

FACULTY MEETING AGENDA

March 11, 2015
Griffin 3—4:00 p.m.

1. Call to order *President Falk*
2. Balloting for election to the Curricular Planning Committee
3. Balloting for election to the Faculty Steering Committee
4. Motion to approve the 2017-2018 calendar
*(see memo from the Calendar & Schedule Committee
and proposed calendar below)* *Professor L. Brown*
5. Motion to adopt the 2015-2016 course package
(see memo from CEP below) *Professor Low*
6. Motion to adopt a new pass-fail option
(see memo from CEP below) *Professor Low*
7. Discussion of grievance procedures for complaints of
sexual misconduct *Professor C. Johnson*
*(see memo from Working Group and
draft of proposed policy below)* *Dean Bolton*
8. Discussion of parental leave proposal and policy
about delaying the tenure decision *Professor Love*
(see memo from FCC and memo from FSC below) *Professor C. Johnson*
9. Questions and Announcements

(Continued on next page)

ACTIONS TAKEN AT THE FEBRUARY 11, 2015 FACULTY MEETING

As a result of voting:

Nominated to the Curricular Planning Committee
(3 year term with minimum required 2 years):

Div. I Full Professor – Guy Hedreen, Stefanie Solum
Div. I Associate/Assistant Professor – Bernie Rhie, Amanda Wilcox
Div. II Full Professor – Sam Crane, Karen Merrill
Div. II Associate/Assistant Professor – Sara Dubow, Anne Reinhardt
Div. III Full Professor – Joan Edwards, Bill Wootters
Div. III Associate/Assistant Professor – Mea Cook, Mihai Stoiciu

Nominated to the Faculty Steering Committee (2 year term):

Div. I Tenured – Katie Kent, Christopher Nugent
Div. I Non-tenured – Jessica Fisher, Anjuli Raza Kolb
Div. II Tenured – Nicole Mellow, Ngoni Munemo
Div. III Tenured – Colin Adams, Brent Heeringa

The Motion for a new pass-fail option was recommitted to the Committee on Educational Policy.

NOTE: FACULTY WITH CHILDREN AT THE COLLEGE'S CENTER WHO WISH TO MAKE USE OF THE 6:30 P.M. PICKUP OPTION MUST SIGN UP AT THE CENTER BY THE MONDAY PRIOR TO THE MEETING.

WILLIAMS COLLEGE
WILLIAMSTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS 01267
CALENDAR AND SCHEDULE COMMITTEE

To: Williams College Faculty
From: The Calendar and Schedule Committee
Re: Proposed Calendar for 2017-2018

The committee recommends adoption of the proposed calendar for 2017-2018 (see attached). The calendar cannot be amended on the floor of the meeting prior to voting on its acceptance. For this reason, we request that you notify the chair of the committee, Leslie Brown (leslie.brown@williams.edu) before Friday March 6th, if you foresee any problems with the proposed calendar. The committee will consider any such problems prior to bringing the calendar to the faculty for a vote at the Wednesday March 11th faculty meeting.

WILLIAMS COLLEGE
Office of the Registrar

CALENDAR 2017-2018

2017

Sept.	TBA		First Days
Sept.	4	Monday	Williams Reads
Sept.	6	Wednesday	First-Year Student Advising
Sept.	7	Thursday, 8:30 a.m.	Fall Semester classes begin
Sept.	16	Saturday	Convocation
Oct.	TBA	One of the first three Fridays	Mountain Day
Oct.	9-10	Monday & Tuesday	Fall Reading Period
Oct.	27-29	Friday through Sunday	Fall Family Days
Nov.	11	Saturday	Homecoming
Nov.	27-29	Wednesday-Sunday	Thanksgiving Recess
Dec.	8	Friday, 3:50 p.m.	Fall Semester classes end
Dec.	9-12	Saturday through Tuesday	Reading Period
Dec.	13-18	Wednesday through Monday	Final Examinations
Dec.	19	Tuesday	Vacation begins

2018

Jan.	3	Wednesday, 9:00 a.m.	Winter Study Period begins
Jan.	26	Friday, 3:50 p.m.	Winter Study Period ends
Jan.	31	Wednesday, 8:00 a.m.	Spring Semester classes begin <i>(classes to follow a Thursday schedule)</i>
Feb.	1	Thursday	Claiming Williams (no classes)
Feb.	2	Friday	Classes resume their assigned schedule
Feb.	16-17	Friday & Saturday	College Holidays (Winter Carnival)
Mar.	17-April 1	Saturday-Sunday	Spring Recess
May	11	Friday, 3:50 p.m.	Spring Semester classes end
May	12-15	Saturday through Tuesday	Reading Period
May	16-21	Wednesday through Monday	Final Examinations
June	2	Saturday	Class Day
June	2	Saturday	Baccalaureate Service
June	3	Sunday, 10:00 a.m.	Commencement
June	7-10	Thursday through Sunday	Alumni Reunions

NUMBER OF CLASS MEETINGS

	<u>Mornings</u>		<u>Afternoons</u>			<u>Evenings</u>
	M,W,F	T,Th	M,Th	W	T,F	M
Fall Semester	36	25	25	12	24	12
Spring Semester	36	25	25	12	24	12

The Winter Study Period covers 24 calendar days.

Proposed 2/26/2015.

To: Williams College Faculty
From: Committee on Educational Policy
Date: March 4, 2015
Re: Course package for 2015-16

At the upcoming faculty meeting on March 11, the CEP will present the course package for 2015-16 for faculty approval. Included in the course package is a report from each department and program describing any changes to the major or concentration as well as new or significantly modified courses.

The course package is available online at <http://sites.williams.edu/educational-policy/course-packages/>. A PDF version of the package is available via email upon request.

In this memorandum, we highlight significant changes to majors and programs from each division of the college. Our intention is to alert faculty in advance to changes that may merit discussion during the faculty meeting. We kindly request that faculty members who expect to challenge any portion of the course package on the floor of the faculty meeting inform the chair of the CEP in advance (Peter.D.Low@williams.edu). In this way, we hope to arrange for representatives of relevant departments to be present and prepared to respond to the challenges.

DIVISION I

Art

The Art Department is proposing a series of interrelated changes to the art-history major.

The current art-history major requires the following 9 courses:

- Any two of the following three foundational courses, ARTH 101, 102, or 103
- Any studio course (preferably taken by the end of the junior year)
- Any three courses in art history concerned, respectively, with the following:
 - 1) a period of art prior to 1800
 - 2) a period of art prior to 1400
 - 3) art of the Middle East, Asia, or Africa
- ARTH 301: Methods of Art History
- One 400-level Seminar or 500-level Graduate Seminar (in addition this course may be used to satisfy the pre-1400, pre-1800, or art of the Middle East, Asia, or Africa requirement)
- One additional course, at the 300, 400, or 500 level (in addition this course may be used to satisfy the pre-1400, pre-1800, or art of the Middle East, Asia, or Africa requirement)

The changed art-history major would require the following 9 courses:

- ARTH 101-ARTH 102, and either ARTH 103 or ARTH 104
- Any studio course (preferably taken by the end of the junior year)

- Any two courses in art history concