversation turned to the revision of the College's current [policy on research misconduct](#) (*Faculty Handbook*, XI. Appendix: Federal, State, and Local Policies and Regulations, Section B., Scientific Misconduct). The new policy, titled "[Statement of Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct](#)" (appended) must be adopted for federally funded research, in order to bring the College into compliance with the requirements of federal regulation, including but not limited to regulations issued by Department of Health and Human Services, Dean Call explained. Working with colleagues, Associate Dean Cheney made use of a [checklist](#) (appended) provided by the Office of Research Integrity to draft the policy and to ensure that all of the office's specified requirements were met. The Faculty will be asked to vote only on whether to adopt this same policy to govern non-federally funded research conducted at Amherst College, Dean Call noted. Several members of the Committee asked what had prompted the revision of the policy, wondering whether recent events might have caused the administration to revise the policy. Dean Call said that this was not the case. Assistant Dean Tobin, who prepares a required annual report on research misconduct for the Office of Research Integrity, explained that the College was notified in January 2012 that the Office of Research Integrity had decided to review Amherst's current policy, which was adopted in 1990 and which has not been revised since 1995. In December of 2012, the College was notified that the policy is not in compliance with federal regulations. After reviewing the new policy, Professor Hunt said that she is impressed with the attention that is paid to important issues in the document but slightly put off by the legalistic tone. She and Professor Harms asked if it is necessary to use the terminology of Deciding Official (DO), which the policy indicates is the Dean of the Faculty at Amherst, and Research Integrity Officer (RIO), which the policy indicates is an individual who is appointed by the Dean and who will have primary responsibility for implementation of these policies and procedures, in the new policy. Dean Call said that the Office of Research Integrity requires that these titles be used. Professor Harms encouraged the Dean to make clear in the policy how the RIO would be chosen, as the RIO appears to play a significant role in the process. She suggested that if this policy is to be adopted for all faculty, many will want assurances about who the RIO might be. The Dean noted that, normally, the RIO would be an Associate Dean of the Faculty.

The meeting concluded with a discussion of a proposal from the Library Committee that all senior theses be made available in a digital form. The proposal had initially been made in October to the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), which had expressed concern at that time about confidentiality agreements that a number of thesis writers had made with their informants. The CEP had also been concerned that the wide digital availability of theses might also make it difficult for some students, such as those in the sciences or in creative writing, to find publication venues for that work at a later time. Rick Lopez, Chair of the CEP, communicated these concerns to the Library Committee, which later put forward the [current proposal](#) (appended), which the CEP endorsed and forwarded to the Committee of Six.

Professor Rogowski expressed some concern about the effect that the proposed policy could have on students who might want to publish their thesis work, sometimes with a faculty member. He questioned whether the two embargo options that are included in the proposed policy are sufficient and wondered whether the option of making a thesis available electronically only to the Five-College community should be made available. It was noted that the policy includes an option of restricting access to on-campus users. He pointed out that, while the two embargo options make it possible to make a digital copy of a thesis available to on-campus users, there is not an option that allows for not making the thesis available electronically at all. The

**Amended February 26, 2013**

Committee noted that students could be told that the College would prefer having theses submitted electronically whenever possible, but that students have the option of not submitting theses electronically if they wish. It was the sense of the Committee that the current proposal does not suggest that paper copies of theses will no longer be collected and archived and that electronic copies will replace paper. The Committee agreed that the proposal should include actionable language, which it does not at present. The members asked the Dean inform the Library Committee that the members had a generally favorable response to the proposal, and to request that the committee develop a proposal for specific standards and procedures that would govern collecting and archiving theses in electronic formats. The Committee would then consider the motions proposed and decide whether they should be forwarded to the Faculty for consideration.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended February 28, 2013

The fifteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, February 18, 2013. Present were Professors Ferguson, Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder.

The Committee was joined by Suzanne Coffey, Director of Athletics, Title IX Coordinator, and Chair of the Title IX Committee. Ms. Coffey reviewed with the members revisions that she had made to the draft of the Title IX Committee's sexual misconduct and harassment policy recommendations, based on the feedback that the Committee had provided to her at its February 4 meeting. She thanked the members for these clarifications and commented that their advice had been very helpful. Professor Harms informed the members that she had reviewed the document carefully and had noticed that little attention is devoted to sexual harassment that is not primarily physical in nature. She suggested that the policy should provide more information about what members of the community should do if they are experiencing a pattern of behavior, such as disrespectful or sexually suggestive remarks, that meets the criteria for sexual harassment, rather than a single incident of sexual misconduct that is physical in nature, e.g., a rape. At present, the policy seems to her, to be a bit "incident-centric." For example, it might be helpful to explain that it is important for individuals to document behavior that he or she may be experiencing that seems to point to a pattern of sexual harassment. Ms. Coffey agreed that this is an important point and said that she would make revisions to the "reporting and resources" sections of the policy to incorporate Professor Harms's suggestions, clarifying how individuals should respond to this form of harassment and what resources are available to them. The Committee agreed that it would be helpful to include information that is specific and instructive, e.g., "if you are uncomfortable with something that happened in classroom, you should do the following..." Professor Hunt noted that a good deal of Title IX's emphasis of late has focused on sexual misconduct involving student-to-student interactions, though Title IX governs staff and faculty as well. Ms. Coffey once again thanked the Committee for its helpful advice.

Ms. Coffey then provided some background about the new Title IX policies that have been developed. Some Title IX policies are still in the process of being drafted, she noted. Following the events of the fall that brought heightened attention to issues of sexual misconduct on campus, members of the administration and outside experts reviewed current Title IX policy at the College, as well as the ways in which it was being communicated to the Amherst community. It was found that the policy was inconsistent and appeared in more than thirty different places on the Amherst website and in various College handbooks. To address Title IX compliance issues, including ensuring that necessary processes and procedures are in place and necessary resources are available to members of the community, a Title IX Committee was formed. A first step taken by the group, which is composed of faculty, staff, and students, was to consolidate information about [Sexual Respect and Title IX on a new website](#). The new site continues to be updated as Title IX policy evolves at the College and additional information is provided to the community about sexual respect and sexual misconduct. Since the early-fall, the committee has been working to develop a set of student-centered policies that will ensure that Amherst is in compliance with Title IX law, adheres to best practices in this area, and is consistent with the College's values. Ms. Coffey stressed that the resulting policies will continue to evolve over time and that the document that she had shared with the Committee should be seen as a living and breathing one.

Conversation turned to the process for sharing the policy with the Faculty. After some conversation, it was agreed that information should be provided to the Faculty in stages, with the

Amended February 28, 2013

most pressing issue, the student-centered policies that have been designed to align College procedure and policies with Title IX law, being presented to colleagues by the Title IX Committee at a Faculty Meeting on March 5. Some of the topics covered in the policy include definitions of sexual harassment, including information on the forms it takes; a statement on consent, coercion, incapacitation, and alcohol; the composition of the hearing board and the adjudication process for cases of sexual misconduct; confidential resources and support; reporting options; bystander intervention; and the role of the Title IX Coordinator and the Title IX Team. It was noted that the implementation of these particular policies, which must be done immediately and which are mandated by Title IX, will not require decision making by the Faculty. It was agreed that it is essential, however, that the Faculty be informed about these policies. Now and in the future, it was agreed that the College Council should be consulted about revisions to policies that fall under Title IX that govern student conduct. The members decided that policies governing faculty grievance procedures and a motion to revise the policy on Consensual Sexual Relationships between Faculty Members and Students would be brought to the Faculty at a Faculty Meeting that would be held later this semester. The Committee thanked Ms. Coffey, and she left the meeting at 4:20 P.M.

The Committee next discussed other potential agenda items for the March 5 meeting of the Faculty. It was agreed that Associate Dean Cheney should provide an introduction to the revised research misconduct policy which is titled, "[Statement of Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct](#)," (appended) that has been adopted by the College to govern federally funded research conducted at Amherst, in order to bring the College into compliance with the requirements of federal regulation, including but not limited to regulations issued by the Department of Health and Human Services. (See also the [Office of Research Integrity checklist](#).) Professor Harms suggested that, while it might make sense for the College in the future to adopt this same policy to govern all research conducted at Amherst, it would be useful to familiarize the Faculty with the purpose and details of the policy before asking colleagues to consider taking this step, which would require a vote of the Faculty to revise the current policy in the *Faculty Handbook*. Professor Harms noted that the new policy is written in a legalistic style, and she wondered if it might be possible to make stylistic changes to use language that is consistent with other Amherst policies of this kind and/or to provide an executive summary at the beginning of each of the report's sections. Professor Harms also feels that the policy should articulate who the Research Integrity Officer (RIO) will be. Dean Call said that the RIO will normally be an Associate Dean of the Faculty, unless there is a conflict of interest of some kind, and that the Deciding Official (DO), the Dean of the Faculty, would appoint the RIO. He said that he would be happy to revise the policy to reflect this.

Continuing with the discussion of the agenda, President Martin asked the members if they thought it would be informative for her to discuss the recommendations of the Special Committee on Sexual Misconduct (SMOC) as part of her remarks at the March 5 Faculty Meeting. Professor Schneider suggested that the Faculty be informed about the ways in which the College will be addressing the recommendations. The other members agreed. President Martin commented that it might be helpful to share with the Faculty, in advance of her remarks at the meeting, the sequence that is envisioned for considering each of the SMOC's recommendations and the College entities that should be part of the process, based on areas of responsibility and oversight. In addition, since some of the recommendations are already in the planning stages or are under way, while other recommendations have not yet been brought forward, the status of each recommendation could also be shared. The members agreed that this information would be informative.



Amended February 28, 2013

Continuing with the discussion of the agenda for the Faculty Meeting, the President broached the topic of athletics in the context of the conversation about the SMOC's recommendations and/or Title IX. The Committee agreed that, while athletics should be considered as part of broader discussions about student life that will be a central part of the strategic planning process, it seems inappropriate to focus on athletics in the context of a consideration of Title IX and sexual misconduct. Professor Ferguson asked if there is any evidence that athletic teams play more of a role in sexual misconduct on campus than any other student group. Professor Hunt said that, after reviewing cases of sexual misconduct at Amherst over the past decade, as well as survey data, the SMOC came to the conclusion that members of athletic teams, in proportion to their numbers in the student body, are no more likely to commit sexual misconduct than people who are not members of athletic teams. Professor Ferguson expressed the view that the Faculty should be very careful to avoid identifying and targeting a subset of the student body for investigation without evidence that points to the necessity for doing so. Professor Rogowski stressed that all members of the Amherst community, including athletes, should feel that they are included and respected. The other members, the President, and the Dean agreed.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call informed the members that the Lecture Committee has nominated Adam Sitze, Assistant Professor of Law, Jurisprudence and Social Thought, 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 Sitze's lecture is set for Tuesday, April 9, at 4:30 P.M., in the Alumni House. The Committee then turned briefly to a nomination for a working group.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Schneider asked why some committee nominations appear on the Faculty Meeting agenda and others do not. The Dean responded that the (faculty) members of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), the College Council, the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR), the Adjudication Committee, and the Discipline Committee are elected by the Faculty. Other standing faculty committees are appointed, not elected. President Martin next updated the members on the progress of the search for a new Dean of Students and asked for their feedback on the candidates for the position with whom they had met. President Martin said that she would be making a decision about the position very soon.

Continuing with "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Ratner asked the President about her meeting with the leader of a student group that had requested funding from the College for a fundraiser for an outside non-profit group. President Martin said that she had met with the student and had informed him that the College would not provide funding for anything other than the expenses associated with the speakers who would come to campus. Professor Ratner noted that he had been particularly disturbed to read that plans had called for those who made large donations to enjoy different tiers of participation in the event, and in particular a greater extent of interaction with the speakers, based on the level of their support. President Martin agreed that the College should not host or support fundraisers for outside groups on campus, though of course there are no constraints on groups that wish to do so off campus, for example, at the Lord Jeffery Inn. Professor Ratner next raised a question about draft language in a motion to revise the *Faculty Handbook* language concerning consensual sexual relationships. Since the motion will not be on the agenda for the March 5 Faculty Meeting, the members agreed to discuss the language at a future meeting.

Turning to another question, Professor Rogowski raised concern about the impact of the decision to have Amherst's Spring semester start earlier than it has in the past, a decision that

Amended February 28, 2013

was made when the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, made the unilateral decision to begin its semester early. He noted that Smith College has recently decided to reinstate a later starting date, and he wondered whether Amherst might do so as well. Professor Rogowski commented that there is some evidence that the early start date puts Amherst students at a disadvantage in regard to their schedule for January internships, field work, travel, and senior thesis research. He expressed the view that the earlier start has reduced the time that faculty have available for preparing Spring semester courses, and that it places pressure on Academic Department Coordinators, who must complete book orders, secure copyrights, and prepare course readers with less time. In addition, he said, the compressed timeframe puts considerable strain on staff in the Library and IT, who need to complete projects such as re-shelving books, setting up course reserves of both print and electronic resources, and getting course websites and classroom technology equipment up and running prior to the start of the Spring semester.

Dean Call noted that Amherst has tried to “split the difference” with other Five-College schools in terms of the start of the Spring semester, starting its spring semester after UMass, Mount Holyoke, and Hampshire, but before Smith, in order to maintain a schedule that enables Amherst students to take classes on other campuses. The Dean said that he has had some concern about the long five-day reading period this spring, which will delay the start and end of exams, and which will result in less time between the end of exams and the deadline for submitting grades for seniors. He noted that for many years the reading period during the Spring term had been just two days. The Dean said that he had asked the College Council to consider reducing the reading period to four days, which would have enabled exams to start on a Monday, as they usually have in the spring, and that the Council had declined to do so. He noted that, under the calendar that has already been voted by the Faculty, about five out of every seven years Amherst would start on Thursday instead of the following Monday, and the Spring semester would end on a Wednesday, instead of a Friday, making for a shorter Interterm and a longer reading period. Professor Harms, who has concerns over the shortened Interterm, expressed the view that it might be necessary to see how the experiment with this Interterm schedule works for the three-year period that has been approved by the Faculty and to evaluate the impact of this change to the calendar before continuing with it. Professor Ratner, who shared Professor Rogowski’s disappointment with the shortened Interterm, agreed that the impact of the change should be assessed, sooner rather than later. Particularly since Smith has made the decision not to follow UMass’s changes to the calendar, Professor Rogowski expressed the view that the Committee of Six should request that the College Council evaluate the effects of the early-Spring semester start date and shortened Interterm with sufficient time to inform the calendar proposal for 2015-18 that will be brought to the Faculty, or even to consider revising the calendar for 2014-2015 (which has been voted already) by bringing the issue to the Faculty for a vote.

In a related matter, Professor Schneider said that it is his impression that deadlines for providing information about courses for the Course Catalog are getting earlier and earlier. In his view, this results in more work, as departments rush to provide information to which they must make multiple changes later. Professor Hunt agreed that the schedule for submission has become quite problematic. The Dean agreed to research this matter and to report back to the Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call

Amended February 28, 2013

Dean of the Faculty

Amended March 1, 2013

The sixteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by Dean Call in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, February 25, 2013. Present were Professors Ferguson, Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. President Martin, who was traveling for the College, participated in the meeting via speaker phone.

The members reviewed a revised draft of a summary of the recommendations of the Special Oversight Committee on Sexual Misconduct (SMOC), in anticipation of sharing this organizational tool with the Faculty to inform discussion at the March 5 Faculty Meeting. The document offers a timeline for the consideration or implementation of the SMOC's recommendations and identifies offices and committees that could be responsible for considering the recommendations; developing a process for consultation with relevant constituencies, where appropriate; and following through (or not) on the SMOC's suggested changes. President Martin noted that, in some cases, particularly as part of those recommendations that concern legal compliance and student well-being, considerable work has already been done. In most cases, however, there is a great deal more to do, she said. The recommendations summarized in the document (the final version of which is appended [here](#)) were divided into those that are already in progress, those that will be taken up this semester and through the summer, and those that will become part of a longer planning process. This proposed sequencing remains open to suggestion and change, President Martin noted. The members offered a number of suggestions to clarify the document, and the President thanked the Committee for these useful revisions.

Discussion turned to the Library Committee's recommendation that the Faculty adopt an open-access policy and the committee's proposed motion. The Committee raised some questions about definitions and procedures within the motion. The members requested that Mr. Geffert, Librarian of the College, be asked to address the question of whether only those authors who do not request a waiver need to deposit an (electronic) article. (Mr. Geffert later confirmed that, if the open-access policy is adopted, this would indeed be the case, and he revised the final version of the motion to clarify this point.) Mr. Geffert also later responded to some members' concern about the meaning of the word *irrevocable*, which appears in the motion (see below). Mr. Geffert informed the members that, in the motion, *irrevocable* does not mean that authors cannot change the rights that they may grant to Amherst; because authors may request a waiver, and because the policy does not specify when they may request a waiver, authors may, at any point—now or in the future—*revoke* Amherst's right to distribute a given article. Mr. Geffert noted that those who oversee the open-access policy at Harvard strongly suggest retaining the word *irrevocable* as a means of protecting authors and Amherst from the machinations of publishers. The motion, in its final form, appears below. The members voted four in favor and zero opposed on the substance of the motion. Two members abstained. The Committee voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the motion to the Faculty. The members also voted six in favor and zero opposed to forward the Faculty Meeting agenda to the Faculty.

Motion:

Open-Access Policy<sup>1</sup>

The Faculty of Amherst College is committed to disseminating the fruits of its research and scholarship as widely as possible. In keeping with that commitment, the Faculty adopts the following policy: Each Faculty member grants<sup>2</sup> to Amherst College permission to make available his or her scholarly articles<sup>3</sup> and to exercise the copyright in those articles.<sup>4</sup> More specifically, each Faculty member grants<sup>5</sup>

Amended March 1, 2013

to Amherst College a nonexclusive, irrevocable,<sup>6</sup> worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright<sup>7</sup> relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, provided that the articles are not sold for a profit, and to authorize others, including Faculty members<sup>8</sup>, to do the same. The policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while the person is a member of the Faculty except for any articles completed before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the Faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy. The Dean of the Faculty or Dean of the Faculty's designate will waive<sup>9</sup> application of the policy for a particular article or delay access for a specified period of time upon express direction<sup>10</sup> by a Faculty member.

Each Faculty member will provide an electronic copy of the author's final version<sup>11</sup> of each article for which no waiver has been directed no later than the date of its publication<sup>12</sup> at no charge to the appropriate representative of the Dean of the Faculty's Office in an appropriate format (such as PDF) specified by the Dean of the Faculty's Office.

The Dean of the Faculty's Office may make the article available to the public in an open-access repository. The Office of the Dean of the Faculty will be responsible for interpreting this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending changes to the Faculty from time to time.

(Endnotes relating to this motion appear at the end of the minutes.)

At 4:10 P.M., the Committee was joined by Professors de la Carrera, Hall, O'Hara, and Sarat, and Mr. Lieber, Dean of Academic Support and Student Research, all of whom served on the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising. Dean Call thanked the Ad Hoc Committee for meeting with the Committee of Six and apologized that the Committee's schedule had not permitted the meeting to take place earlier. The members also expressed gratitude to the Ad Hoc Committee for all the work that the committee had done on its report.

Beginning the conversation, Professor Harms asked if the Ad Hoc Committee had changed any of its views and/or recommendations about advising since it had completed its [report](#) (appended) in July of 2011. Professor O'Hara, co-chair of the Ad Hoc Committee, noted that, while the Ad Hoc Committee put forward recommendations and offered some models for consideration, the members recognize that there are many approaches that could help to improve advising at Amherst and are open to all ideas. She stressed that the broad and fundamental questions about advising that the Ad Hoc Committee was charged to explore, which guided its research, deliberations, and conclusions, remain. It is the hope of the Ad Hoc Committee that its report, will stimulate further conversation and consideration of this important topic.

Professor O'Hara expressed hope that the report of the Ad Hoc Committee would serve as a starting point for continued dialogue about what the advising experience at Amherst should and could be. The committee suggested that an organizing principle for such a discussion should be that advising at Amherst should be concerned with more than just course selection. The Ad Hoc Committee's view is that the advising experience should be an important part of the academic program, a moment for a faculty member and a student to reflect together on the student's educational experience and goals. Continuing, Professor O'Hara commented that the

Amended March 1, 2013

Ad Hoc Committee's conclusion was that the current advising system fails to meet an expectation, shared by many members of the community, that advising should do more than address the nuts and bolts of course selection. Professor Sarat, the other co-chair of the Ad Hoc Committee, noted that advising is particularly important at Amherst because of the open curriculum and the lack of structure imposed on students as part of an Amherst education. In addition, Professor Sarat commented, he feels that it will be important for the College to explore the impact that online registration may be having on advising.

Professor Ratner expressed support for the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendation that greater emphasis be placed on setting and supporting student learning goals as part of the advising experience, but he noted his great concern that the committee was proposing to do so at the expense of advising within the major. He wondered whether it would be possible to retain the major advising system and to encourage major advisors to broaden their advising perspective to include a focus on learning goals; the issue of the disparity in number of advisees across the College would have to be addressed in other ways. Professor Sarat responded that the Ad Hoc Committee had developed its proposal to reorient the advising system—toward continuity with the same adviser over the course of four years—as a means of addressing the problem of the unevenness of the Faculty's advising loads. Professor Hunt commented that, in its conversations about the report, the Committee had supported the idea of incorporating learning goals into advising conversations. The members had expressed the concern that an aspiration expressed in the report seemed to be that faculty, in the course of the “teachable moment” of advising, would be expected to focus more on the private lives of students than has been the case in the past. She noted that some of the members of the Committee worried that the proposed new emphasis on advising outside the major could encourage faculty members to attempt to intervene in areas of student life (mental health, etc.) that few faculty members are trained to deal with. She expressed the view that it will be important to identify what should and what should not be part of the advising relationship, and the system's educational mission. For example, what are the questions and topics that would be discussed with students over the lengthy time (year-after-year) that advisors would be getting to know students, under the Ad Hoc Committee's proposal?

Professor Sarat suggested that it might be helpful to frame the present conversation by noting that, within the world of advising, the Ad Hoc Committee's proposal is a “moderate” one. He noted that the College's current advising system is rooted in course selection, but that there are many other models of advising in which the charge of the advisor also places emphasis on addressing students' cocurricular lives, which is inevitably intertwined with their academic ones. He noted that the pilot project that Amherst undertook from 2008 to 2010 explored a less registration-oriented form of advising. The focus of that experiment was on advisors and advisees working on identifying what students wanted to achieve, gathering feedback from their professors about students' progress on their learning goals, and developing plans for the future. Professor Sarat said that, in his experience over the two years, there was a good deal for advisors and their advisees to talk about. Conversation did not spill over into students' personal lives unless personal issues were affecting students' ability to meet their learning goals.

Professor Harms expressed the view that, under the current advising system, many advisors and advisees have meaningful conversations about students' learning goals. She commented that problems with advising at Amherst more likely stem from the failures of some advisors, than from the system that is in place. She asked why the committee had chosen to recommend a major change to the advising system rather than addressing what could be done to improve faculty advising skills. While it was agreed that there is likely a cohort of faculty who are not invested in advising or who may not feel well prepared for that duty, the Ad Hoc Committee and most members of the Committee concurred that excluding some faculty from

Amended March 1, 2013

advising would have more costs than benefits. Doing so would certainly not address the uneven advising loads of faculty. Professor Sarat noted that Amherst's advising system is currently focused on course selection and that the realities of such a system have an impact. A conversation with an advisor who has forty advisees will not be the same as a conversation with an advisor who has a more manageable number, for example. The Ad Hoc Committee surveyed the student body about advising (there was a 53 percent return, with all classes equally represented). Professor Sarat noted that more than 50 percent of the respondents reported that they had met with their advisors during pre-registration and add/drop for fifteen minutes or less. He explained that adopting a different view of what advising should be would go a long way toward improving the quality of advising, in an overall sense. Professor Hunt commented that, while many faculty members, including herself, could benefit from discussions about advising and could learn to be better advisors, she believes that improvements could be made without overhauling the current advising system as drastically as the report suggests.

Conversation turned to the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendation that overseeing advising become the responsibility of an Associate Dean within the Dean of the Faculty's office. The idea would be that the Associate Dean, who would serve as a mentor for advising at the College, would coordinate advising-focused training and other programs aimed at both new and experienced advisors. In addition, the Associate Dean of Advising would be responsible for developing materials for students and informing them of the nature of the advising process, according to the proposal. Professor O'Hara noted that, at present, advising-related activities are distributed among a number of offices, and, as a result, advising is not handled systematically. A lack of coordination has also made it difficult to evaluate and address the inequities in the advising system, in her view. Professor O'Hara commented that there are few incentives for faculty to devote significant attention to advising, under the current system.

The Ad Hoc Committee's proposal that students no longer be assigned to a major advisor was the next topic of conversation. Professor Sarat commented that major advising is most closely involved with course selection. Having a substantive advising relationship, with a focus on students' learning goals and on continuity, was seen as more important than maintaining the system of major advising, in the Ad Hoc Committee's view. Professor Sarat expressed the view that the role of a major advisor is not all that different than that of a College advisor, noting that students, after declaring a major, continue to take courses outside the major. They also rely on major advisors for guidance about courses that are spread across the curriculum, just as they do from College advisors. Under the Ad Hoc Committee's proposal, directors of studies in each department could be available to students who are seeking advice and help in navigating their major requirements. Professor Harms took strong exception to the proposal to eliminate major advising. She gets to know her advisees as individuals—their strengths, challenges, and aspirations—through her experiences with them in her classes. Professor Sarat stressed that some major advisors have as many as fifty-four advisees and that the type of relationship that Professor Harms had described, which is to be admired, is difficult to replicate under such circumstances.

Professor Rogowski suggested that departments that carry a great burden in terms of advising majors be relieved from College advising. At present, Professor O'Hara noted, faculty in departments with a high number of majors are often not assigned College advisees. In addition, if a faculty member has more than the average number (12.7) of College advisees, Professor O'Hara does not assign them additional advisees unless they ask for them by volunteering to do orientation advising. There is, however, no cap on the number of advisees an individual faculty member can have. Professor Hall commented that the intention of the Ad Hoc Committee's proposed advising system is not to replace the close relationship that faculty

Amended March 1, 2013

develop with students in their classes, such as that mentioned earlier by Professor Harms. The goal of the new system would be to supplement that relationship and to address the inequities among departments in terms of the demands placed on them by the advising role. Professor Harms responded that the proposal to eliminate major advisors is unnecessarily radical and would increase the amount of time spent on advising, since it would increase rather than decrease the number of effective advisees for which she was responsible. Professor Hall agreed, noting that the increased time devoted to advising in all of its forms was a desired outcome of the proposal. Professor Schneider suggested that decisions about ways to structure advising within departments, such as whether to have a director of studies, could be left up to departments. He said that he would hesitate to legislate substantial changes to the advising system, when adopting slight ameliorating techniques might result in the necessary improvements. Professor Sarat argued that inequities will continue to be built into the advising system, if departments decide principles that should govern the advising practices of the College as a whole. He expressed the view that systems matter.

Professor Hunt asked what the Ad Hoc Committee saw as the greatest benefit of continuity within the advising relationship. While she was surprised by the frequency in the turnover of advisors among students, as described in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee, she sees some benefit to having students gain the perspectives of a number of different advisors during their time in college. Professor Sarat responded that the advantage of continuity in the advising relationship is that advisors get to know their advisees. Professor Ratner suggested that, to address the problem with discontinuity in the major advising system, which results from leaves, chairs could make more of an effort, at the time a major advisor is assigned, to pair students with faculty who have just returned from leave. He noted that leaves also would result in some discontinuity in the Ad Hoc Committee's proposed system, which would make use of College advisors only.

Professor Ferguson wondered whether it is always best to employ highly individualized approaches to advising. He offered the view that it might be effective and efficient to adopt group structures when conveying information that is not particular to individual students. For example, defining learning goals and how one should go about meeting them would be a topic that could be conveyed to a group of students. Professor O'Hara noted that a group advising model is certainly practiced by some colleagues successfully, but she expressed the view that it cannot substitute for individualized advising. It is especially difficult, for example, to use a group model when students are new to Amherst and most often do not feel comfortable speaking in front of their peers. Professor O'Hara said that she does not feel that advising in groups will solve the problems of structure and approach that characterize Amherst's advising system. The Ad Hoc Committee strongly supports a system that fosters individualized conversation between an advisor and student that focuses on reflections on the past and goals for the future.

Professor Hunt suggested that the pervasiveness of double majors is contributing to the inequities of the advising systems, since individual students have an advisor for each major at present. The problem, she argued, is not just that more advisors are needed under this structure, but that advising double majors is challenging because they have very few options in terms of course-taking, if they wish to complete their major requirements. While the job of an advisor is to encourage breadth as well as depth, there is not space to do so in this sort of advising relationship. She wondered if the College might consider adopting minors and discouraging double—and for that matter, triple—majors.

Returning to the discussion of an advising system that would focus on learning goals, Professor Hall stressed that advisors should have conversations with students about learning goals that are independent of course selection. In his view, the focus of an advising relationship



Amended March 1, 2013

should be on what students are aspiring to get out of their education and how they can accomplish their goals, and that could include whether they are best served by double-majoring. Professor Rogowski said that he sees an intractable structural problem on both sides. The College cannot mandate that students take particular courses and cannot force faculty to do certain kinds of advising. Neither problem would disappear under the Ad Hoc Committee's proposed system, in his view. As possible paths to improvement, he commented that group advising could be workable for certain purposes and that faculty could decide that advising responsibilities should be distributed more equitably among faculty/departments. Professor Sarat said that, in his view, the advising system should foster deep relationships between advisors and advisees that encourage students to be engaged in meaningful ways with the choices that they are making. Advising conversations would be more helpful for students if faculty put in place a comprehensive system that encouraged these kinds of relationships and interactions. He offered the example of the Faculty deciding that more attention needed to be given to students' writing and putting in place a system for providing this instruction through the First-Year Seminar Program.

Professor Hall said that the constraints of the current advising system are real. He noted that there are no easy solutions and that there are trade-offs to all systems, including the one proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee. Establishing the values that are the most important, and which can serve as the foundation of an advising system, can only be accomplished through a broader conversation, in his view. He pointed out that the committee's report was a proof-of-principle, that there is at least one solution that can balance the major inequities of the current advising system while at the same time creating new advising opportunities. He hoped that further conversations would identify other solutions. Professor Ratner said that he favors trying to create a system that would incorporate a discussion of learning goals for both college and major advising. Professor Hall said that the inequities of the current system, in which many students are only meeting for fewer than fifteen minutes with their advisors, make the assurance of such conversations impossible under the current structure. Professor Hunt would support having only one advisor for double majors, a step that would alleviate some of the burdens placed on advisors. Professor O'Hara said that, while taking that approach may sound attractive from the point of view of discouraging double majors and alleviating some of the burden on advisors, some members of the Ad Hoc Committee worried about some of the effects of adopting this model, particularly on language departments, which students often view as a "second" major. It was felt by some that a likely result of adopting the single advisor-model, which would call for the advisor to be in the smaller of the two departments in which a student might wish to double major, would be that students would declare a major in the larger of their two departments and delay declaring a major in the smaller department until the last minute. In this way, they could keep their advisor in the major that they considered to be their primary one, which is often the larger department.

Professor O'Hara reiterated that the committee's report should be viewed as the beginning of a conversation and noted that many of the recommendations of the SMOC touch on advising and will likely be discussed in the context of considering and moving forward with those recommendations. Venues need to be found to have a dialogue about these and other issues, all agreed. Professor Rogowski expressed the view that not all students will navigate the open curriculum with equal ease, and that it is possible that, for some students, experiencing some discomfort and disorientation as part of their educational experience will aid in their personal growth. He argued against legislating in the pursuit of perfection, noting that the surveys provided in the Ad Hoc Committee's report suggest that it is a relatively small number of students who are dissatisfied with advising. Professor Sarat said that he is less concerned with

Amended March 1, 2013

student satisfaction and more concerned that the College is offering advising that will broaden students' perspectives and meet their educational needs. He also noted that the current advising model was put in place for a student body that is far less diverse than it is now, so that the context within which advising occurs has changed significantly. Professor Harms expressed some concern that an emphasis on learning goals may lead some students to view such goals as a "game plan," with targets that should not change during their time at Amherst.

The Dean expressed support for facilitating further discussion about advising. Professor Harms suggested that the Committee of Six and the Ad Hoc Committee think together about how to move the conversation forward. It was agreed that conversations in small groups, such as the discussion planned as part of the Teaching and Advising Program, on March 1, are informative. In addition, it was agreed that it would be helpful to have a broader conversation at a Faculty Meeting and/or an open meeting. After considering a number of possibilities, it was decided to have a discussion about advising and the Ad Hoc Committee's report at an upcoming Faculty Meeting. The Committee of Six could then consider how best to move forward with a topic that all agreed is a central part of the College's educational mission. The Ad Hoc Committee left the meeting at 5:30 P.M. The Committee then turned briefly to a personnel matter and a committee nomination.

Dean Call reported back to the Committee about his inquiries on their behalf in regard to whether the deadline for submitting course proposals has changed over time. He summarized a report from Nancy Ratner, Researcher for Academic Projects, which was later shared with the Committee of Six. Ms. Ratner reported that there has been some course proposal deadline creep—from February 8 in 2008 and 2010, to February 4 in 2011, to January 28 this year. At times, the deadline has changed based on whether a Friday or a Monday was chosen for the deadline, she said. A more dramatic change occurred in 2009-2010, based on a request from the Registrar, and approved by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), to move the catalog reporting for ongoing courses earlier. At the time of the request, all catalog copy had been due in early-February. This meant that a flood of information came in to the Registrar all at once. In order to spread out the work of entering, checking, and double-checking course entries, it was agreed that the Registrar would request that department chairs submit to the Registrar's Office those courses that they knew that their department/program would be offering the next year by mid-November. As was the case for years, departments were asked to indicate which semester(s) the course would be offered or if it would be omitted for the year, the instructor(s), and any minor changes in the course description. This step was taken to make adding new courses to the catalog, as they are approved in the spring, much easier and more expeditious. While it was recognized that there would be unanticipated changes to existing courses after mid-November, it was thought to be easier to incorporate these changes as they arose, if the Registrar's Office had the bulk of the courses that were not changing already in their data base. By spreading the work out over several months, rather than concentrating it in several weeks, it was thought that errors could be reduced. Ms. Ratner reported that courses continue to be submitted to the CEP into August. The committee, she noted, is constrained by having to complete its review of the courses at least a week prior to a Faculty Meeting so that approval can be obtained prior to pre-registration. That review takes several CEP meetings, and Ms. Ratner must complete her review (and communications with faculty members) before the CEP review. Hence the slightly earlier date. The Committee continued to have questions about this issue and asked the Dean to invite the Registrar and/or Ms. Ratner to meet with the members at an upcoming meeting. He agreed to do so.

President Martin said that she was pleased to announce that James Larimore had accepted the position of Dean of Students and would begin work at the College on a part-time basis in

Amended March 1, 2013

April. He would assume the position full time this summer. The Committee expressed its enthusiasm for the appointment.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

<sup>1</sup> This policy is based on the work of Stuart Shieber at Harvard University and informed by the policies voted by several Harvard faculties, as well as MIT, the Stanford University School of Education, Duke University, and others. Like those policies, it includes a freely waivable rights-retaining license and a deposit requirement. The annotations derive in large part from Shieber's annotations to the Harvard resolution. Further information explaining the motivation for and implementation of the Harvard open-access policies is available at the web site of Harvard's Office for Scholarly Communication (<http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/>).

<sup>2</sup> *grants*: The wording here is crucial. The policy directly causes the grant of the license. We avoid wording such as "each Faculty member shall grant," which would place a requirement on faculty members but not actually cause the grant itself.

<sup>3</sup> *scholarly articles*: The scope of the policy is scholarly articles. What constitutes a scholarly article is purposefully vague. Clearly falling within the scope of the term are (using terms from the Budapest Open Access Initiative) articles that describe the fruits of scholars' research and that they give to the world for the sake of inquiry and knowledge without expectation of payment. Such articles are typically presented in peer-reviewed scholarly journals and conference proceedings. Clearly falling outside of the scope are a wide variety of other scholarly writings such as books and commissioned articles, as well as popular writings, fiction and poetry, and pedagogical materials (lecture notes, lecture videos, case studies). We are not concerned that the term is not (and cannot be) precisely defined; an exact delineation of every case is neither possible nor necessary. If concerns arise that a particular article inappropriately falls within the purview of the policy, a waiver can always be obtained.

<sup>4</sup> *exercise the copyright to those articles*. Any article authored by Amherst faculty after the passage of this policy becomes subject to the policy. The language in this policy trumps any agreement the author might sign with a publisher, even if that agreement purports to grant that publisher exclusive rights to the published article. In other words, a Faculty member cannot sign away Amherst College's rights to his or her article, unless s/he invokes a waiver.

<sup>5</sup> *grants*: Again, not "shall grant."

<sup>6</sup> *irrevocable* - "Irrevocable" is designed to protect the author and the College, by making it difficult for any given publisher that receives a transfer of copyright from the author, to then turn around and attempt to revoke the author's right to enable Amherst to distribute that article on behalf of the author. "Irrevocable" does not in any way trump the author's right to direct that a waiver be granted for any of the author's articles (see below), either at the point of publication or at some point in the future.

<sup>7</sup> *exercise any and all rights under copyright*: The license is purposefully broad. Such language ensures, for example, that Amherst can allow the articles to be crawled and indexed by search engines, and that Amherst can permit anybody with an Internet connection to view the articles.

<sup>8</sup> *authorize others, including faculty members*: The transferability provision is key. It allows Amherst College to authorize the Amherst faculty to make use of their own articles, for instance, to legally distribute their articles from their own web sites, to use them for their classes, to develop derivative works, and the like. In other words, granting a license to the College is a roundabout but powerful way of ensuring that faculty members retain those rights themselves—rights they almost never retain on their own when signing contracts with publishers. The happy irony of this policy is that—in granting rights to the College—Amherst faculty grant rights to themselves they almost never enjoyed before.

Amended March 1, 2013

<sup>9</sup>*will waive*: Not “may waive.” The waiver is at the sole discretion of the author. The author’s ability to waive the license means that the policy is not a mandate for rights retention, but merely a change in the default rights retention from “opt-in” to “opt-out.” We trust that any concerns about academic freedom, about unintended effects on junior faculty, or about threats to principled libertarian stands, should be assuaged by this broad waiver. Those in favor of stringent open-access policies might note that this policy could be “stronger” without the broad waiver provision—for instance, if waivers were vetted according to some evaluation criteria. We believe, however, that it is best to build this automatic safety valve into the policy rather than to risk creating an evaluation process that could be perceived as bureaucratic or confrontational.

<sup>10</sup>*direction*: We use “direction” rather than “request” to make clear that the request cannot be denied.

<sup>11</sup>*author’s final version*: The author’s final version—the version after the article has gone through peer review and the revisions responsive thereto and any further copyediting in which the author has participated—is the appropriate version to request for distribution. Authors may legitimately not want to provide versions earlier than the final version, and insofar as there are additional rights in the publisher’s definitive version beyond the author’s final version, that version would not fall within the license that the author grants.

<sup>12</sup>*no later than the date of its publication*: The distribution of articles pursuant to this policy is not intended to preempt journal publication but to supplement it.

Amended March 20, 2013

The seventeenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 10:00 A.M. on Wednesday, March 6, 2013. Present were Professors Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Ferguson was absent.

The members, the President, and the Dean offered praise for the substantive and informative discourse that had characterized the March 5 Faculty Meeting, during which important business had been accomplished effectively and efficiently. After the Dean and some members commented that they had been contacted by some colleagues about the possible complications of adopting a 7 P.M. starting time for Faculty Meetings, the Committee agreed to discuss this proposal further. While a majority of faculty had indicated their support for this change in a straw poll at the March 5 Faculty Meeting, the Committee felt that concerns that the earlier time could have a negative impact on faculty with young children should be considered before any final decision is made. They agreed to discuss this issue at an upcoming Committee of Six meeting. With sadness, the President then shared with the members the news of the death earlier in the day of Pema Tsering, a custodian at the College. She then discussed a personnel matter with the Committee.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," the Dean reported back on two committee nominations. Dean Call informed the members that Associate Dean Griffiths would complete his second term as Associate Dean of the Faculty at the end of this academic year, and that Professor Sarat will join the Dean's office as an Associate Dean this summer.

At 10:20 A.M., the Committee was joined by Kathleen Goff, Registrar, and Nancy Ratner, Researcher for Academic Projects, for a discussion about concerns that have arisen about the deadlines for submitting course proposals and information about course scheduling. Ms. Goff noted that the deadlines for submitting course information in the spring have been the same for the last four years. She explained that she and her colleagues develop this deadline by working backward from the dates by which courses must be visible to students during the advising period, and the need to meet deadlines for completion of the course catalog, taking into account the time that her office needs to process this information and build course schedules. Ms. Goff said that the deadline is somewhat flexible, noting that departments have the ability to make changes after their initial submissions. In addition to being helpful to the Registrar to receive this information by the deadline, it is also useful to the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), which must review and approve course proposals in time for the courses to be made available by the beginning of advising week, Ms. Ratner noted. She informed the members that, since the CEP plans to shift the deadline for FTE requests to late-November next year (as noted in this year's FTE request for proposals letter to department chairs), which will mean that its review of course proposals will no longer take place at the same time as its consideration of FTE requests, it may be possible to delay the deadline by a week or ten days for course proposals. A later deadline would be difficult because of the need to have the course information in time for advising week and pre-registration. Professor Hunt asked if it would be possible to shift the schedule so that advising week occurs later than it does at present. Ms. Goff responded that the pre-registration periods of the Five Colleges need to be aligned, so this would not be possible. Professor Harms stressed that departments need time to meet at the beginning of the Spring semester for the purpose of course planning, which is difficult to accomplish when the deadline for submitting course information is so early. It is particularly challenging for departments to determine, without more time for discussion, the courses that they would like to teach during the spring of the following academic year. Professor Ratner agreed that the deadline that is used in the spring should allow sufficient time for departments to meet at least twice during the start of the Spring semester for the discussion of courses. Ms. Ratner noted that she had checked with four large

Amended March 20, 2013

departments about whether this year's deadline would be problematic and had been told the slightly earlier deadline would not present a problem. The two smaller departments that subsequently requested additional time were each accommodated with extensions. She hadn't realized that the deadline had been problematic for other departments. Professor Hunt noted that the current deadline comes at the same time that many departments are very busy interviewing candidates, if searches are under way. It was noted that this year's Spring semester started earlier than it had in the past, which may have contributed to the feeling of many that the time period for submitting course proposals and considering course scheduling was particularly compressed.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Schneider said that the deadline may not have changed in recent years, but he believes that it is now earlier than it was during his early years at the College. He suspects that it has been moving to an earlier date gradually. He expressed concern that this year's deadline placed a great deal of stress on Academic Department Coordinators, a view shared by Professors Rogowski and Hunt. Ms. Goff asked the Committee what changes could be made to reduce this stress and improve the process. Professor Hunt noted that it is particularly challenging to look a year ahead to consider what a department might wish to teach in spring. She wondered if the deadlines for submission of materials for the Fall and Spring semesters might be disjoined, with the one for spring courses occurring later in the Spring semester. Professor Hunt also commented that it takes more and more time to complete the course proposal forms and the process for bringing them before the Faculty for a vote. She noted that the CEP now often asks for clarification or additional information after the form is initially submitted, which can create a bottleneck in the process. At the same time, Professor Hunt said, she understands that the CEP needs to do so for a variety of reasons, one of which is to ascertain faculty members' reasons for limiting their classes; placing limits seems to be a growing trend. Ms. Ratner confirmed that there has been a steady increase in the number of courses with enrollment caps in all departments. She noted that the CEP is planning to have a discussion about this issue, and its implications, with the Faculty. It was noted that another trend is that more and more courses are being offered one day a week or two times a week; fewer and fewer are being offered three days a week.

Ms. Goff said that it would be possible to offer more time to departments by making the deadline for submission of information a week later. She commented that, while it would be possible to separate the deadlines for submitting the time schedules for fall and spring courses, creating a later deadline for the spring information, the deadline for letting the Registrar know what courses will be offered in fall and spring cannot be separated because of the deadline for the course catalogue. Professor Schneider asked why the times of classes for next spring need to be identified so early after the start of Interterm. Ms. Goff replied that this year, there was a need to have extra time to identify and address potential conflicts, in terms of time slots and locations, in the proposed schedule, since the upcoming construction of the new science center will present challenges in terms of scheduling classes. Professor Harms noted that the deadlines for the pieces of information under discussion used to be staggered, and the work to meet them was once done in stages. A staggered set of deadlines would enable departments to make decisions in a staggered way. Requiring that all decisions be made at the same time creates an unmanageable situation, in her view.

Continuing, Ms. Goff acknowledged that the language used in the request to departments perhaps suggested that information would be required, when in some cases the intention was to convey that it would be helpful to her office to receive information. Professor Hunt said that even knowing the reasoning behind the request, i.e., that the construction would have implications for scheduling would have been useful to departments. She agreed that it would be

Amended March 20, 2013

best if the language of future requests from the Registrar is clear in terms of what information is required by the deadlines set and which is merely optional.

Conversation turned to the Registrar's suggestion that a way be found to confer the degrees of E-graduates and provide them with diplomas earlier than is possible at present. The Registrar explained to the Committee that the Faculty and Board often do not vote to award degrees to E-graduates until April, though these students have completed their requirements at the time that grades are submitted for Fall semester. In the past, it had been possible for these students to satisfy employers and/or visa-granting entities that they had completed their degrees by sharing a letter from the Registrar that validated that they had completed the requirements for the degree. The Registrar noted that, increasingly, such a letter is deemed insufficient in these cases. In the case of students who are applying for jobs in other countries, companies often require a notarized diploma. The Registrar expressed the view, and the members agreed, that the College has a responsibility to confer degrees as soon as possible after students have completed the graduation requirements. The Dean noted that Mr. Murphy, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, has expressed his willingness to have the Board vote electronically so that these degrees can be awarded earlier. Typically, the Faculty has not been able to vote on the degrees until after the January Board meeting, which means that the degrees of E-grads are not approved by the Board at its January meeting. Professor Ratner commented that, while it would not be his preference that the Faculty vote electronically on these degrees, he recognized that, on a practical level, it might make sense to do so. He noted that there is rarely faculty discussion prior to the votes on degree cases. Professor Harms argued against moving to an electronic vote by the Faculty. She expressed the view that, to avoid a "rubber stamp" approach, and in the spirit of making degree votes meaningful, a Faculty Meeting should be held at the beginning of the semester each spring. At this meeting, the Faculty could vote on the degrees of E-graduates and conduct other business. Professor Hunt agreed that this would be a good solution and suggested that the meeting would also be a time to welcome colleagues back from leave, as is done at the Labor Day Faculty Meeting. Professors Hunt and Harms agreed that, in the past, when questions have been raised about degree cases during Faculty Meetings, broader issues have often emerged that the Faculty then addresses, for example the system for awarding honors. The other members agreed that starting a new tradition of having a Faculty Meeting at the beginning of the Spring semester should be implemented.

The Dean noted that it might be helpful, while the Registrar was still present, to return to the Committee's discussion of the College calendar. Ms. Goff informed the members that there are indications that UMass is considering changing its calendar once again. The Dean explained that the UMass faculty senate voted down the last calendar proposal presented to it, which was to continue with the current calendar. A number of faculty members in the senate appealed for more class days, so the conjecture is that the university would start earlier or end later than it does at present. If that is the case, the Dean suggested that the university may prefer an earlier start date. Professor Schneider suggested that Amherst and the other Five-College institutions should play a leading role in decision making about the calendar, rather than following the university's lead. He asked the Registrar when the university is likely to decide to change its calendar. She said that she did not know. President Martin said that the other Five-College schools should be informed that the Amherst Faculty would not accept an earlier start date. Ms. Goff expressed the view that the other Five-College institutions with Interterm courses will push back if there is a move to an earlier start time, as they do not wish to shorten their Interterms further. The Registrar noted that the pre-registration periods and spring breaks of the Five-College institutions are in sync, at present, and that the add/drop periods are closely aligned. The Committee thanked Ms. Ratner and Ms. Goff and they left the meeting at 10:55 A.M. Noting that

Amended March 20, 2013

the deadlines for submitting course scheduling information and course proposals seems to be driven to some degree by the amount of time needed to process this information, Professor Harms asked the Dean to explore how that processing time might be reduced so that deadlines could occur later. He agreed to do so.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Ratner asked the Dean if he anticipated that several issues that have been carried over for discussion from previous Committee of Six agendas could be discussed by the members of this year’s Committee of Six before the end of the academic year. Specifically, he wondered about the proposal that candidates for promotion to full professor be required to submit letters about their scholarship and teaching as part of their promotion dossiers and, second, the topic of the format of end-of-semester teaching evaluations of untenured faculty. He suggested that, due to the volume of business that comes before the Committee of Six, perhaps consideration should be given to having two committees—one that would serve as a personnel committee and another that would focus on executive issues. Professor Ratner commented that he appreciates that there would be costs as well as gains to adopting such a model. The Dean said that he would do his best to include on the Committee’s agenda for the spring the items mentioned by Professor Ratner.

Continuing with “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Hunt asked for the members’ advice about how best to advise tenure-track faculty who might wish to publish their work with publishers such as Oxford University Press India (OUPI) and Cambridge University Press-India (CUP-I) that distribute primarily in South Asia, rather than an academic or other press that distributes primarily to North America. She wondered how the Committee of Six might view these publication placements, with which they, and perhaps some reviewers, might be less familiar, as part of a tenure review. She noted that promising scholars of South Asia at colleges and universities in North America and the UK are routinely approached by academic presses like OUPI and CUP-I that are interested in looking at their manuscripts. The members agreed that this could be a complicated issue that is intertwined with increasing globalization. Professor Harms expressed the view that the Committee of Six would likely rely on the outside reviewers to assess the stature of the press and that the most important factor would be how a candidate’s peers in his or her field judge the work. President Martin noted that it would also be important for the work to have an impact on the field in North America, from whence most of the external reviewers are likely to come, so where it is published should be considered with care. She suggested that it would be helpful to ask peer institutions about how they view scholarship published in these presses and to learn more about the editorial processes and the nature of peer review for any press, whether domestic or foreign, with which we are less familiar. Obtaining hard data, such as how many books are submitted and how many are published, would be valuable. Several members raised questions about book distribution. A press that distributes primarily to South Asia may have a significant readership, but would the books be as widely read in North America? Professor Schneider said that publishing is changing so quickly that it is hard to predict where things will stand in a few years. He expressed the view that it should be left up to tenure candidates and departments to determine the best publication placements in their fields. This led to a discussion of external reviewers. It was agreed that, while up to now external reviewers have usually (though not always) been from North America or western Europe, as the interests of the Amherst Faculty become more diverse and the world becomes more globalized, it is inevitable that more outside reviewers will be sought from other regions. Departments should strive to deepen their familiarity with distinguished scholars in sectors beyond North America and western Europe as they mentor tenure-track colleagues working and publishing internationally.



Amended March 20, 2013

Returning briefly to the topic of enrollment caps, Professor Hunt stressed the importance of engaging in a faculty conversation about enrollment caps, which she sees as a tremendous problem. Those faculty who do not limit the enrollments of their classes often end up with very large enrollments because so many colleagues are limiting enrollments, which is unfair. Professor Ratner suggested that, while individual classes may well have strong reasons to be capped, departments might be asked to offer a balance of limited enrollment and unlimited enrollment classes.

The members next discussed whether there should be a Faculty Meeting on March 26. After some conversation, it was agreed that a meeting should be held for the purpose of discussing the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising. In addition, the members felt that it would be helpful to have a brief presentation about online learning, which would be preliminary to the presentation that the faculty MOOC Committee is preparing for a future Faculty Meeting, likely on April 2. It was agreed that roughly two-thirds of the March 26 meeting should be devoted to advising and one-third to online learning. The Committee decided to review a draft Faculty Meeting at its next meeting, which would be on March 8. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended March 15, 2013

The eighteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 2:00 P.M. on Friday, March 8, 2013. Present were Professors Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Ferguson was absent.

The meeting began with the Dean reporting back about a committee nomination. The members next reviewed a draft Faculty Meeting agenda for a March 26 meeting. They discussed several possibilities for structuring a conversation about advising and decided that it would be best if the Ad Hoc Committee reported on its findings and recommendations, which could be followed by discussion. As part of the conversation, the Committee of Six could offer its views on the issues identified in the report and the recommendations that had been made. A goal of the discussion at the Faculty Meeting should be to begin to gain a common understanding of the aspirations of the Faculty in regard to advising. Establishing a context in which advising takes place at Amherst would be a significant outcome of the meeting, it was agreed, no matter what steps may be taken next in regard to this issue.

Conversation turned to the next agenda item for the meeting, a discussion of online learning. Dean Call suggested that, since the faculty MOOC Committee plans to offer a presentation at the April 2 Faculty Meeting, it might be informative to have an outside speaker give a brief presentation at the March 26 meeting in preparation for the conversation to come. Members who had attended a presentation about online learning the previous day offered some of their impressions of it. Terry Fisher '76, WilmerHale Professor of Intellectual Property Law at Harvard Law School and Faculty Director of the Berkman Center for Internet and Society, had spoken on "Opportunities and Challenges in Distance Education: Lessons from an Online Copyright Course." Professor Fisher is currently teaching a HarvardX course on copyright and is experimenting with new ways to expand student engagement within an online learning course. Professor Rogowski, while finding Mr. Fisher's lecture and online learning project interesting, and admiring its goal of making educational content more broadly accessible, said that he could not envision how the course would be replicable in an Amherst context, nor why it would be advisable to do so. For example, Professor Fisher is able to rely on twenty-five teaching fellows to assist with his online course. The course, Professor Rogowski pointed out, is not a MOOC, since there are only five hundred students. Dean Call noted that it would be possible for Amherst to experiment with a course of this size or smaller on the edX platform, in addition to offering some MOOCs.

Continuing, Professor Rogowski said that he would be most interested in a presentation that might be more practical in approach, demonstrating more concretely how online learning might be done at Amherst. Professor Harms, who said that she had been impressed with Professor Fisher's talk, explained that, for her, the presentation had addressed what she considers to be the first question to consider about online learning: Should we do it? How we should do it, which touches on Professor Rogowski's concerns, could follow afterward. She found Professor Fisher's presentation to address the first question quite effectively. The intent and caliber of his project, in her view, was consistent with what she would like an Amherst online experience to be. It was noted that the question at hand is whether the Faculty can imagine three colleagues, who are interested in doing so, offering online learning in a way that is consistent with Amherst's standards and values. The Committee agreed that having an outside presenter, either Professor Fisher or someone else, would further the Faculty's conversation about online learning. It was noted that the Faculty had, in fact, requested that such a presentation be given at a Faculty Meeting. The members then voted five in favor and zero opposed to forward the Faculty Meeting agenda to the Faculty. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to personnel matters.

Amended March 15, 2013

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended March 29, 2013

The nineteenth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, March 8, 2013. Present were Professors Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Ferguson was absent.

The meeting began with Dean Call asking for the Committee's suggestions of colleagues who might serve on a Memorial Minute Committee for Carl N. Schmalz, Jr., Professor of Fine Arts, Emeritus, who died on February 22, 2013. Discussion then turned to the proposal that the start time for Faculty Meetings shift from the canonical 7:30 P.M. time to 7:00 P.M. While a majority of faculty had indicated support for this change in a straw poll at the March 5 Faculty Meeting, the Committee felt that it was important to respond to the recent suggestion by some colleagues that the earlier time might have a negative impact on faculty with young children. Professor Schneider expressed the view that, since strong sentiment among faculty members did not underlie the development of the proposal or the suggestion that it be brought before the Faculty, and because it appears that a change to an earlier start time might affect one constituency in significant ways, it would be best not to start Faculty Meetings earlier. Professor Rogowski, who had initially suggested that the Faculty be polled about this question, said that he had not been aware that faculty with young children might be adversely affected if faculty meetings were to start earlier. If he had known that a 7 P.M. start time would pose challenges for colleagues, he might not have brought the proposal forward. Professor Ratner agreed that the preference of those who feel that an earlier start time would have an impact on family life should be respected. Professor Harms wondered if the Committee had enough information about the views of faculty members, including those with young children, to dismiss the proposal out of hand. Several members noted that some colleagues with young children had indicated that they would prefer an earlier start time. Rather than relying on anecdotal evidence, it was agreed that the Office of Institutional Research would be asked to conduct a survey to gain a better sense of the needs and preferences of colleagues. The results of the survey could then inform the Committee's discussion about this issue. The Dean agreed to contact Ms. Matheson, Director of Institutional Research, about the survey.

At 4:15 P.M., the Committee was joined by the members of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). They are Professor Lopez, chair; Professors Bishop, Honig, Keller, and Moss; students Elizabeth Scott '13, Adam Gerchick '13, and Matthew Debutts '14; and Nancy Ratner, Associate Dean of Admission and Researcher for Academic Projects, the committee's recorder. The CEP had requested the meeting with the Committee of Six to discuss the impact that current trends in course caps are having upon students' ability to access the open curriculum. Professor Lopez noted that there are a number of issues, ranging from course bunching, to off-schedule start times, to problems with add-drop, that undermine students' access to the open curriculum. He commented that the Faculty has acted to address some of these concerns, and that others will need to be addressed in the future. Professor Lopez noted that the Faculty has successfully helped students take greater advantage of quantitative courses, but that there is still much to be done to encourage, in similar ways, students to explore arts courses (which are taken only by 31 percent of Amherst students). For now, he focused on new challenges created by recent trends in course caps that have not yet received faculty attention.

The CEP shared relevant data and explained the ways in which the committee has been exploring this issue. The committee discussed the importance of bringing the issue of course-capping before the Faculty as soon as possible. Professor Lopez said that it is the hope of the CEP that raising awareness about the seriousness of the problem will lead the Faculty to make changes that will result in improvements through self-correction.

Amended March 29, 2013

Professor Lopez noted that, with the help of the Office of Institutional Research, the committee has been examining new courses proposed between 2009 and 2013, and in doing so has identified some disturbing trends. There has been a sharp recent trend toward capping courses, so much so that three-quarters of new courses proposed this year are now capped. He noted that a review of the number of new courses by cap size reveals that there is also a trend toward smaller caps, including significant growth in classes that are capped at fifteen students and under, and at twenty students and under. The number of courses that are capped is also increasing at all levels—from introductory courses to advanced courses. Professor Moss expressed concern that it appears that attention is not always given to whether enrollment caps are appropriate for particular types of courses, e.g., introductory courses at the one hundred and two hundred level. When reviewing course proposals, members of the CEP noted that similar rationales that had been used for course caps in the twenty to fifty student range increasingly are applied to caps of fifteen, and sometimes less. Some departments, it was noted, have begun capping almost all of their courses.

Professor Lopez commented that an examination of course section caps by faculty rank yields the following information: at present (in 2012-2013) 76 percent of the sections of all new courses are capped; 59 percent of all courses-sections are capped; 67 percent of visitor-taught courses are capped; 63 percent of lecturer-taught courses; 66 percent of assistant professor-taught courses; 51 percent of associate professor-taught courses; 52 percent of full professor-taught courses; and 63 percent of courses taught by professors on phased retirement. Professor Schneider expressed the view that some faculty members are being advised by senior colleagues to cap courses at levels lower than historical norms for the types of classes being offered. While there are certainly reasons, at times, to encourage tenure-track faculty to do so, capping courses shouldn't become the "new normal" as those faculty move through the ranks, he said. It was noted that most associate professors started their careers at Amherst before the trend of capping courses began. Now, however, when assistant professors are promoted, it would be advisable for them to reexamine their caps and take active steps to remove barriers to their enrollments. Professor Rogowski asked if Mellon Seminars and First-Year Seminars, which by definition have small enrollments, are included in the CEP's studies of enrollment caps. Professor Lopez said that they were.

Continuing, Professor Lopez noted that, according to rough calculations, a college of 1,800 students, in which each student is taking four courses a term, and where 385 full sections are taught per semester, courses need to average 18.7 students per class to ensure a seat for everyone. (These calculations assume that the number of Amherst students taking Five-College classes would be roughly equivalent to the number of Five-College students in Amherst classes, which is essentially true this year.) He suggested that even caps of twenty to twenty-five in a class would still place pressures on enrollments.

Professor Lopez commented that recent student surveys suggest that, when making course selections, students are being forced to strategize in ways that further stress access to the open curriculum. Preliminary results reveal that, when asked how many courses offered in spring 2013 they had wanted to take, but ultimately did not, 34 percent of students who responded said none, 24 percent said one course; 21 percent said two, and 21 percent said that they had not taken three or more courses that they had wanted to take. When asked why they didn't end up taking these courses, 39 percent of those who responded said that the course was already full. The student members of the committee expressed the view that students are frustrated by their inability to access courses. In addition, course caps undermine the effectiveness of advising, as the emphasis for students is often on taking courses that fit into their schedules, rather than those that fit in with advising plans focusing on learning or career goals,

Amended March 29, 2013

for example. Professors Schneider and Ratner wondered about the effects that online registration combined with limited enrollment in courses may be having on advisors' ability to ensure that their advisees are assembling a final course schedule with their advisors' input. Professor Ratner expressed concern that a feature of the online registration system permits students to register for courses that the advisor has not approved, with the advisor notified only subsequently of the anomaly. This feature allows students to register for a combination of courses that the advisor might not feel is advantageous, but about which he or she may not be consulted. Dean Call pointed out that a committee of faculty had decided to design the online registration system so that it included these features.

Professor Schneider asked if most courses reach their enrollment caps. Professor Lopez said that enrollments are typically several students below course caps. There is a sense that enrollment caps can have a deterrent effect, as students sometimes feel that they should not bother trying to get into a course because the chances are slim. Professor Lopez also noted that many students delay acting on add-drop decisions until the final day of the period, a strategic approach that has repercussions for other students. Professor Harms suggested some refinements to the ways in which statistics under discussion were being presented to gain additional insights about the impact that enrollment limits are having. Professor Hunt said that she would be interested to know if one of the effects of students being closed out of classes during the end of add/drop is that they then crowd into the remaining uncapped courses. Anecdotally, this is what she believes has been the trend, with one result being that students who may benefit from being in smaller classes end up in large un-capped courses. Professor Harms wondered whether the average size of non-capped courses is growing as a result of students not having access to the courses they want to take. Several Committee members asked whether a bimodal pattern of very small and very large courses with few middle-sized courses is beginning to emerge. Professor Lopez said that the CEP is trying to gain an understanding of this issue. Professor Schneider noted the loss within the curriculum of some large introductory courses within the humanities that had been taught in the past by colleagues who have now retired. He expressed the view that these courses covered subject matter that was effectively conveyed in classes with large enrollments. These courses appealed to general audiences of students and served a valuable purpose in regard to general education, in his view. He wondered whether having fewer of these large courses, in combination with the trend toward capping enrollments, was contributing to the lack of availability of courses, in some instances. He also wondered if it might be possible, at times, to offer additional sections, even with little notice, of courses with enrollment caps, if, during any given semester, a significant number of interested students were unable to get into the course. Perhaps single-course visitors could be hired under such circumstances. Dean Call confirmed that additional sections have, at times, been offered when there is significant enrollment pressure for a particular course.

Professor Honig noted that the College advertises that the average class at Amherst is sixteen students, but that this figure does not reflect the average experience of students. A new measure that Professor Honig designed (now known as the "Honig index of student experience") offers a better representation of students' average class size experience. The index calculates for each student the average class size experienced by that student in a given semester. It then averages this number over all students. This index can be calculated by department, by major, and for the College as a whole. Included in these numbers, Professor Honig said, are students writing a thesis or engaged in independent study, as they are part of a student's experience. These index numbers were offered to present a more accurate representation of the student experience, including breakdowns for first- and second-year students, and separately for juniors and seniors, for the fall semester of 2012.

Amended March 29, 2013

Professor Harms commented that, when discussing these issues with the Faculty, it will be important for the CEP to be clear about what course of action the CEP recommends. Should faculty be asked not to cap classes? Should they be asked not to cap classes under an enrollment of eighteen, or an enrollment of twenty? The goal should be explicit. Professor Lopez said that, when the CEP receives a course proposal with an unusually low cap, the committee often contacts the faculty member and asks if he or she would be willing to raise the cap; adding even five more students can make a big difference. The committee also noted trends in the justification that faculty offer for particular capping levels. He noted that, for example, courses capped at fifteen in the past were most often upper-level seminar or writing intensive courses, but now they occur at all levels of a department's curriculum. Justifications for capping courses have been changing, and the reasons for setting enrollment limits may now range from wanting students to get to know each other, to the fact that a course is a one hundred or two hundred-level course (in the past, an argument for capping a course might have been that it was an advanced course), to wanting to stimulate conversation, to identifying the course as writing intensive. The CEP is also worried that capping courses at low levels is emerging as the norm in some departments. With the help of the Office of Institutional Research, the committee has conducted some research on trends for capping courses by department. The members of both committees agreed that taking a departmental approach to addressing the problem of access to the curriculum would be advantageous, and that departments should be encouraged to examine how many of their courses are capped and how many are not. They should aspire to seek a balance so that each low cap below nineteen is off-set by a cap proportionally above nineteen.

Professor Harms said that, while she is not concerned that students are not able to take every course that they may wish to take, she considers it unacceptable that some students may not be able to take a single course in a particular discipline. In her view, as part of their Amherst education, every student should be able to take at least one course in the arts, for example. President Martin agreed, commenting that one of the goals of an open curriculum is that students, unhampered by general education requirements, have the opportunity to make their interests and their curriculum cohere. It is not a feature of an open curriculum that every student should be able to take every course, but every student should be able to take a course in every discipline.

Professor Schneider noted his concern, after reviewing the most recent round of proposals for new courses, that a seemingly increasing number of courses are being scheduled to meet once a week for 120 minutes. In his view, for the vast majority of Amherst students, meeting once a week is not the ideal pedagogical approach. Such courses, it was noted, also have an impact on scheduling other courses, because they cut across multiple time slots. Professor Lopez said that, while this topic is not part of the current conversation, he agrees that this trend toward once-a-week classes that meet for 120 minutes (and in some cases with requests for even shorter time periods), raises concerns. Professor Hunt wondered what the reasons might be for some colleagues seeking to do less teaching than would ordinarily be expected, either by reducing the number of contact hours with students or seeking to teach fewer students through enrollment caps. The Committee thanked the CEP for raising these important issues, and the CEP left the meeting at 5:30 P.M.

The Committee spent the remainder of the meeting considering the optimal structure and schedule for upcoming conversations about online learning and to address the issues raised by the CEP. After exploring a number of options, the Committee decided that a Faculty Meeting should be held on April 2, for which the agenda would be presentations by the Faculty MOOC/edX Committee and the CEP, with conversation following each report. A Faculty Meeting on April 16, it was agreed, would allow the Faculty to continue its discussion of online

Amended March 29, 2013

learning, and to consider relevant motions. It might also be possible to continue the conversation about the issues raised by the CEP, if that discussion does not conclude on April 2.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty



Amended April 11, 2013

The twentieth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 10:00 A.M. on Wednesday, March 27, 2013. Present were Professors Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Ferguson was absent.

As a follow up to the Faculty Meeting of March 26, when the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising had given a presentation on its report, the members discussed where things stand now in regard to the Amherst/edX pilot. President Martin commented that a requirement by edX that Amherst issue certificates could present an obstacle, in her view, but she is still thinking.

Dean Call agreed and said that he and others at the College are continuing to negotiate with edX about this point. Professor Ratner asked if an alternative to joining the edX consortium might be that Amherst itself would develop a platform and host online courses, and if members of the Ad Hoc Committee were prepared to discuss the significant technical challenges that likely would accompany such an approach. Thirteen faculty members have proposed taking this approach (the full text of their [motion](#) with this request is appended here via link), which will be discussed at the Faculty Meeting of April 16. Dean Call responded that he and others are exploring the investment that would be needed to accomplish this proposal, while recognizing that some past efforts that have made use of a “home-grown” approach, most recently Amherst’s content management system (CMS) project, for example, have presented major challenges and have required significant resources. The Dean would anticipate that the resources that Amherst would need to develop a platform, and particularly to develop courses, without edX or another partner, would be prohibitive. Yale develops and offers its own online courses, courses that are fairly static, the Dean noted, and he is making inquiries into the level of investment Yale has made thus far. Princeton, it was noted, has partnered with Coursera and, as Professor Adelman commented, the university would not feel comfortable developing and offering courses without Coursera. As an “early adopter” with Coursera, Princeton is the only school that has been allowed to offer courses without the requirement to issue certificates, Dean Call said. At the end of the conversation about online learning, the Committee discussed the technical difficulties that had prevented Professor Adelman’s presentation from being heard clearly at the last Faculty Meeting. Gayle Barton, Chief Information Officer, had reported to the Dean that, initially, all of IT’s testing with Jeremy Adelman had involved the Princeton Broadcast Center. When Professor Adelman had learned that the Broadcast Center would not be available in the evening, on the day of the Faculty Meeting, he had proposed using Skype. Princeton and Amherst are both on Internet 2, so a campus-to-campus Skype connection would have provided a good quality experience. However, Professor Adelman ultimately connected from his home in New York City, and the connection had been subject to the vagaries of evening service with a residential Internet service provider. Ms. Barton apologized for the technical difficulties. The Committee noted that it would have been difficult to prevent these problems under the circumstances, expressed its support for the staff members in IT, and recognized the challenges that they had faced.

Returning to a consideration of what had transpired at the March 26 Faculty Meeting, Professor Harms asked what the next steps should be following the discussion of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising, which the members, the President, and the Dean agreed had been a fruitful conversation. Dean Call informed the members of the Ad Hoc Committee’s plans to write a letter to the Committee of Six with the committee’s recommendations. The members agreed to address the topic of advising further, once the Ad Hoc Committee had shared those recommendations. Professor Harms suggested that it would be informative to ask those departments that shoulder a particularly large burden when it comes to advising what they would favor as a solution to the inequities of distribution associated with the current system. Professor

Amended April 11, 2013

Ratner reiterated his view that it would be helpful if departments assigned newly declared majors to faculty who are returning from leave, as doing so would promote greater continuity of advisors, one of the goals articulated by the Ad Hoc Committee. Dean Call said that he is aware of some departments that follow this practice, at present. Professors Harms and Schneider stressed that the best approach is a departmental one, with departments finding solutions that meet the needs of their faculty and students.

The members briefly discussed the survey that is being prepared by the Office of Institutional Research to inform decision making about whether to change the start time of Faculty Meetings from 7:30 P.M. to 7:00 P.M. It was agreed that the survey should be given to all faculty and staff who attend Faculty Meetings. The remainder of the meeting was spent on personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 12, 2013

The twenty-first meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by Dean Call in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, April 1, 2013. Present were Professors Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. President Martin and Professor Ferguson were absent. The Committee discussed plans for the April 2 Faculty Meeting. It was agreed that the brief presentation by the Faculty MOOC/edX Committee should be informational in focus. The members further agreed that the Faculty should be encouraged to ask questions of the committee members and of the invited guest, Johannes Heinlein, the Director of Strategic Partnerships and Collaborations for edX. It would be preferable, the Committee felt, for debate about the pilot to take place at the Faculty Meeting that has been scheduled for April 16. At that meeting, two motions (Professor Sarat's motion and a substitute motion to be put forward by thirteen faculty members) regarding the Amherst/edX pilot would be considered. It was noted that, to inform discussion, the Faculty MOOC/edX Committee plans to ask Mr. Heinlein the following two questions during the April 2 Faculty Meeting:

1. Can you explain why MIT decided to start edX when it already offered courses online through MIT OpenCourseWare?
2. Why are certificates so important to edX?

The members suggested that the Faculty be encouraged to send to Associate Dean Cheney, chair of the MOOC/edX Committee, any questions or concerns that they might have that are not addressed during the Faculty Meeting.

The Committee discussed briefly the possibility that edX might require the issuing of certificates as a condition of partnering with the College to develop and offer online courses. The members agreed that, if edX is committed to the awarding of certificates, it might be problematic in regard to Amherst's participation in this enterprise. Dean Call noted that edX has informed him that certificates would not be required the first time an AmherstX course is offered. The Dean stressed that, in his many conversations with edX representatives, he has emphasized that requiring AmherstX to offer certificates would be a cause of considerable concern. The Committee expressed the view that, if edX will not reconsider its stance on requiring certificates, the administration should inform the Faculty by the time of the April 16 Faculty Meeting. Professor Schneider stressed the benefits for the Faculty of understanding how the administration's views about online learning may be evolving in the course of trying to navigate what is clearly a rapidly changing landscape. Dean Call agreed. He informed the members that President Martin and he agree that the Faculty's votes on the issue of online learning will be respected. In their view, the question of whether the decision about moving forward with the pilot is a prerogative of the administration or the Faculty is not the most significant in this instance, since an Amherst/edX pilot would be intertwined so closely with the work of the Faculty, and because of the substantive discussions with the Faculty that have been at the core of the consideration of this issue in recent months. The Committee agreed that this is the most desirable approach to decision making surrounding this important question.

Returning to the question of certificates, Professor Rogowski asked why other institutions that are partnering with edX don't seem to be concerned about certificates. Dean Call said that most of the partners are universities, and many already have different models for offering credit and certificates to different constituencies, through extension divisions, for example. Thus the universities do not seem to have concerns about the meaning associated with certificates. Wellesley, because it is an institution that is similar to Amherst, understands the questions and

Amended April 12, 2013

concerns surrounding certificates, but it has decided to move ahead with an edX pilot. Professor Harms expressed the view that the Dean should convey to edX that Amherst has serious concerns about the meaning of certificates. Since an AmherstX certificate would be a piece of paper without any real value at this point, in her view certificates would not be consistent with the College's best practices. As a final comment, Dean Call noted that, while the College may or may not decide to move forward with a pilot with edX at this time, the issue of online learning will remain a reality. In his view, it will be important for the College to be a part of the conversation, as this quickly changing world evolves.

The members then briefly reviewed a draft of a survey focusing on the question of changing the start time of Faculty Meetings from 7:30 P.M. to 7:00 P.M., which had been prepared by the Office of Institutional Research. The members agreed that it would be best to distribute the survey toward the end of the academic year, as there are other more pressing matters that currently demand the Faculty's attention.

The Committee next reviewed its agenda for the coming weeks and set a schedule for discussion of personnel matters and other topics of conversation. The members noted the following recommendations that the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising has urged the Committee to consider, as the discussion of advising continues:

1. Appointment of a Dean of Advising
2. Changing the College's current system of Orientation Advising
3. Moving forward with the so called "hybrid model" outlined the [Ad Hoc Committee's report](#) (appended via link) on pages 11-12.

The Ad Hoc Committee suggested that, "Adopting these changes would, in our view, be useful incremental adjustments in the current advising system." The Dean noted that it may be possible to accomplish some of the suggested changes through administrative efforts at consolidating and enhancing things that are already being done. Other recommendations would require further discussion by the Faculty. The Committee discussed the pros and cons of waiting until next year to implement any changes to the advising system. Professor Harms said that it will be important to think carefully about what the Ad Hoc Committee is recommending. She feels that it would be helpful to learn more about the views of departments that are particularly overburdened with advising. The members agreed to return to the topic of advising at its April 15 meeting.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Ratner repeated a suggestion that he has made in the past during conversations about the need to facilitate the assessment of the substance of end-of-semester teaching evaluations by improving the format in which they are organized. In his view, organizing students' responses by grouping them thematically by question rather than by respondent can be very helpful to Committee of Six members. As student names would be attached to all responses, as they are at present, it would always be possible when reading responses to look for "outlying" respondents. He noted that the Department of Biology has been able to present the evaluations in multiple formats, including this one, without having to spend too much time on the project. The members asked the Dean to explore whether it would be possible for other departments to put teaching evaluations in the format described by Professor Ratner, without placing undue burdens on Academic Department Coordinators. The Dean agreed to ask members of his office and Ms. Barton, Chief Information Officer, to do research on this question.

Amended April 12, 2013

Professor Ratner returned to another suggestion that he had made last year as a member of the Committee. He noted that the Faculty had voted in 2011-2012 to approve the Committee of Six's motion that candidates' letters on their own behalf, in which individuals discuss their scholarship, teaching, and service, be required, rather than optional, at the time of reappointment and tenure review. He expressed the view that it would be appropriate and desirable for candidates for promotion to full professor to be likewise required to submit such a letter to the Committee of Six to inform the review of promotion cases. Professor Ratner argued that it is valuable for the Committee to hear in the candidate's own words about the past, current, and future directions of the individual's scholarship and teaching. For the candidate, putting this information on paper would be an informative process of self-reflection that would be helpful and appropriate during this stage of a faculty member's academic career. Professors Hunt and Schneider expressed some concern about adding a new layer to the promotion process that would place yet another demand on the candidate and his or her faculty colleagues at an already busy time of the year. Professor Harms agreed. Professor Hunt noted that some candidates for promotion now delay consideration of their cases, particularly when they feel that their level of scholarly productivity may not warrant promotion. She sees this form of "self-policing" as evidence that the promotion process, sometimes seen as pro forma, in recent years has become more substantive. Professor Harms expressed the view that she evaluates a candidate for promotion largely based on his or her publication record, which is evident from the CV. She has found that letters from candidates only rarely provide information that is helpful to the review process, such as how a candidate is melding teaching with research or a candidate's position in regard to his or her department's style of pedagogy. She also worries about the amount of time the letter would require, taking colleagues' time away from other valuable activities. Dean Call asked the members if they could imagine what kind of letter would produce what the Committee would want to know and be sufficiently valuable to warrant requiring it of candidates. The Committee considered whether proposals for senior sabbaticals might provide the same information that would be contained in a candidate's letter, while commenting that such proposals largely focus only on scholarship, offering little about teaching. Another idea would be to allow a letter from candidates for promotion about their work to replace the senior sabbatical proposal at the time of promotion, and to ask for a short, focused letter that focuses on the arc of teaching and scholarship instead. Noting the time, the members agreed to continue this discussion at a future meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended April 12, 2013

The twenty-second meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by Dean Call in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, April 1, 2013. Present were Professors Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. President Martin participated via speaker phone, and Professor Ferguson was absent.

Dean Call and President Martin reported on the Instruction Weekend meetings of the Board of Trustees, which had been held April 5 and 6. The Dean noted that the following new members of the College's Senior Staff introduced themselves to the Trustees: James Larimore, Dean of Students; Lisa Rutherford, Chief Policy Officer and General Counsel; Peter Uvin, Provost; and Kevin Weinman, Chief Financial Officer. The Dean commented that the Board had had several discussions about online learning. Along with some faculty colleagues, the Trustees attended three short presentations (by Jeremy Adelman, Samuel Carpenter III Professor in Spanish Civilization and Culture at Princeton University, via videoconferencing; Mitch Duneier, Maurice P. Daring Professor of Sociology at Princeton; and Terry Fisher '76, WilmerHale Professor of Intellectual Property Law at Harvard Law School and faculty director of the Berkman Center for Internet and Society) on Friday, which included a question-and-answer period. Dean Call said that the Board is interested in learning about the ways in which the Faculty is moving forward with conversations about online learning, generally, and the edX-AmherstX pilot, specifically. During the weekend, the Trustees had been informed about the process that is under way, including concerns that have arisen about issuing certificates as a possible condition of participating in a pilot with edX. Professor Rogowski, who had attended the Friday presentations, commented that they were the most useful of the talks about online learning that he had attended. He expressed the view that it would have been informative to have had such presentations that presented multiple perspectives earlier in the process of taking up the question of online learning.

Professor Schneider, who had also attended the Friday talks, felt that there had been some confusion among the Trustees about the difference between online learning in general and MOOCs (massive open online courses). He noted that not all the experiments with online learning that had been presented were MOOCs. Indeed, what appeared to be the most successful of them was not a MOOC. Professor Fisher had not offered a MOOC, which is given to thousands of students by definition, but rather a smaller online course for five hundred students, who had been selected from an applicant pool of approximately 4,000 interested individuals. Continuing, Professor Schneider said that he had found the presentation sobering in regard to information that had been provided about Princeton and Harvard's ability to support online courses, experiments that have required a significant commitment of faculty time, substantial infrastructure, a high level of funding, and a great deal of support from staff, the speakers had said. Even Princeton's robust teaching and learning center is being stretched to the maximum to meet the needs of faculty who are offering online courses, and HarvardX also seems to lack the necessary resources to support the university's efforts in this sphere, Professor Schneider commented. Professor Schneider said that he was impressed to learn about the richness of the educational experience of Professor Fisher's twenty teaching fellows, graduate students who had provided substantial support for his online course. The pedagogical model of having the fellows teach what they had recently learned seemed to be a very effective one, and the fellows clearly learned the material in new and thorough ways. In regard to the resources question, Dean Call said that he understands that Professor Fisher's institute at Harvard has provided resources that supplement those offered through HarvardX. Professor Hunt commented that Amherst, if it undertakes a pilot with edX, will not have the advantage of having twenty graduate students to assist with courses. Professor Ratner noted that, in a true MOOC, the number of teaching

Amended April 12, 2013

assistants becomes irrelevant, as it would not be possible to have monitored discussions. Professor Schneider added that Professor Fisher had stated that, while his model worked well with five hundred students, he did not think it was “infinitely scalable.”

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Hunt noted that some faculty colleagues have shared concerns with her following the discussion of the preliminary plans for the Humanities Center, which had taken place at the Faculty Meeting on April 2. Professor Hunt said that some colleagues had imagined a Humanities Center as a supplement to the Copeland Colloquium and were taken aback that the center seems to have become a vast project with significant implications, including the need to move books out of the library to make it possible to locate the center there. Questions have emerged about the process that is being used to make decisions, Professor Hunt noted. She reported that some faculty members are very concerned about the displacement of colleagues from their library carrels, as well as the possible removal of books from the library, and would view these steps as a significant diminution of their scholarly lives.

Dean Call thanked Professor Hunt for sharing these concerns and said that he recognizes that there should be additional opportunities to gather input and answer colleagues’ questions, and to further communicate ideas for the humanities center. He explained that, under the model that is being discussed, each year, a faculty advisory committee would solicit ideas from the Faculty for the center’s annual theme, and, working with the Dean, would determine the theme. Departments interested in hosting a Mellon-Keiter postdoctoral fellow in their field would be invited to participate in the annual search for three fellows whose work relates to the center’s theme. Fellows would each have a joint appointment to the Humanities Center and a department, with a primary affiliation and office in the center during their first year and in the department during their second year. Fellows, who would be at the post-doctoral stage, would be expected to teach two courses per year, one each semester, and use the remainder of their time to conduct scholarly research. In addition, each year, two Copeland Fellows, who are envisioned to be senior scholars, would be appointed to the Humanities Center, with offices in the center. They would be supported with Copeland funds. In alternating years the Copeland Colloquium would be organized, as it has been in the past by groups of colleagues, who may have no affiliation with the Humanities Center. The center would have a budget to develop campus-wide programming, including lectures and seminars related to the annual theme, as well as other topics. Continuing, the Dean said that the thinking is that the center would be designed to be an inclusive space that would facilitate work that is broadly associated with humanities—including some work in the arts and social sciences—for example. The space would be flexible, providing ten offices and increased study space for students and other library patrons in the evening hours, as well as to the fellows. The preliminary plan would create a seminar room that could be used as a classroom for about two-dozen students, as well as another space that could serve as an eleventh office or a smaller collaborative space.

Professor Rogowski stressed the importance of communicating and consulting with occupants of library carrels and other affected parties as part of the planning for the center. Dean Call agreed to do so and noted that the Library Committee has already begun to take an inventory of the carrels. The Dean has been informed that it is likely that those who may be displaced from their carrels, should the preliminary design move forward, could be accommodated within the library. Under the plan, twelve carrels out of the fifty-seven currently in the library would need to be removed to create the center. The Dean noted that there are a few unassigned carrels and some that are about to open up due to retirements and departures from the College. The Dean said that his office will be reaching out to faculty with carrels who would be affected under the preliminary plan to discuss future options with them. The Dean informed the

Amended April 12, 2013

members that Bryn Geffert, Librarian of the College, has asked National Library Relocations, a leading firm that focuses on moving library collections, to study the space in the library and determine what books would need to be moved—for the most part within the library or, perhaps, in some cases to the bunker—under the preliminary plan. That assessment is expected to be completed soon. One possibility would be to move off site volumes, such as government records, that the library also possesses in a digital form.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Schneider noted some of the concerns that have been articulated by colleagues in the humanities, including displeasure with the proposal to move the books that they need to have close at hand, and to remove the carrels in which they work. He commented that the space in the library would not be workable for projects in the arts. Professor Hunt noted that some colleagues had hoped that the center would encourage interactions among humanists and scientists, something that the proposed plan would not foster in all likelihood. Professor Schneider commented that some colleagues at the Faculty Meeting had felt that the plan was tantamount to putting a “Band-Aid” on the library, a step that could prevent the “major surgery” that actually needs to be done. Professor Hunt expressed concern that Mellon-Keiter postdocs would lose their connection to departments under the plan, and the valuable mentoring that departments have provided to them. She asked how the postdocs come to be affiliated with a department at present, and wondered what the benefit would be to the College of locating the postdocs in the Humanities Center. Professor Ratner asked if there is a timeline for decision making in regard to the center, given that plans for it have now caught the attention of a large number of faculty, and that concerns have been expressed. Professor Hunt asked who would be making final decisions about the center.

Responding to this series of questions and providing further details, Dean Call noted that the College currently has post-docs in the humanities and humanistic social sciences who are supported equally through the Mellon-Keiter post-doc endowment and annual budgeted funds that he has been able to set aside. These colleagues, who have two-year appointments and teach one course per semester, are indeed mentored by their host departments, which would continue under the proposed plan. 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. One of the program’s goals is to encourage young colleagues to consider teaching at a liberal arts college, an ambition that would be supported through fellows’ association with the Humanities Center. The Dean commented that the Humanities Center Working Group (Professors Epstein, Hewitt, Gewertz, Kimball, Parham, and Sarat, Mr. Geffert, and himself) has been working on developing a plan for the center, including working with Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services, and Tom Davies, Director of Facilities/Director of Design and Construction, on space needs. The working group’s role is to consider, with input from the Faculty, how best to implement the proposal for the center, which originated with a group of Faculty, and which was discussed with the Committee of Six.

Continuing, the Dean acknowledged the need to better articulate the goals and purpose of the Humanities Center and to provide the Faculty with more information and more opportunities for discussion. He noted that the administration is committed to establishing a humanities center, either under the proposed plan, or another that may evolve from it. Dean Call expressed the view that placing the center in the library will enhance the case for a new library. Rather than waiting until a full vision for a new library can be imagined, he believes that the Humanities Center will provide an opportunity to make an even more compelling case for a new library. In the short term, space can be adapted to better meet research needs, and the center can be a means



Amended April 12, 2013

of experimenting with the type of collaborative spaces and programming that might one day be part of a new library.

Professor Rogowski expressed concern that some faculty feel that they were not included in the planning process, which is unfortunate. It will be important to bring faculty into the planning process, he said. The carrel issue is a concern that is not limited to the current occupants, Professor Rogowski said. There are structural problems with the system for allocating carrels that result in precluding access to them for many of the colleagues who need them the most, including incoming faculty and other colleagues who have not been at the College for very long. There is a great need to develop an improved system, in Professor Rogowski's view. Professor Schneider asked if others could explain the need for library carrels. Professor Rogowski responded that some colleagues use the carrels as places of refuge in which they can focus on their research without interruption, and work productively in close proximity to the books and other resources they need. Professor Hunt said that being able to work in a carrel has been essential to her research productivity. She asked that the Dean offer examples of models for humanities centers at other institutions to inform discussion about Amherst's Humanities Center. Professor Ratner suggested that there be additional open meetings, some of which might be hosted by the Library Committee, to discuss the proposed plan for the Humanities Center. He encouraged the Dean to ask colleagues to send questions and concerns to the Library Committee. Professor Harms noted that donors tend not to make gifts to build structures just to house books anymore, preferring to fund projects that create library spaces that represent an intellectual hub and communal space for scholarly endeavors, and reiterated Dean Call's point that placing the humanities center in the library could be a way of demonstrating Amherst's enthusiasm for a new kind of library that would be built in the future. Professor Hunt suggested that it will be important to approach the Humanities Center project with care, to ensure that the center represents a benefit for the bulk of the humanities faculty; it would be helpful if the sciences, the social sciences, and the arts were included to foster interdisciplinarity. It will be important for faculty to feel that they are gaining more than they are losing, she commented.

Returning briefly to the topic of online learning, Professor Schneider asked President Martin where the administration stands in regard to MOOCs. He is pleased that the President and the Dean have indicated that they will stand behind what the Faculty decides about online learning, but given how Friday's presentation had influenced his own thinking about MOOCs, he wondered where the President currently stands on the issue. President Martin stressed that there are risks associated with trying online learning—MOOCs, as well as efforts focused on smaller audiences—but that there are also risks posed by not being involved in experimentation in this arena. In her view, the benefits of being a part of efforts that are on the frontier of this new landscape, and of being a part of this conversation rather than staying on the sidelines, must be weighed against concerns about longer term implications of MOOCs. The President said that she believes that participating in the edX consortium will offer unique opportunities for the College to experiment with new forms of teaching on campus. Amherst does not have the resources—in terms of a platform or infrastructure—that would enable the College to offer high quality online courses on its own, she noted. While the MOOC format may be incompatible with Amherst's interests and practices, offering a small number of MOOCs, a requirement of the edX consortium, would allow the College to learn from being involved with excellent partners and to bring the benefits of experimentation to on-campus teaching, to Amherst students, and to Amherst alumni. That is where her primary interest lies. President Martin said that she is interested in the potential of MOOCs when it comes to offering courses to alumni, who might be willing to pay for the experience and provide another source of revenue to the College. Experimenting with MOOCs through an edX pilot would provide the infrastructure and expertise

Amended April 12, 2013

that would be needed to learn about offering MOOCs for this purpose. She stressed the “practical imperative” of trying to find supplemental sources of revenue, even if on the margins, rather than relying only on increasing tuition and endowment.

Continuing, President Martin commented that the edX pilot would also enable the College to develop online courses in smaller formats. It is important that it be set up as an experiment that can be ended. Professor Schneider asked if it would be possible to participate in the edX pilot without offering MOOCs. The Dean said that, while edX has given permission for Amherst’s first online course to be offered without certificates, there would be a non-negotiable requirement after that that the College develop and offer at least three MOOCs with certificates. President Martin expressed the view that, if developing and offering MOOCs must be done to gain the benefits of the experiment, she is convinced that Amherst faculty members will develop MOOCs that will be more interesting than those other colleges can mount. The Dean commented that the Faculty has developed mechanisms, which would be put in place, that would ensure that any MOOC developed and offered by AmherstX would be of high quality.

Dean Call next addressed two questions that had been raised at the April 2 Faculty Meeting. In answer to questions raised about the appointment of an individual (who is not a member of the Amherst Faculty) who would be co-teaching a First-Year Seminar with Professor Zamperini, the Dean said that his research revealed that the individual had been appointed as a visiting lecturer and is not associated with a department. He said that there is a precedent for this structure and noted that he had, on a previous occasion, appointed an individual to co-teach a colloquium without having a departmental affiliation. The Dean next addressed Professor Woodson’s request about voting in absentia on motions at Faculty Meetings. The Dean noted that his research revealed that there is no precedent for doing so. He quoted the following passage from *Robert’s Rules of Order*: “A ‘proxy’ is a means by which a member who expects to be absent from a meeting authorizes someone else to act in his or her place at the meeting. Proxy voting is not permitted in ordinary deliberative assemblies unless federal, state, or other laws applicable to the society require it, or the bylaws of the organization authorize it, since proxy voting is incompatible with the essential characteristics of a deliberative assembly...” The members agreed that, consistent with the spirit of the Faculty Meetings as occasions for deliberation and the exchange of ideas, as well as with *Robert’s Rules*, proxy voting is not an option.

Several members next expressed their frustration with the current online processes for submitting new course proposals and for advising tasks. They noted that steps are often hidden and/or obscure, and that the time needed to figure out how to complete tasks often results in significant delays. Professor Ratner said that it is his understanding that the online course proposal process had been driven at the time of its formulation largely by needs associated with the printed course catalog. The Committee asked the Dean to work with administrative colleagues to make improvements, noting that it would be best if beta testing were done by users of these systems, rather than by those who played a role in creating them. The Dean agreed to move forward with finding ways to address the problems noted by the Committee.

Discussion returned to Professor Ratner’s suggestion that it would be helpful to organize students’ responses in end-of-semester teaching evaluations by grouping them thematically by question, rather than by respondent. Indeed, having responses available in both formats would help all faculty in reflecting upon their individual courses. Professor Hunt commented that asking departments to provide evaluations in this form is a good idea. The members agreed that, while the Committee cannot and should not require a particular format for teaching evaluations, the Dean’s office should make efforts to explain the benefits of providing the Committee with formats that facilitate the assessment of the substance of end-of-semester teaching evaluations.

Amended April 12, 2013

As was noted in an earlier conversation, if the responses are grouped thematically by question, student names would be attached to all responses, and it would always be possible when reading responses to look for “outlying” respondents. The Dean agreed to communicate to departments the Committee’s desire that evaluations be presented in the multiple formats described, since doing so would aid the Committee in its work. In addition, the Committee asked the Dean to provide mechanisms to train Academic Department Coordinators in the process of creating the different evaluation formats. He agreed to do so.

The Committee next discussed how best to move forward with its discussion about advising, including consideration of the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising. The members agreed that it would be helpful to solicit further information from departments and decided to formulate a series of relevant questions. The members reviewed the Committee’s agenda for upcoming meetings and decided that it would seek more information from departments in regard to advising and have a discussion on April 29 about this topic, which, hopefully, would be informed by the departmental responses that would have been gathered by that time.

The members reviewed the agenda for the Faculty Meeting of April 16. After discussing the complex parliamentary history surrounding the motions that would be brought before the Faculty, the members asked the Dean to provide the Faculty with a summary of that history when distributing the agenda. The Dean agreed that it would be helpful to provide a review of the history surrounding the two motions that would be included on the agenda and the substitute motion that would be introduced by colleagues at the meeting. It was noted that the Committee of Six had placed a motion on the agenda of the Faculty Meeting of December 18, 2012. At that meeting, Professor Sarat moved to postpone discussion of the Committee of Six motion until after the Faculty had endorsed Amherst’s participation in the AmherstX project, and the Faculty voted in favor of the postponement. Professor Sarat then moved that the Faculty endorse Amherst College’s participation in the AmherstX project. Consideration of his motion was postponed as well, and, on March 26, the Faculty voted that Professor Sarat’s motion would return at the April 16 meeting. The members decided that the text of the motion from the thirteen colleagues who plan to introduce it as a substitute motion at the April 16 meeting should be sent to the Faculty along with the agenda. The Dean reminded the members that Professor S. George had requested that a word be changed in the substitute motion. The members asked the Dean to check to see if the other signatories to the motion had been consulted about this change. Dean Call agreed to do so. The members then voted five to zero in favor of forwarding the agenda to the Faculty. The Committee turned to personnel matters. (Professor George later informed the Committee that he had discussed the change in wording with some signatories, but not all, of the original signatories before sending the email to the Committee of Six about the word change. At the same time he had sent the email to the Committee of Six, he had informed all of the original signatories that he planned to change that word, asking them to let him know if they had any objections. Several replied saying that the change was fine with them, and no one objected. The Committee was satisfied that due diligence had been done. The corrected version of the motion was later sent to the Faculty. The change is indicated below.)

The Faculty ask that the College invest in making it possible for Amherst courses and course materials to be available online, to the extent desired by those teaching the courses. The online courses would be free of charge and without credit or other certification. Amherst’s stated mission is to offer “learning through close colloquy” that takes place “in a purposefully small residential community.” That mission is best served by having the College itself, rather than an outside

Amended April 12, 2013

organization that offers so-called massive open online courses, develop and offer these online courses and course materials.”

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended May 3, 2013

The twenty-third meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by Dean Call in the President's office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday April 15, 2013. Present were Professors Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. President Martin and Professor Ferguson were absent.

With sadness, the Dean noted the sudden death of Merle Ivone Barriga Ramirez, Five-College Fellow in the Department of Theater and Dance, on April 11, 2013. The members expressed their sympathy for this tragic loss, and several members who knew Ms. Barriga commented on the many contributions she had made in the short time she was part of the Amherst community. Dean Call noted that the capstone event of this year's Copeland Colloquium, "Art in Place/the Place in Art," which had taken place on Saturday, April 13, had been dedicated to Ms. Barriga. The Dean and those members who had attended that performance, a presentation of new collaborative works by faculty and staff from the Departments of Music, Theater and Dance, and Art and the History of Art, said that it had been a wonderful event. The Committee agreed that this year's colloquium has been a great success.

The Dean next reported that tenure-line hiring for this year is now complete and discussed the schedule for upcoming tenure reviews for two senior hires. The members then discussed plans for the April 16 Faculty Meeting.

Discussion turned to a [letter](#) (appended via link) that Professors S. George and Hall had sent to the Committee to inquire about the "guidelines or policies by which extra-departmental faculty appointments can be made" and the "guidelines or policies by which faculty appointments can be made to the Faculty without pay." Professors George and Hall also wondered whether the category of Visiting Lecturer should be described in the *Faculty Handbook*. Their letter was prompted by the recent appointment of an individual as a Visiting Lecturer, without an affiliation with an Amherst department or program, to co-teach a First-Year Seminar with a member of the Amherst Faculty, at that faculty member's request. Dean Call began the conversation by noting that the title of Visiting Lecturer has been used at the College for many years. Visiting Lecturers have been listed in the faculty section of the course catalog since 1989; before that time, the listing of faculty in the catalog had been organized by rank, with lecturers listed as a group and without a notation of whether they were visiting. Noting the reference in Professor George's and Hall's letter to previous discussions with the Committee of Six about appointing Simpson Lecturers and McCloy Professors, the members commented that the appointment under discussion, to co-teach a single course outside a department, does not raise the same level of concern as a longer-term visiting professorship appointment outside a department or program would. The Dean suggested that, in hindsight, consulting with the First-Year Seminar Committee would have been a good approach. The Committee agreed. It was noted that, in the past, colleagues who did not have an affiliation with a department or program have taught First-Year Seminars. Professors Schneider and Rogowski wondered about the College's policy in regard to having individuals teach without compensation. In a related vein, Professor Ratner asked for clarification about the College's policy in regard to allowing individuals, recent graduates, for example, to work in Amherst labs, without compensation, as a means to gain experience. Dean Call commented that there are legal constraints surrounding the College's ability to allow individuals to do work without being paid. Though it is sometimes possible to make an arrangement to do so for brief periods, it is not a desirable structure in most cases, the Dean said. The Committee asked that additional information be provided as to potential legal restrictions or liabilities regarding non-compensated activity.

Amended May 3, 2013

Continuing the conversations, the members discussed the pros and cons of articulating a definition of a Visiting Lecturer for the *Faculty Handbook*. It was agreed that it would be best to retain the current flexibility that this category provides, which has served the Faculty well, for example, when it becomes necessary to make a hire at short notice when a colleague becomes ill and someone is needed to teach his or her class. Retaining the ad hoc nature of Visiting Lecturer appointments, rather than developing formal criteria for these positions, seems like the best approach; the Committee agreed that, when such appointments are proposed outside a department or program, an appropriate faculty committee should act as a substitute for a department or program, vetting the appointment. The Committee of Six could act in this capacity, when needed. The members asked whether Visiting Lecturers, and others who may be teaching single courses under short-term appointments, have the right to attend and to vote at Faculty Meetings. The Dean noted that, according to the *Faculty Handbook*, IV, R.,1., “The following members of the College have the right and responsibility to attend Faculty meetings, with voice and vote: (1) the President, the Dean of the Faculty, Professors, Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors appointed to regular full-time or part-time tenured or tenure-track positions; (2) all individuals on non-tenure-track, renewable contracts, who teach regularly in the College curriculum and whose primary affiliation is with Amherst College; (3) all persons with visiting teaching appointments, for the duration of their appointment at Amherst College, provided that appointment is their primary professional responsibility at the time; and, (4) the following members of the Administration: the Dean of Students, the Class Deans of Students, the Dean of Admission and Financial Aid, the Director of Financial Aid, the Librarian of the College, the Director of Information Technology, the Director of the Academic Computer Center, the Director of Health Services, the Director of the Counseling Center, the Director of Athletics, the Registrar, and the Director of the Mead Art Museum.” Continuing, he said that, in the *Faculty Handbook*, IV, R., 2., under Attendance Without Vote, the following is noted: a. “Interchange faculty members from other colleges in the valley or part-time appointees teaching on a per-course basis and retaining primary concurrent affiliation with another academic institution (including adjunct appointees and teaching assistants and associates) are welcome to attend meetings of the Faculty with voice but without vote, as are contract coaches of the Department of Physical Education, and the associates and assistants of administrative officers named above, unless individually otherwise designated.” Visiting Lecturers would fall in this latter category of “voice without vote,” he observed. At the conclusion of the discussion, the Committee expressed its thanks to Professors George and Hall for bringing this matter to the Committee’s attention.

The Dean informed the members that he had received a letter from Professor Sitze on the subject of advising, which he would share with the Committee in advance of the advising discussion that is planned. He noted that two letters, each signed by a number of colleagues, had been sent to President Martin, Mr. Geffert, and himself about the proposal for the Humanities Center. Dean Call said that he would seek permission from those who had sent the letters to share them with the Committee. Professor Ratner asked if the Library Committee had been consulted about the proposal and whether the committee is being apprised of ongoing conversations about the center. The Dean said that the committee has been part of some discussions about the center, and will be kept informed. 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 Committee spent the remainder of

Amended May 3, 2013

the meeting making nominations of colleagues to serve on faculty committees for the 2013-2014 year.

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended May 10, 2013

The twenty-fourth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday April 22, 2013. Present were Professors Harms, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Hunt participated in the meeting via speaker phone, and Professor Ferguson was absent.

Dean Call began the meeting by informing the members that the Committee on Education and Athletics had recently forwarded a resolution to him to share with the Committee of Six. The Dean explained that the stated purpose of the resolution is to determine the “sense of the Faculty” regarding the committee’s proposal that a process be developed to replace the “Lord Jeff” mascot. The committee requested that, at some future point, the resolution be brought before the Faculty for a vote. Dean Call said that, if the members agreed, he would include a discussion of this resolution on the Committee’s agenda for its next meeting. The members agreed to that suggestion. To ensure that there is as much information as possible to inform the consideration of this important issue by all constituencies, President Martin suggested it would be wise to draw on colonial historians, on campus and off, to help educate everyone—students, faculty, staff, and alumni—about the historical record associated with Lord Jeffery Amherst. Professor Hunt agreed that doing so would be helpful. The President stressed the importance of consulting broadly with all constituencies of the College, and of laying the groundwork for a decision in which the entire community can participate. The members agreed that time and care should be taken in making a determination about the future of the mascot.

The Committee next turned briefly to personnel matters. The Dean informed the members that it is his understanding that the Title IX Committee is preparing a recommendation for the Faculty that the College’s [policy on consensual sexual relationships between faculty members and students](#) (*Faculty Handbook* IV., 3) be revised. Professor Hunt commented that, if the proposal reaches the Committee this spring, there would not be sufficient time to discuss it fully before bringing it before the Faculty. She suggested that the Committee focus on this issue in the fall, and the members agreed that this would be the best course.

Dean Call next informed the members that he has received permission from the colleagues who sent [letters](#) (appended via link) to President Martin, Mr. Geffert, and himself about the proposal for the Humanities Center to share the letters with the Faculty by appending them to the Committee’s minutes. He noted that the meeting that he had scheduled for April 19 to discuss the center had been postponed, due to the event organized by students to honor the victims of the Boston Marathon bombing and demonstrate solidarity with the city of Boston. He informed the members that the meeting about the center is now set for Friday, April 26, at 4 P.M., in Pruyne Auditorium in Fayerweather Hall. (The minutes of previous Committee of Six conversations about the center appear at the end of these minutes.) Professor Ratner reiterated his view that it will be important for the Humanities Center Working Group to consult with the Library Committee when planning for the center. Dean Call agreed and said that he plans to organize meetings between the outgoing and incoming members of the Library Committee and the Humanities Center Working Group. The Dean noted that twelve library carrels have now been identified that could be made available to colleagues whose current spaces would be removed, if the current plan for the center goes forward. Professor Harms suggested that this might be a good moment to reassess the process for allocating and occupying carrels. Professors Ratner and Rogowski agreed, noting that, at present, younger scholars are sometimes disadvantaged by the system. Professor Schneider asked if emeriti continue to occupy carrels



Amended May 10, 2013

and noted that space for emeriti should be a part of the conversation about the carrel issue. The Dean confirmed that some emeriti do have carrels, and he informed the members that the Library Committee has been considering the question of carrels and has drafted a policy, which he believes will be brought forward soon.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Ratner asked about the timetable for distributing the questionnaire about the Faculty Meeting time, which will focus on colleagues’ views on the possibility of changing the time from 7:30 P.M. to 7:00 P.M. The Committee agreed that the survey should be sent out soon, and the Dean agreed to work with the Office of Institutional Research to distribute the survey. Professor Ratner next asked whether the Dean had learned more about the question of whether individuals may work at the College without being compensated. Dean Call responded that he had consulted with Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel, who says there are legal constraints surrounding the College’s ability to allow individuals to do work without being compensated. At the Committee’s request, the Dean agreed to ask Ms. Rutherford, the College’s new Chief Policy Officer and General Counsel, for her thoughts on this matter.

Continuing with “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Ratner asked the President if the duties of the new Provost have been defined and how responsibilities might be divided between the Dean and the Provost. He noted that the [description of the administration that appears in the \*Faculty Handbook\*](#) (*Faculty Handbook* II, B. 2.) should be revised to reflect recent changes in positions within the administration. President Martin responded that Provost Uvin is now on campus two days a week and has been spending his time meeting with members of the community, reading all of the reports produced over the past decade, and familiarizing himself with Amherst, more generally. The President said that roles and responsibilities of the senior staff will evolve and become clearer as the team begins working together, and working with faculty, staff, and students. Provost Uvin’s primary job in the near term will be overseeing the strategic planning effort and diversity initiatives. President Martin suggested that it would be informative and helpful for Provost Uvin to attend meetings of the major committees—the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR), the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), and the Committee of Six, in particular—as well as the strategic planning working groups. Professor Harms suggested that the Provost could be invited to attend meetings of these committees on an ad hoc basis, perhaps, for a year, while noting that if he were to attend on an ongoing basis, a vote of the Faculty would be required to include the Provost as an ex officio member of the individual committees. President Martin agreed that it would be a good idea for the Provost to attend the meetings. Professor Rogowski suggested that it could be helpful to provide the Provost with a mentor, perhaps, a current or former Associate Dean of the Faculty, as a resource. President Martin noted that Dean Call and the other members of the senior staff have been introducing the Provost to Amherst’s culture and operations, and that he has been meeting with individual faculty members and staff, absorbing information about the College with great assiduousness, enthusiasm, and speed.

President Martin next updated the Committee on the progress of the strategic planning effort. She noted that the Financial Outlook Working Group and the Campus Facilities Working Group are up and running. The work of these two groups will be foundational; they will conduct analyses and present a range of options and a sense of available resources, which will inform the process of setting priorities. President Martin said that the Facilities Working Group, which is tasked with developing a campus assessment and framework plan—a flexible roadmap for how

Amended May 10, 2013

the campus could be developed—has been interviewing architectural planning firms this week to work on the first phase of the plan. President Martin asked for the members' views on other groups that could be established as part of the strategic planning process. Among the possibilities discussed were a group that would focus on innovative pedagogies (topics for consideration could include a teaching and learning center and online learning, among others), a group that would focus on ways to integrate student learning inside and outside the classroom (topics could include residential life and social spaces on campus), and a group that would focus on support for faculty research. The President noted that the working groups would solicit information, conducting campus-wide and small-group discussions and synthesize information that would feed into an eventual plan.

Professor Rogowski noted that the recent consideration of MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses) should be seen as the beginning of a larger process of self-examination of teaching. He suggested that the planning process address the question of ways that Amherst can support teaching and learning. A question that might be asked is: what is not adequate about the way teaching is supported now? Continuing Professor Rogowski said that the issue of mentoring is also an important area, noting that, while mentoring is usually thought of in terms of senior faculty mentoring new colleagues, mentoring may also go both ways—with new faculty bringing new training, ideas, and pedagogical techniques to Amherst that senior faculty may wish to learn. Professor Harms recommended that assistant and associate professors be appointed to the working groups, since the plan will consider a future of which they will be a part. President Martin said that Professor Hall has suggested creative ways of soliciting broad input from the Faculty, without placing too much of a burden on faculty as part of the planning process.

President Martin said that she had envisioned a relatively small umbrella group, made up of faculty, staff, and students, that would consider all the information that is funneled through and synthesized by the working groups, but has asked Provost Uvin to design the process. Professor Rogowski expressed support for the holistic nature of the planning process, as described, which he hopes will help the College move away from a “silo” approach to considering issues and encourage thinking about how resources can be shared and used to meet the institution's needs.

Discussion turned to the recent announcement that the College will be refurbishing and repurposing the old power plant to create a social space for students, who will be consulted about the functions and design. Professor Schneider, who expressed support for the plan, suggested that there also be consultation with members of the arts faculty, who can provide advice about the conception of performance spaces. President Martin said that such advice would be welcome and that Mr. Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services, would be meeting with interested faculty about the project. She noted that the space will be designed to serve a number of functions, while commenting that building codes, a desire to develop a social space quickly to meet a request by students, and the need to keep costs relatively low will set parameters on what can be done with the space.

The members discussed the schedule for distributing to department chairs and their Academic Department Coordinators (ADCs) the Committee's questions regarding the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising. The members asked Dean Call to forward the questions to departments as soon as possible and noted plans for next year's Committee to return to the subject of advising, with this helpful information in hand. It was noted that some of the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee could be implemented

Amended May 10, 2013

administratively, while others would require faculty consultation. The Dean noted a likely upcoming change, commenting that the system of orientation advising by faculty may change after this fall. The Committee briefly discussed the recommendation that a Dean of Advising position be established within the Dean of the Faculty's office. Professors Harms and Ratner noted that students' academic difficulties often are linked with personal challenges that have traditionally been addressed by the Dean of Students Office, and they wondered about implementing a structure that would place the focus of advising within the Dean of the Faculty's office. The Dean said that it is his understanding that the duties of the Dean of Advising position have been envisioned to include developing and providing training on advising for faculty and making advising assignments (a task that the overburdened Dean of New Students has responsibility for at present). The Committee agreed that it would be helpful to consult with Mr. Larimore, the new Dean of Students, before any reconceptualization of advising occurs, as Mr. Larimore will likely be making changes in structure to the Dean of Students office. The Committee turned briefly to a personnel matter.

The Dean next informed the members that the College's fifth-year report to the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) was well received by the accreditors, and that the points of emphasis that were identified as areas of focus for the ten-year review are areas that the College itself identified. The Dean expressed his appreciation for the exemplary work done by Associate Dean Griffiths and other colleagues who worked on the report, and the Committee and the President also offered admiration and thanks.

Discussion turned to a draft motion (see below) to require candidates for promotion to full professor to submit a letter on their own behalf. Professor Ratner, who argued for the motion, which emerged out of Committee of Six conversations of last year, reiterated his view that requiring the letter would encourage candidates for promotion to reflect on their teaching and scholarship—looking back at what they had accomplished since the time of tenure and outlining plans for the future. Some members of the Committee felt that requiring the letter of candidates would not ensure that such reflection, a worthy goal, would occur. Professor Schneider and others noted that such letters were already allowed. Requiring them, they feared, would unnecessarily increase administrative bureaucracy. They expressed support for bringing the motion before the Faculty for debate. The Committee then voted five to zero in favor of forwarding the motion to the Faculty and one in favor and four opposed on the substance of the motion. The motion appears below:

To revise the *Faculty Handbook*, III., G., Promotion (to become effective in the academic year 2013-2014)

### **Promotion**

A member of the Faculty appointed initially as an Assistant Professor and subsequently granted tenure will be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, effective the start of the academic year following the tenure decision.

A member of the Faculty appointed initially as an Associate Professor without tenure and subsequently granted tenure will continue as an Associate Professor

Amended May 10, 2013

with tenure until promoted to the rank of Professor. (Voted by the faculty, May 2007)

Promotion to the rank of Professor may originate with the department or with the candidate and usually occurs between six and eight years after the tenure decision. A candidate's promotion committee consists of all tenured full Professors in his or her department(s) and, at the request of the candidate, may include up to two other tenured full Professors from the College Faculty, chosen by the candidate in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty. The Chair of the promotion committee is selected by the Dean. A letter from the Chair of the promotion committee, and signed by all members of the committee, discussing the candidate's scholarly or artistic growth and achievement, teaching performance, and College and professional service, should accompany all recommendations for promotion to the rank of Professor. The eCandidateS ~~may~~ **FOR PROMOTION WILL** also submit a letter on **THEIR** ~~his or her~~ behalf **TO THEIR DEPARTMENT(S) AND THE COMMITTEE OF SIX DESCRIBING THE PRESENT STATE OF THEIR SCHOLARSHIP OR CREATIVE WORK AND THEIR AIMS AND PLANS FOR THE FUTURE, THEIR TEACHING EXPERIENCE AT THE COLLEGE; AND THEIR ENGAGEMENT IN COLLEGE LIFE.** (Voted by the Faculty, May 2007)

In cases where there are fewer than two tenured full Professors in the candidate's department, the Dean of the Faculty and the Committee of Six will appoint an ad hoc committee of tenured full Professors from related departments to serve as the promotion committee. Should the department have one member at the rank of tenured full Professor, he or she will also serve. At the request of the candidate, the promotion committee may include up to two other tenured full Professors from the College Faculty, chosen by the candidate in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty. The Committee of Six reviews all candidates for promotion. The President formulates the various recommendations and presents them to the Board of Trustees, together with his or her own views. All promotions must be voted by the Board of Trustees. (Voted by the Faculty, May 2007)

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended May 10, 2013

Committee of Six Minutes of Discussions about the Humanities Center

Excerpt from Committee of Six Minutes of October 24, 2011

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 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.

Excerpt from Committee of Six Minutes of May 7, 2012

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.

Excerpt from Committee of Six Minutes of May 14, 2012

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 and that consideration be given to including the humanistic social sciences under the umbrella of

Amended May 10, 2013

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.

Excerpt from Committee of Six Minutes of September 10, 2012

Continuing with “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Rogowski asked about the current status of the Humanities Center initiative. The Dean replied that the Humanities Center Working Group (Professors Epstein, Hewitt, Gewertz, Kimball, Parham, and Sarat, Librarian of the College Bryn Geffert, and himself), which he chairs, has met twice and will soon be touring the library with Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services, and Tom Davies, Assistant Director of Facilities/Director of Design and Construction, to explore the space for the new research center. Dean Call noted that the group’s role is to consider, with input from the Faculty, how best to implement the proposal for the center. Current discussions are focusing on 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, and ways to integrate the Copeland Fellows into the center, as well. Professor Hunt asked about the envisioned place of the sciences in the center, stressing the importance of interdisciplinarity and the trend in a number of disciplines toward the blurring of boundaries between the sciences and the humanities. Other members also stressed the importance of taking a broad approach. Dean Call responded that the goal is for the center to take an inclusive approach and that the center’s name has not yet been decided, though Professor Basu had offered the suggestion last year of the Center for Humanistic Inquiry and he has been using the moniker, “Hum-Plus” as a placeholder until a formal name is

Amended May 10, 2013

chosen by the Faculty. The Committee encouraged the Dean to seek faculty input at all stages of the process of developing the center, and he said that the working group intends to do so. The group's goal is to prepare a report for the President and the Committee of Six by the end of the semester.

Excerpt from Committee of Six Minutes of September 24, 2012

This year there are six Mellon-Keiter post-docs. In the future, Dean Call envisions that the Mellon-Keiter post docs will be integrated into the new Humanities Center, and that this opportunity will be an excellent recruitment tool.

Amended May 16, 2013

The twenty-fifth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday April 29, 2013. Present were Professors Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Ferguson was absent.

President Martin began the meeting by informing the members that the open meeting for students to solicit input on the Power House project, which she and members of the senior staff had held on April 28, had been lightly attended. Students had conveyed the strong view that the process for booking space in the Power House should be as efficient as possible, and that the ability to offer a quick turnaround on requests to use the facility will be essential to the success of the facility. President Martin said that creating such a process would be a part of the project. Professor Schneider suggested that those working on the Power House reach out to a cappella groups. President Martin said that Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services, will ensure that consultation takes place with interested groups.

President Martin next discussed with the members ways to gain faculty input on the question of how to ensure that students are exposed to a wide range of political views while at Amherst, pointing out that the College does not and would not use a political litmus test when hiring faculty. The members, the Dean, and the President agreed that it would be beneficial to develop more events for students that will provide opportunities for debate on different viewpoints and/or feature speakers with opinions and experiences that span the political spectrum. The Dean then reviewed a scheduling matter with the Committee.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Schneider expressed some concern that some restrictions placed on departmental prizes by donors, often long ago, can now pose problems in the equity of awards provided to students and challenges in the selection process. He wondered whether it is possible to revise the original criteria associated with some prizes. President Martin recommended that Professor Schneider ask Megan Morey, Chief Advancement Officer, for assistance with this matter. Dean Call noted that, to ensure that all departments can offer awards, even if they do not have an endowed fund to do so, his office now provides modest funds in some departments' budget so that they can honor seniors with prizes. On a related note, Professor Schneider asked if consideration has been given to finding ways to shorten the prize portion of Senior Assembly, during which lengthy descriptions of prizes are read. Dean Call pointed out that, in recent years, the full descriptions for prizes have not been read in order to reduce the time devoted to distributing awards at the event.

Following up on the meeting that the Dean had held on April 26 to discuss the plans for the Humanities Center, Professor Hunt noted that, while it seems that most faculty members are in favor of having a center, some colleagues are concerned about the idea of locating it in the library, and about the process that will be used to make decisions about the center. Some faculty, Professor Hunt said, would prefer that the center not be structured around an annual theme or include Mellon-Keiter postdoctoral fellows on the grounds that the Mellon-Keiters work well within departments and moving them to the Humanities Center would limit the number of departments who might host them. In addition, it could limit Mellon-Keiter fellows' exposure to departmental life, which is currently a key benefit of the program both for the fellows and the departments. Some faculty, she said, are also unhappy about the notion of an annual theme for the Humanities Center on the grounds that it will limit faculty interest to people interested in the annual theme. If the Mellon-Keiters are linked to the center *and* required to conform to the annual theme, this will tend to make that program far less responsive to departmental needs.



Amended May 16, 2013

Continuing, Professor Hunt commented that some faculty who have a deep interest in the humanities and who have some interest in having a Humanities Center nevertheless feel that more would be taken away from them (in terms of the loss of shelf-space in the library and the ability to browse books and government documents, for example) than they would gain, if the center is located in the library. They feel that, under the current plan, the humanities would be disproportionately “taxed” in order to pay for the Humanities Center and some colleagues do not see a net gain, either for the College or for their own scholarship. The Dean said that he has also heard the concerns Professor Hunt has raised. He remarked that he is sorry to see that this conversation has divided the Faculty; Dean Call noted that an equal number, if not more colleagues—many of whom are members of the younger generation of faculty—signed the letter in support of locating the Humanities Center in the library (appended to the Committee of Six minutes of April 22).

Professor Ratner commented that, at the April 26 meeting, some faculty had said that creating a center in the library would necessitate the removal of a significant number of books, a number sufficient to destroy the integrity of the library’s collections, in their view. Professor Ratner noted that the Dean and Mr. Geffert, Librarian of the College, had pointed out that the study of the space in the library, which is being conducted by the National Library Relocations to determine what books would need to be moved—for the most part within the library or, perhaps, in some cases to the “bunker”—under the preliminary plan, has not yet been received. Thus, the number of books that would be affected under the proposal is unknown at this time. The Dean noted that the conceptual designs that have been developed for a center to be located in the library were done as a means to assess the viability of that plan. The designs are preliminary, and the plan is not a *fait accompli*. Professor Ratner pointed out that it was clear that faculty at the meeting expressed the desire to learn more about options beyond the library in which the Humanities Center could be housed. Dean Call said that he would be open to having a group explore other options, as the Humanities Center Working Group has done, while noting that renovation costs and proximity to campus are some of the challenges that would need to be considered. The Dean reiterated his view that there is additional value in placing the Humanities Center in the library as a means of enhancing the case for a new library. Rather than waiting until a full vision for a new library can be imagined, he believes that the Humanities Center will provide an opportunity to make an even more compelling case for a new library. As he has said previously, the Dean believes that the center can be a means of developing the type of collaborative spaces and programming that might one day be part of a new library.

Professor Schneider asked Dean Call whether experimenting in the ways that the Dean had described would actually expedite the process of building a new library. The Dean responded that it is clear to him that donors would be more likely to contribute to a new library if they see an exciting, active Humanities Center in the current library, particularly during this time when most people are wondering about the future of the library as we have known it. Professor Hunt commented that faculty and others have been making proposals for a new library for more than twenty-five years. The Dean suggested that trying a new strategy to achieve this shared goal could result in an outcome that all would welcome.

The members discussed how best to move forward with planning for the Humanities Center. Since the National Library Relocations study will come too late in the term to make it possible to discuss it this semester, conversations about the study’s implications, and the Humanities Center more generally, should resume this fall, the Dean said, and the members

Amended May 16, 2013

agreed. The Dean said that he would like to ask the Library Committee to think about the center over the summer, and the members agreed that would be a good idea. President Martin stressed the benefits—for the entire Amherst community—of creating avenues for faculty and administrators, many of whom are relatively new to the College and will be an important part of Amherst’s future, to explore exciting new ideas in which they are deeply invested.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Rogowski asked, on behalf of a colleague, about the status of the letter that the Housing Committee had sent to the Dean at the end of last week. The Dean said that he had not yet reviewed the letter but that he would be happy to put it on the Committee’s agenda for the May 6 meeting. The letter, it was noted, offers recommendations for changing the housing policy.

At Professor Ratner’s request, the members returned to the topic of the Committee’s motion to require candidates for promotion to full professor to submit a letter on their own behalf. The Committee had voted on the motion at its last meeting. Professor Ratner, who continues to favor the proposed change, asked that the members reconsider their vote (five to zero in favor) on forwarding the motion to the Faculty, in light of the Committee’s vote (one in favor and four opposed) on the substance of the motion. Given the Committee’s lack of support for requiring a candidate’s letter, Professor Ratner expressed the view that it didn’t make sense for the Committee to bring the motion before the full Faculty; the situation seemed rather different here than one in which another faculty committee had crafted and forwarded a motion to the Committee of Six, in his opinion. Given Professor Ratner’s preference that the motion not be brought forward, the Committee agreed to reconsider its earlier vote and voted one in favor and four opposed to bringing the motion before the Faculty. After reviewing a draft agenda for a possible Faculty Meeting on May 7, the members decided that there was insufficient business to have a meeting. They noted that proposals for new courses could be considered at the Commencement Faculty Meeting on May 23.

The members returned to the topic of the resolution drafted by the Committee on Education and Athletics to determine the “sense of the Faculty” regarding the committee’s proposal that a process be developed to replace the “Lord Jeff” mascot. The Committee, the President, and the Dean agreed that, while there is little time left for discussion during this semester, it would be important for the Committee of Six to meet with the Committee on Education and Athletics to have an initial conversation as soon as possible. It was also agreed that, in order to have the broad consultation with all College constituencies that this issue warrants, it would be best if the Committee were to have further conversations in the fall about the proposal to change the mascot. All concurred that it will be important for all arguments to be heard and for this weighty issue to be thoroughly vetted. The members agreed that, before the Committee of Six considers a motion to bring to the Faculty, it is essential that this consultation take place. The members then turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended May 17, 2013

The twenty-sixth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday May 6, 2013. Present were Professors Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Ferguson was absent.

President Martin remarked that the meetings that she has had with faculty, students, and staff about the change of direction on the science center project have gone well, with members of the community offering helpful suggestions and asking interesting questions. Given the information that the President had conveyed about the problems with the project, the members expressed their support for the decision to find an alternate site for the new building. President Martin informed the members that, as part of the strategic planning effort, the College has been in the process of identifying an architectural planner to perform a campus assessment and develop a framework plan. The firm that is engaged will work with the Facilities Working Group to define strategies for the development of the campus in the long term and identify options to address many of the currently known facilities deficits. Identifying the most advantageous site for a science center will be a top priority. On Thursday, May 7, the preferred firm, Beyer Blinder Belle Architects and Planners LLP (BBB), will be on campus for meetings. The purpose of these meetings will be to introduce BBB to the community and provide a general sense of how the science center siting and framework plan process will move forward, and to begin to gain feedback from the community. The President said that there will be open meetings with BBB for faculty and students on May 9, and that there will be other opportunities provided to interact with the firm in the future.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Ratner informed President Martin and Dean Call that some colleagues have shared with him the importance of giving faculty the opportunity to convey their perspectives about a new site for the science center, and have cautioned that the decision about where to locate the building not be made too rapidly. Professor Harms acknowledged that the Faculty should be consulted about programming-related questions involving the new science center, but pointed out that those decisions about the siting and aesthetics of the building are within the purview of the administration and the Board of Trustees. President Martin agreed, from a governance-driven point of view, while noting the importance of gaining the perspectives of the Faculty about all aspects of the project. Professor Schneider commented that it appears that decisions about the site will drive many other decisions about the project that will have an impact on faculty. Professor Hunt praised the use of Merrill as swing space under the new plan, as did Professor Harms, who noted the desirability of Merrill as a location that is in close proximity to the athletics fields, which students appreciate. The Committee then turned to a personnel matter.

Under "Announcements from the Dean, Dean Call said that he has been in correspondence with the members of the Committee on Education and Athletics and the College Council about meeting with the Committee of Six on May 13 to discuss ways to move forward with engaging the Amherst community in dialogue about the College's mascot.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Ratner asked if the Dean had learned any more about the College's policy relating to having individuals work for the College without compensation. The Dean said that Ms. Rutherford, Chief Policy Officer and General Counsel, is researching this question and that he would report back to the Committee once he hears back from her.

Amended May 17, 2013

Conversation returned to plans for the Humanities Center. Dean Call said that he would like to clarify that the intention behind the creation of a Humanities Center is to support faculty scholarship, whether individual or collaborative. He stressed the importance of taking time to gather more data about issues relating to the center. Dean Call informed the members that no decisions will be made about the Humanities Center until more information is gathered and presented to the Faculty in the fall. The Dean said that he has asked the Humanities Center Working Group to produce a report, which would make use of this research, as well as the working group's consultation with members of the community, that would be shared with the Committee of Six, and the Faculty as a whole, in the fall at the earliest. To inform the working group's deliberations about the location of the center, which will include an examination of the costs and benefits of a number of options, the Dean has asked the Library Committee to inform the working group about any implications for the library of locating the center there. The Dean said that, once broad consultation is complete and the report is discussed by the Faculty, the administration will make a final decision about the shape and location of the center.

Professor Hunt expressed support for slowing down the process of moving forward with the Humanities Center and said that it will be important to establish goals for the project. At the same time, when one looks at the statements of purpose for humanities centers across the country one discovers that this is a surprisingly under-theorized area. She finds that the goals of humanities centers are typically nebulous—ranging from encouraging interdisciplinary work and thinking about “big questions of the day” to merely existing. Professor Hunt said that the goals of the Amherst center, which currently include fostering research and considering interesting/interdisciplinary questions, need to be more fully fleshed out. Professor Hunt argued that it will be important for faculty to learn more about the intended direction of the center. In her view, establishing a center for the purpose of having one in existence would not seem to be sufficient justification, particularly if the center is located in the library. Since some faculty members clearly feel that having the center there would involve trade-offs and sacrifices (lack of access to books on the shelves, in particular), they will want to know what is being gained. The Dean commented that these are good points and noted that faculty need different kinds of support for their scholarship and have different types of projects in mind, many, but not all of which could be enhanced by creating a humanities center.

Professor Rogowski asked if there might be ways to structure the center to place a priority on meeting the needs of new faculty members, who, at their career stage, are often more focused on interdisciplinary research than more senior colleagues who may be more entrenched in a single field. Professor Rogowski suggested that Dean Call reach out to newer colleagues to learn more about how they would envision the Humanities Center. Dean Call agreed and noted that the Humanities Center initiative originated in a proposal that had been brought forward by a group of faculty that included colleagues who had been at the College for many years, as well as those who were relatively new to Amherst. The vision for a center was also explored during the 2011-2012 academic year as part of the Copeland Colloquium, the theme of which that year was “The Future of the Humanities in an Age of Technics.” Professor Rogowski stressed that new colleagues could make valuable contributions to the center. Dean Call concurred, noting that many assistant and associate professors who have expressed a view about the center have placed more of an emphasis on having a space that fosters collaborative, interdisciplinary research at the core of the campus. Professor Harms commented that she can imagine that colleagues with this view feel that the need for a physical space is what justifies the establishment of a Humanities

Amended May 17, 2013

Center since, under the current model, most faculty conduct their research in relative isolation. It was agreed that it would be helpful to have a statement about the Humanities Center that, among offering other points, would provide a justification for creating a physical space for this purpose. Professor Harms said that she can imagine that the argument that a physical space is needed would be the same argument that could be used to justify creating such a space in the library.

Continuing with the conversation, Professor Schneider asked if the Humanities Center proposal has been brought to the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR). Dean Call responded that a rough estimate, which has served as a placeholder for the project, has been shared with the CPR. That estimate for the project is between \$1 million and \$2 million, the Dean said, noting that the CPR has not approved a budget. Professor Schneider asked when the CPR would weigh in on the question of the Humanities Center. The Dean said that the committee would likely weigh in when there is an actual plan for the project, which would later be brought to the Board of Trustees. Professor Schneider inquired if the CPR would be asked to consider the debate surrounding broader questions about the Humanities Center when making a judgment about budgetary implications. Dean Call said that the committee would not ordinarily do that as part of its charge, unless it was tasked to do so by the Committee of Six. Professor Harms said that it is her understanding that the CPR is charged with considering the budgetary implications of expenditures that have an impact on the operating budget. The committee does not, for example, set priorities for fundraising. Professor Ratner wondered whether the Library Committee would consider, once the Humanities Center Working Group had distributed its report, the broader question of whether housing the center in the library should be a priority in terms of the use of the library. Dean Call said that he expects that, as part of the Humanities Center Working Group's gathering of additional information to inform its report, it would solicit the Library Committee's views about the costs and benefits to the library of situating the Humanities Center there. The working group's report would, as noted earlier, also address other possible locations.

President Martin asked about earlier plans for the Mellon-Keiter Postdoctoral Fellows and Copeland Fellows who are being brought to the College in 2013-2014 to have an affiliation with the Humanities Center, now that the process for creating a center is proceeding more slowly than envisioned. Dean Call responded that there could be a Humanities Center pilot next year that would involve these individuals, even though there will not be a physical space in place until later. Professor Rogowski asked about the possibility of housing these colleagues together in Amherst housing. The Dean responded that Copeland Fellows are not ordinarily provided with College housing. It was noted that some Copeland Fellows were housed together in College housing this year. The Dean said that, since this year's Copeland arts theme involved an unusual structure (with numerous shorter-term visitors coming to campus over the course of the year), a space for housing visiting artists that were here as part of the program had indeed been provided. He does not anticipate replicating this structure on a regular basis for future Copeland Fellows. President Martin noted that the faculty who organized this year's Copeland Colloquium have requested that the College house that was used as a living space for visiting artists be used again next year for housing visiting artists who are brought to the College. She said that she is considering the request and expressed hope that it will be possible to support the collaborative efforts in the arts that were so successful this year.

Conversation turned to a letter that the Housing Committee ([appended via link](#)) recently forwarded to the Committee of Six. In the letter, the committee made a number of proposals to

Amended May 17, 2013

revise the College's housing policy. The Committee discussed the Housing Committee's recommendation that a rental subsidy of \$400.00 per month be provided to all members of the Amherst community who are eligible to rent College housing, if these individuals do not rent housing from the College. Noting that the College is now in a period of increased hiring, when demand for rental housing is high, the Housing Committee is proposing that, once the need for housing and available rental units returns to an "equilibrium level," the subsidy should be phased out. The committee is also recommending that no distance limit be set for the rentals, noting that it would be a requirement, under the proposal, that the rented unit be the primary residence of the recipient of the subsidy. After some conversation, the Committee agreed that, if a rental subsidy is provided to those who qualify for College housing, but do not rent from the College, that subsidy should also be used as an incentive for faculty to live nearby the College, which brings many advantages to the Amherst community. Eliminating the distance requirement of the policy altogether would represent a significant shift in approach that the members would not favor. Professor Harms pointed out that there is a trade-off between the benefits of the distance requirement and the benefit of a policy that could attract and serve the needs of two-career families, where one career is at a distance from Amherst. The members agreed that, if there is no direct benefit to the College as a result of offering a housing subsidy, and the purpose of it is to provide what amounts to additional income to be used for housing or another purpose, the College might as well be raising the salaries of everyone by \$400.00 per month, a step that seems ill-advised without a more considered plan. The Committee noted that it does not seem possible for the College to know that a rental unit is being used as an individual's primary residence, a requirement under the proposal. The Dean said that he agreed that, if the College provides a subsidy to those who qualify for College housing, there should be a requirement that recipients of it live near campus.

Continuing, the members also discussed the proposal that the subsidy be made available to those who qualify for College housing, but choose not to make use of it. In terms of providing a subsidy, some members felt that there is a difference between choosing not to rent from the College when it is possible for a colleague to do so, "opting out," so to speak, and not being able to rent because there is no availability. Professor Hunt noted that colleagues opt out of College housing for all kinds of reasons, including that the available housing is inappropriate for their own and their families' needs, and that they should not be penalized for that. One risk of incentivizing the rental of non-College units would be that College units may end up being underutilized, which would represent a loss of revenue for the College. However, the Housing Committee proposal covers that eventuality by proposing that the housing subsidy be dropped if the squeeze on faculty housing diminishes, Professor Hunt commented. Professor Harms expressed the view that there are many inequities in faculty benefits and that the proposal addresses just one. She suggested another approach, particularly if the incentive to live near the College is not part of the policy. Amherst might consider renting College housing at fair market value to those who qualify and wish to make use of it, while at the same time, everyone who qualifies for College housing, but has not already benefited from the College's second mortgage plan, could be given a raise of \$400.00 (or some other amount) per month. Professor Schneider argued that it is important to Amherst to have faculty living near the College and said that he would favor having a subsidy if living near the College were a requirement for receiving it. Professor Ratner agreed. He also expressed concern that there has not been enough College housing to meet recent demand, given the pace of current and anticipated faculty hiring.

Amended May 17, 2013

Professor Ratner commented that providing sufficient rental housing should be a top priority, and he said that he is troubled by the recent renovation of a College house to provide a space for the Mind-Life Institute. President Martin noted that, in that particular case, it would have been quite expensive to renovate the house for domestic use. Dean Call said that some current housing stock is being renovated for domestic use, and he noted that consultants have advised that building additional rental units may not be the most desirable approach to solving the housing shortage, as the shortage will likely be acute only for the period of intensive hiring that is currently under way. In addition, it seems that individuals may wish to have a variety of housing options.

President Martin said that it will be important to consider the purpose of the College housing program, including whether this program should be benefiting the College, as well as individuals. From a structural perspective, she made some observations about the approach to bringing requests for resources forward at Amherst. Individual committees, such as the Housing Committee, focus on considering issues within their charge, as they should. From an administrative perspective, however, it is important that decisions be made within a broader context. While the CPR is often asked to weigh in on requests such as this one from the Housing Committee, an appropriate and helpful step, the President commented that establishing priorities for the College will help guide the allocation of resources in ways that are less ad hoc, and which will allow for the consideration of the trade-offs when making choices and decisions. For example, one could ask as a thought experiment, should the priority be to spend \$3.5 million (the projected costs of the rental subsidy program), or a portion of this amount, on changes to housing policy, or on something else—improved childcare, for example? President Martin said that developing and setting college-wide priorities will be an important part of the strategic planning process. The President and the Dean noted that the housing program is a benefit for faculty and some administrators, and that the administration would consider the Housing Committee's proposal and its potential broader implications before any recommendation would be brought to the Trustees, as is customary with such requests.

Continuing with a discussion of the proposal, Professor Schneider expressed concern that the College's second mortgage program is structured in such a way that participants are being disadvantaged, rather than receiving a benefit. While he can imagine that the program would be helpful if it were reimagined, in his experience the interest rates for loans that are offered through the program are higher than those offered through banks. Some members noted that this may be the case because interest rates are at historic lows. The Dean said that the current proposal from the Housing Committee seeks to provide a range of options for colleagues, who may have different needs. The President and the Dean thanked the Committee of Six for their feedback on the Housing Committee's proposal. The Committee turned to personnel matters.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended May 21, 2013

The twenty-seventh meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin at the President's house at 3:30 P.M. on Monday May 13, 2013. Present were Professors Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Ferguson was absent.

Under "Announcements from the Dean," Dean Call discussed committee nominations with the members. Dean Call then informed the members of plans to place on the agenda for the Committee's next meeting a discussion of the letter that Professor Sitze had sent to the members on the topic of advising. After discussing the response to the Committee's survey about advising (twelve departments have replied so far), which had been sent to all department chairs on April 24, the members decided to postpone further conversation about advising until the fall—including the discussion of Professor Sitze's letter—when more information should be available to inform the conversation.

Continuing with his remarks, Dean Call noted that, to facilitate projects involving online learning and the use of technology in teaching, as well as to encourage collaborations between faculty members and IT that will enhance scholarly endeavors, he would soon be sending to the Faculty, on behalf of the Faculty Computer Committee (FCC), a call for technology-related proposals. The Dean commented that it would be helpful if the Committee would discuss a process for reviewing proposals to put full courses online, as some proposals to do so may come forward. Questions to consider might include which faculty committees should be consulted and criteria for vetting the proposals. The Dean said that he would also ask the Committee for advice on related matters that might not rise to the level of policy. The members agreed that they should discuss these topics at their next meeting. Professor Harms suggested that thought be given to developing a policy to address the issue of substituting online lectures for students' attendance in classes. The other members and the Dean agreed that they would trust that existing procedures at the level of individual faculty, departments, and the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) would effectively address this question.

Dean Call next reported that Lisa Rutherford, Chief Policy Officer and General Counsel, has responded to the members' questions about the College's policies relating to having individuals work without compensation. Ms. Rutherford has informed the Dean that this question is governed by state and federal law. She learned from her research, and subsequent discussion with outside counsel, that Massachusetts has employment laws that differ from most other states. For instance, Massachusetts law does not permit the College to allow individuals to teach without pay. To determine if someone may be considered a volunteer (in this case, to teach without pay), there is a four-part test that must be met. Ms. Rutherford noted that the College fails one part of the test—specifically—the rule that says that volunteer positions must be ones in which Amherst typically does not pay others. Obviously, she said, the College does pay those who teach. The outside attorney informed Ms. Rutherford that, if someone wants to teach but not receive compensation, he or she could donate the compensation to the College. Before anyone agrees to this structure, however, he or she should receive advice from a tax expert, Ms. Rutherford noted. Turning to the question of whether the College can allow recent graduates to work in Amherst labs without compensation, the Dean said that Ms. Rutherford had said that it may be possible to do so. This situation should be distinguished from the volunteer one by treating these individuals as interns. To be an intern, state law requires a six-part test, Ms. Rutherford noted. The general idea is that the individual should gain more from the experience than Amherst College does. In fact, one part of the test requires that the employer derive no immediate advantage from the activities of the intern, and, on occasion, its operations may actually be impeded. Ms. Rutherford has advised the Dean that it is not necessary for the



Amended May 21, 2013

College to create a formal intern program to “hire” interns. Professor Harms commented that she has become aware of ways of complying with these laws, while allowing greater flexibility in regard to having volunteers do work without compensation. Professor Harms suggested that the Dean speak with Fred Venne, Museum Educator for the Beneski Museum of Natural History, who had some experience with these matters when he was working as a school principal. Dean Call said that he would be happy to learn more about this topic from Mr. Venne. Professor Ratner asked about the outcome of plans that had been under way for an Amherst faculty member to co-teach a First-Year Seminar with an individual who is not an Amherst faculty member and who would not be compensated. Dean Call said that the seminar is no longer being offered so the question about it is moot.

The Committee next reviewed the nomination from the Department of Physical Education and Athletics for the Edward Hitchcock Fellowship, and voted five in favor and zero opposed to support the awarding of the fellowship to the nominee and to forward the nomination to the Faculty.

At 4:00 P.M., the Committee was joined by members of the Committee on Education and Athletics and the College Council to discuss ways to move forward with engaging the Amherst community in dialogue about the College’s mascot. Present from the committees were Professors Carter, Couvares, Grillo, and Parham; Suzanne Coffey, Director of Athletics; Charri Boykin-East, Interim Dean of Students; Hannah Fatemi, Assistant Dean of Students and Director of the Campus Center; Torin Moore, Assistant Dean of Students and Director of Residential Life; and Pamela Stawasz, Assistant Director of Residential Life; and students Shruthi Badri ’16, Erik Christianson’ 14, and George Tepe ’14.

On behalf of the Committee of Six, Dean Call thanked the members of the two committees for attending the meeting and said that the Committee feels that it would be helpful to have conversation about the next steps that could be taken in regard to this issue. Professor Couvares, who chairs the Committee on Education and Athletics, said that his committee had drafted the resolution ([appended via link](#)), with the intention of bringing it before the Faculty for a vote, as a vehicle for having the Faculty go on record as supporting the replacement of the “Lord Jeff” mascot because of its “entanglement with the history of racial injustice.” Professor Couvares expressed his committee’s view that this is an issue on which the Faculty should take a leadership position, making an important statement and sending a signal to the community as a first step in a process that might very well garner less opposition than some imagine. Professor Grillo, who chairs the College Council, expressed the Council’s gratitude that the Committee on Educational and Athletics had brought this important issue to the College Council’s attention. He also thanked the Committee of Six for meeting with the two committees.

Continuing, Professor Grillo commented that the College Council (see the Council’s letter to the Committee of Six, which is [appended via link](#)) has decided not to endorse the resolution at this time out of concern that having the Faculty weigh in on the mascot question as a first step may threaten the inclusivity that should be part of the process; the Council’s view is that more time should be taken to lay the groundwork for decision making. The College Council feels that it will be important to provide space early on for students (as well as for other members of the Amherst community, including alumni) to learn more about this issue and to discuss it, since it is clear that there is a lack of consensus among students about whether the mascot should be replaced. Professor Parham expressed the view that having the Faculty approve the resolution as a first step could create an assumption among students that a decision to change the mascot has already been made. She stressed the importance of framing the discussion about the future of the mascot as an opportunity for a positive moment of transformation that involves the entire

Amended May 21, 2013

College community. Professor Grillo commented that this question may be a very sensitive issue for students and alumni, and that it will be important to provide education, and to have a good deal of conversation, about the reasons for changing the mascot. Otherwise, he fears, some students and alumni may see a decision to change the mascot as an affront to College tradition.

Mr. Tepe, incoming president of the Association of Amherst Students (AAS), noted that the mascot was raised as an issue during the recent AAS election. Some students supported the proposal to change the mascot, while a significant number did not. Mr. Tepe expressed concern that alumni, as well as students, might feel that they had not been asked to engage in the process of considering this important question, if the Faculty takes action ahead of other constituencies. Professor Couvares said that a faculty resolution is not being suggested as a means to change the mascot without having a broad conversation about this issue, but rather to have the Faculty express its sense of the issue as a foundational step. Professor Hunt asked what the benefit would be of having the Faculty weigh in on this question first. She wondered about the effectiveness of this approach, if the ultimate goal is to replace the mascot. In her view the Faculty is commonly perceived as being unsupportive of athletics and as the constituency that is least engaged in this issue, so having faculty address the question first may seem inappropriate to some. Professor Couvares said that the intent of the resolution is to “get the ball rolling” on this issue. Professor Schneider remarked that having the Faculty lead the charge on this issue might drive a wedge between the Faculty and the Trustees, who ultimately would be involved in making the final decision. He suggested that the President offer advice on the best way to bring the Trustees into the conversation so that they feel included. Professor Schneider also noted the implications for alumni of changing the mascot and urged that a cautious approach be taken in regard to the consideration of the mascot issue.

Professor Ratner asked Mr. Tepe if he would tell the Committee more about the views expressed by students during the recent election. Mr. Tepe said that there had been a town hall meeting (the meeting is described further later in these minutes) in which students had put forward passionate arguments on both sides of the issue; the question recurred in the run-up to the election, rather than it being central to the campaign of any particular candidate. Professor Rogowski asked Mr. Tepe how he would envision moving forward with the conversation with students in an open and inclusive way. Mr. Tepe responded that he would approach a variety of groups—athletics teams, for example—and speak with them about the issue. He could also imagine having open meetings for students, while noting that the disadvantage of such a format is that students often feel uncomfortable speaking their minds. In the past in this setting, students with particular views have felt attacked for expressing their perspectives, and a contentious atmosphere has developed. For this reason, it might be preferable to speak with students in small groups, so that they are comfortable speaking publicly and will not feel that they are under fire. Mr. Tepe expressed the view that the conversation about this topic should not be led by the students. Professor Hunt suggested sponsoring a public debate about the mascot that would feature specialists in the area of colonial history, individuals who would be knowledgeable about the questions at hand and could represent their own positions.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Hunt noted that many people who support keeping the current mascot may not realize how damning the historical record surrounding Lord Jeffery Amherst is. If members of the community read the relevant documents, they would likely change their views on the matter, she argued. Professor Parham stressed the need to take great care with the consideration of this question and the language that is used in the process, as the issues surrounding Lord Jeffery Amherst are complex and are intertwined with individuals’ feelings surrounding diversity and inclusion and inequality in their own lives and at Amherst

Amended May 21, 2013

today. She did not feel that a debate would be an especially good way to explore the issues. Professor Hunt said that she would favor having these questions explored in open forums, but she agreed with Professor Parham that the issues were sensitive. The view was expressed that some individuals may not necessarily want to keep the Lord Jeff mascot because of the man himself, but because the mascot is a tradition at Amherst. Ms. Stawasz noted that, last month, the AAS had organized the informative open meeting (referenced earlier by Mr. Tepe) to discuss the mascot, which had been attended largely by students, but also by some faculty members, administrators and staff members, members of the athletics department, and local alumni. The meeting had begun with a presentation by Michael Kelly, Head of Archives and Special Collections, about the history of Lord Jeffery Amherst and how his image has been used at the College—in song, in publications, and as the mascot. Ms. Stawasz suggested that some members of the community may be attached to Lord Jeffery Amherst as a mascot because of the dearth of other traditions at the College; she offered the view that it would be helpful to have members of the Amherst community embark on joint efforts to create new traditions for the College. Mr. Tepe said that some students would like to see past Amherst traditions revived, rather than new traditions developed. He offered the example of “Chip Day,” an opportunity for contributing to the wider community and inclusiveness, when classes had been canceled and students had “chipped in” around the community. By reestablishing older traditions, Amherst would be seen as supportive of tradition, rather than as trying to stomp them out.

Professor Harms commented that she is confident that a path can be found to consider the mascot question, and that the goal should be for the process not to create a backlash or have serious repercussions for the institution. She noted that this has been a challenging year at the College and expressed her desire to avoid divisiveness as much as possible. Professor Harms argued that it would be best for the institution not to have a faculty conversation and vote about the mascot at this moment. In her view, as a first step, efforts should be directed to finding ways to move the discussion forward and to educate the community—beginning the process of considering the mascot question by offering short courses, lectures by outside speakers, and special events that focus on the history of Lord Jeffery Amherst and intersections with Amherst College. Professor Harms said that, in her opinion, most alumni would agree to change the mascot if they feel that students want this change.

Professor Ratner remarked that, while he sees the virtue of having the Faculty make a principled statement to launch this process, he is, at the same time, concerned that the outcome of such an approach might not further the cause of changing the mascot. He said the key to success, in his mind, is beginning the process by offering opportunities for all members of the community to express their feelings about the mascot issue, and to feel heard. Professor Couvares said that he does not think that having a vote on the resolution precludes having such conversations, while commenting that he understands the concerns being raised about taking this step at this time. Professor Rogowski wondered whether it makes sense to include information about the College’s history as part of orientation programming. Professor Harms added that it would be important to present the history in a sensitive and balanced way, placing Lord Jeffery Amherst in the larger context of a college that has much to be proud of in the realm of diversity and inclusion. Mr. Moore expressed the view that it would be helpful, as part of Amherst’s conversations, to do some research about other schools that are reexamining some of their traditions. Professor Hunt agreed and suggested that Brown University might offer a model for how Amherst might proceed, as that university developed a successful process for examining the involvement of Brown’s founders in the transatlantic slave trade. The idea of examining successful, as well as unsuccessful, efforts to change a mascot at other colleges and universities

Amended May 21, 2013

was also discussed. Professor Hunt proposed that the College create a committee, comprising students, faculty, staff, and alumni, and individuals from outside the College with knowledge of colonial history, to consider the mascot issue and to frame it in terms of a less categorical question. She also noted that the smallpox blanket episode is well known to Native American activists and has been for decades. As a result, some people from the Native American communities have strong negative feelings about Amherst because of the College's ties to Lord Jeffery Amherst. This unfortunate legacy is deeply troubling to many, has serious repercussions for student and faculty recruitment, and is particularly painful for Native American members of the Amherst community.

President Martin said that she favors the approach of considering the mascot question as part of a broader set of related questions about Amherst's central values, and how the College should present itself, that will be addressed in thoughtful ways through the strategic planning process. She expressed support for learning more about Brown's process for considering and addressing its deeply troubling history. The President said that she favors seeking outside perspectives about this complex issue, in addition to involving the entire Amherst community in the process of thinking about the mascot question. President Martin remarked that, since the initiative to replace the mascot began with students, having the Faculty vote on a resolution now might be seen as usurping a student-driven effort. In regard to the resolution, she suggested that it might be more powerful if Lord Jeffery Amherst's acts were mentioned in more explicit and concrete terms. President Martin also stressed the importance of involving alumni in whatever process is undertaken to consider the mascot question.

Professor Harms expressed support for the proposal to address the mascot issue as part of the strategic planning process. Questions to be asked might include: what are Amherst's core values, and how do we bring them to life for students over four years? If a core value for the College is diversity and inclusion, the mascot does not serve us, Professor Harms noted. Ms. Coffey agreed, commenting that it will be helpful for the mascot issue to be considered within the larger context of student life. Professor Grillo concurred. Professor Couvares commented that, while this has been a challenging year for the College, he feels that there is a pervasive sense of optimism, owing to the President's leadership. He noted that he will be on leave next year and looks forward to following the progress of efforts to change the mascot. Professor Carter commented that the Committee on Education and Athletics had thought that bringing a resolution to the Faculty would be a way of encouraging the administration to take steps to move forward with a process for considering the mascot question. She feels that incorporating the issue into the planning effort obviates the need for a faculty resolution at this time and expressed her support for having the administration lead this effort, rather than the Faculty or the student body. Professor Harms said that, while she understands the need for students not to be the only ones to lead the process of considering the mascot question, the mascot will not be changed unless students support doing so. She reiterated the need to provide opportunities to educate students about Lord Jeffery Amherst. President Martin said that she will inform the Trustees that students held an open meeting about the mascot, faculty committees have now weighed in on the question, and that the decision has been made that a strategic planning working group will address this issue in the context of broader questions about student life, the College's core values, and the ways in which the College presents itself to the larger world. Professor Ratner was concerned that the membership of a strategic planning working group might differ from that of a group that might be established expressly to consider the mascot issue, lessening the impact of any consensus that resulted. Professor Hunt expressed some worry about including a divisive issue at the center of a working group that will have a broader charge. She remembered several

Amended May 21, 2013

past cases where a similar strategy had led to people focusing all their attention on the controversial issue and ignoring the rest of the report. It was agreed that the members would consider this question, and that one option might be to form a subcommittee of a working group to focus on the mascot issue. On behalf of the Committee of Six, the Dean thanked the two committees for their helpful views, and the members of the Committee on Education and Athletics and the College Council left the meeting at 5:15 P.M. The Committee agreed to return to the conversation about the mascot at its next meeting and to think about a charge for the working group and/or subcommittee that will be asked to consider the mascot issue.

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. After discussing the merits of the theses, 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, Professor Harms took note that many of the students' transcripts reveal that they have taken a very narrow path through the curriculum. Professor Schneider said that, for some students, focusing intensively in several areas, about which they are passionate, can be the best educational approach. Professor Ratner, who served on the Committee last year, felt that the transcripts demonstrated more breadth this year than those of several students who were nominated for summa honors last year. The members agreed that it would be helpful if all departmental recommendations for summa honors provide an explanation of departments' expectations for summa-level work and a description of how theses nominated for summa honors meet those expectations. The members agreed to review the instructions for preparing the summa recommendation letters that are sent to departments by the Registrar.

The members next reviewed a draft agenda for a Faculty Meeting to be held on May 23. The Dean noted that Professor Sinos, on behalf of a group of faculty colleagues, has requested that the motion below be appended to the meeting's agenda:

Out of concern for the loss of books and faculty carrels entailed by the current proposal to place a humanities center in Frost Library, the Faculty asks the Dean to commission a plan making use of an appropriate space elsewhere (e.g., the Campus Center or Alumni House) as a temporary home for a humanities center, until the College can create a space suited to its needs, such as an expanded and renovated library.

The members agreed to append the motion. While agreeing that options for a location for the center appear to be limited, and that there appear to be no easy solutions, the Committee noted that it will be important to take time over the summer to gather more data about issues relating to the Humanities Center, including its location. The Dean noted that the study of the space in the library, which is being conducted by the National Library Relocations, to determine what books would need to be moved—for the most part within the library or, perhaps, in some cases to the “bunker”—under the preliminary plan, will be available soon and will provide important information. Dean Call reiterated that no decisions will be made about the Humanities

Amended May 21, 2013

Center until more information is gathered and presented to the Faculty. The Dean noted once again that current plans call for the Humanities Center Working Group to produce a report, which would make use of this research, as well as the working group's consultation with members of the community, that would be shared with the Committee of Six, and the Faculty as a whole, in the fall at the earliest. To inform the working group's deliberations about the location of the center, which will include an examination of the costs and benefits of a number of options, the Dean has asked the Library Committee to inform the working group about any implications for the library of locating the center there. The working group's report would, as noted earlier, also address other possible locations, weighing all the evidence that can be gathered. The members agreed that offering information about the viability of other options will be important, though some members questioned whether any locations beyond the library represent real possibilities. It was noted that the campus planning effort will include an exploration of this question over the summer, which can inform faculty discussion about the center in the fall. President Martin commented that, in her view, if a location other than the library is selected, it is clear that the launch of a Humanities Center will be delayed because costs will rise. Professor Hunt, who expressed support for taking time in the summer to diffuse the current polarization within the Faculty over this issue, as well as to gather more data, said that, if the library is the best option, it will be important to demonstrate that locating the Humanities Center there will not represent a disproportionate loss to certain disciplines.

After further conversation about the need for more time to gather information about possible locations for the Humanities Center, the members agreed that, if the motion is introduced at the meeting, Professor Hunt, on behalf of the Committee of Six, would move to postpone the consideration of it until the first Faculty Meeting after fall break. Professor Harms suggested that written ballots be used for votes surrounding the Humanities Center, and the members agreed that Professor Harms should request written ballots at the Faculty Meeting.

The members voted five in favor and zero opposed to forward the Faculty Meeting agenda to the Faculty.

The meeting adjourned at 6:45P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended June 13, 2013

The twenty-eighth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in the Board Room of the Lord Jeffery Inn at 3:30 P.M. on Monday May 20, 2013. Present were Professors Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Ferguson was absent.

The meeting began with Professor Schneider asking whether College musical groups should continue to perform the “Lord Jeffery Amherst” song by J.S. Hamilton (Amherst College Class of 1906) at campus events, in light of recent conversations about the possibility of changing the College’s mascot and concerns about the College’s ties to Lord Jeffery Amherst. It was noted that some alumni, in particular, enjoy singing the song, which is considered to be a parody of Lord Jeff. The members agreed that the song has developed a life of its own, beyond any association with the mascot, and that no action should be taken at this time to remove it from the repertoire of songs sung at College events. Attention should be paid to any concerns that might arise about the song, however.

Continuing, Professor Schneider noted that the Committee’s recent discussions about processes for bringing particular issues forward, and the entities responsible for decision making and for creating policies, have suggested that it might be informative for the President and the Dean to offer a presentation about faculty and College governance at a Faculty Meeting next year. Included in such a presentation could be, for example, an explanation of the role of committees and other mechanisms for considering important matters, and the structure and purview of the Amherst College Board of Trustees. Such a presentation would be particularly useful for new faculty members, Professor Schneider remarked. President Martin agreed that Professor Schneider’s proposal was a good idea, commenting that it would be informative, for example, to provide an overview of how Faculty Meetings are run and the ways in which *Robert’s Rules of Order* are interpreted at Amherst. She said she would happy to describe the place of the Trustees in the governance of the College and the opportunities that are provided for faculty committees to meet with the Board. In regard to the discussion about proper procedures for discourse at Faculty Meetings, Professors Ratner and Harms, while agreeing that such a presentation would be useful, stressed the importance of taking an informational and non-judgmental approach.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Ratner asked about the progress of the survey that is being conducted about whether to change the meeting time for Faculty Meetings. Assistant Dean Tobin responded that the Office of Institutional Research is now compiling the results of the survey, which should be available to the Committee by the time of its next meeting. Continuing, Professor Ratner commented that he had recently consulted with the Registrar about how Amherst decides whether the College will grant credit for 100-level general education courses offered by the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. He was informed that, following a review by an Associate Dean and the Registrar, in consultation with a department(s), some courses may fall off Amherst’s list of courses that are approved for credit at the College. Professor Ratner said that he has been told that, when it is perceived that large numbers of Amherst students are co-enrolling in a large, introductory-level UMass course during the same semester, suspicion may be raised that the students’ motivation for taking the course may not be a purely intellectual one. The Registrar and an Associate Dean of the Faculty review these courses on a case-by-case basis. Professor Ratner commented that his own experience suggests that advisors, as a best practice, should give full consideration to the reasons that their advisees may give for enrolling in introductory-level general education courses offered by the university.

Amended June 13, 2013

Professor Hunt noted that other Five-College institutions offer courses that are of the same caliber as those offered by Amherst. Professor Ratner did not disagree and commented that he had in mind a particular type of course taught at UMass that Amherst students may take as a means of avoiding challenge and/or to get a good grade. He said that he is supportive of Amherst students taking courses at Five-College institutions as a general matter, particularly advanced courses or those in subfields that are not offered at the College. It was agreed that there seems to be a system for looking out for the kind of courses about which Professor Ratner has concerns, and for taking steps to remove them from the list of those that are approved for credit at Amherst, when this step is deemed to be appropriate. On a related note, Professor Rogowski raised the issue of how a determination is made in regard to the amount of credit that should be awarded at Amherst for a UMass course, which is typically three credits, while the equivalent Amherst course would be four credits. President Martin agreed that the determination of the award of credit is an important issue, particularly in light of the relatively new federal definition of a “credit hour.”

Under “Announcements from the Dean,” Dean Call discussed some committee nominations with the members. The members turned to personnel matters.

Discussion returned briefly to the topic of the Humanities Center. The Dean noted that he has received some preliminary results from the study of the space in the library to determine what books would need to be moved—for the most part within the library or, perhaps, in some cases to the “bunker”—under the preliminary plan. The Dean said that Bryn Geffert, Librarian of the College, has informed him that a library is viewed as effectively full when it is at 85 percent capacity, and that he has been looking at calculations that keep Frost Library at a capacity of 80 percent or below. Preliminary calculations from the study, which is being conducted by National Library Relocations, suggest that Frost could remain at a capacity of 80 percent or below for the next seven years, if the proposal for locating the Humanities Center in the library is realized, as currently conceived, if hard copies of congressional hearings are moved to the bunker. He noted that the library has wanted to move these documents, which are indexed in an online format only and which most people use in a digital form, for some time. Professor Hunt commented that some historians prefer to read these documents in paper form. Professors Harms and Rogowski suggested that historians and others could continue to read the hard copies if these materials are moved to the bunker, where there is a small workspace and reasonable conditions in which to read the documents as well as parking for visitors unaffiliated with the College. The materials could also be brought to the library upon request. Professor Hunt agreed that this would be a possibility, while noting that the bunker is not staffed on weekends or in the evening, thus limiting potential users’ access to the material.

The members briefly discussed the process and timetable for gathering information to inform decision making about the Humanities Center. It was agreed that, before there is a faculty discussion about the Humanities Center, it will be important to have the following to inform that conversation: the assessment of possible locations for the Humanities Center that will be completed over the summer by Jim Brassord, Director of Facilities and Associate Treasurer for Campus Services, and his staff; the National Library Relocations report; and the report of the Humanities Center Working Group. In developing its report, the working group will make use of the aforementioned reports and input from the Library Committee, as well as consultation with members of the Faculty. The members agreed that it appears that this work could be completed by the time of the first Faculty Meeting after the 2013 fall break, at which time the



Amended June 13, 2013

Faculty could discuss the Humanities Center. Professor Hunt commented that allowing this much time for preparation and discussion would be useful, since it will be important for the Humanities Center Working Group to present a rationale for the center, to outline its mission and goals, and propose a program for the first year, in addition to weighing in about a location. The members agreed that the Library Committee should be asked to assess the impact on the library of locating the center there and to provide this information to the working group, to inform its report, and to the Faculty as a whole prior to the faculty meeting discussion.

The Committee next reviewed the recommendation for the Woods-Travis Prize, and voted five in favor and zero opposed to support the awarding of the fellowship to the nominee and to forward the nomination to the Faculty.

Discussion turned to the topic of developing a process for facilitating projects involving online learning and the use of technology in teaching, as well as to encourage collaborations between faculty members and IT that will enhance scholarly endeavors. The Dean noted that, on behalf of the Faculty Computer Committee (FCC), he had sent to the Faculty a call ([appended via link](#)) on May 14 for technology-related proposals. The Dean asked the members for their advice about how proposals to put full courses online might be vetted. Should anything be required beyond having the course vetted and approved by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and the Faculty Computer Committee, for example? After a brief discussion, the members agreed that proposals for full courses should be vetted by the CEP, while smaller online initiatives should be seen as experiments that do not require the approval of that committee. The FCC will receive proposals that focus on other projects involving online learning and using technology in teaching. That committee, working with Gayle Barton, Chief Information Officer, would be tasked with assessing the proposals and the ability of the College to implement them with available resources. When undertaking these activities and making decisions about which ones to undertake, the members agreed that it will be important to convey that, in its efforts to make use of technology, Amherst is remaining faithful to its mission as an institution that is “committed to learning through close colloquy” and other articulated values. The Dean noted that the College has applied for grant funding to support two staff positions in IT to work on online learning initiatives. If this seed money is provided, the positions will become part of Amherst’s budget planning going forward. Professor Schneider asked if the financial feasibility of a proposal will have an impact on whether it is funded. The Dean said that the financial ramifications of funding a given proposal always need to be taken into account. Professor Rogowski expressed the hope that the funding of projects could be balanced to meet a range of needs. Rather than making use of available funds to support only a small number of ambitious projects, he would prefer to see funding provided for more modest ideas, as well.

The Committee next reviewed the letter that is sent to departments to provide instruction about the process for recommending students for “summa” honors. It was agreed that, in future, this letter should be sent to all thesis advisors, rather than to department chairs, and that it should be sent from the Dean, rather than the Registrar, on behalf of the Committee of Six. The members made several revisions to the letter, with the goal of making more explicit the expectation that, as part of their recommendation letters, advisors and departments should make an effort to explain the particular merits of theses in terms accessible to colleagues outside their academic disciplines.

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 P.M.

Amended June 13, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended June 24, 2013

The twenty-ninth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 1:30 P.M. on Wednesday, May 29, 2013. Present were Professors Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Ferguson was absent.

Dean Call began the meeting by noting the imminent retirement of Mary Miller, administrative assistant in the Dean's office, who has worked at the College for thirty-three and eleven twenty-fourths years, thirty-one and one-third years of which have been in the Dean of the Faculty's office. On behalf of the College, the Dean expressed his great appreciation to Ms. Miller for her outstanding work, noting her great care, attention to detail, dedication, and kind heart, and the invaluable support she has provided to the Committee of Six over more than three decades. The Committee asked to go on record as offering its highest praise of Ms. Miller and, on behalf of the Faculty, its gratitude for her many contributions to Amherst College.

Under "Questions from Committee Members," Professor Harms expressed concern that the College's policies governing field trips are creating undue burdens and obstacles for faculty and departments. She noted that, in an effort to avoid placing the College at risk, policies appear to have been established, under a "one-size-fits-all" approach and a set of unrealistic and exaggerated expectations about the level of risk involved, that are creating barriers to the smooth operation of field trips. Professor Harms said that she had been unaware that these policies had been created until recently. The Dean agreed to look into this matter.

Professor Ratner inquired about the accident that had taken place following Commencement. President Martin responded that an Amherst employee had been involved in a vehicular accident with a Hampshire student, who died as a result of his injuries. The President, the Dean, and the Committee expressed their deep sadness over this loss of life and offered condolences. The members then turned to personnel matters.

The Dean next presented nominations for endowed professorships. The next step will be for the President to recommend these professorships to the Board, Dean Call noted.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

Amended July 24, 2013

The thirtieth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Martin in her office at 10:00 A.M. on Wednesday, June 5, 2013. Present were Professors Harms, Hunt, Ratner, Rogowski, and Schneider, Dean Call, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Ferguson was absent.

The members reviewed the results of the survey that was done to inform the decision about whether to change the meeting time for Faculty Meetings. The Committee agreed that, since the respondents were roughly evenly divided on the question of changing or not changing the time of Faculty Meetings, and since the Committee had agreed that a change from 7:30 P.M. to 7:00 P.M. should be implemented only if a clear and compelling mandate to do so emerged, the time of the meeting should remain 7:30 P.M. The members then turned to personnel matters.

The Dean noted that, since Professor Hunt has indicated that she will likely be leaving the College to assume a professorship in Sweden, it will be necessary, if and when she does, to elect an additional member of the Committee of Six. He asked the members for their advice about how best to proceed. After some discussion, the members agreed that, if Professor Hunt leaves the College, there should be an election over the summer; voting electronically will allow for full participation by the Faculty, it was noted, even if colleagues are away from campus. Because of the unusual timing of the election, the Committee felt that each ballot should remain open for an extended period of at least one week to garner as much participation in voting as possible. Professor Ratner suggested that the Dean write to the Faculty before the election to inform colleagues about the procedures for the election and to encourage faculty who will not be able to vote electronically to inform him of their circumstances, so that other arrangements can be made.

Professor Hunt next commented that the Department of Women's and Gender Studies has informed the Dean of its proposal that the department's name be changed to the Department of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies. She wondered what the procedure would be to effect this change. The members and the Dean felt that informing the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), and asking its members to weigh in on the proposal, should be sufficient consultation. President Martin suggested that it would be helpful to develop a policy for addressing these types of requests, rather than considering them on an ad hoc basis.

The meeting ended with a discussion of the proposal that Peter Uvin, in his position as Provost, be permitted to attend the meetings of the CEP, the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR), and the Committee of Six on a trial basis for the next year. Having him attend meetings of these committees on a regular basis beyond this timeframe, and/or serve on any or all of the committees, would require discussion and a change in the *Faculty Handbook*, it was noted. Professors Ratner and Harms suggested that the Provost should not attend Committee of Six meetings in which tenure, reappointment, and promotion are discussed. They proposed that the Faculty be consulted if Provost Uvin will be reading tenure files. President Martin said that she feels that it would be helpful for Provost Uvin to observe the Committee's deliberations, and that she looks forward to further discussion with the Faculty about this idea. The President and the Dean thanked the members for all of their hard work over the course of the year.

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty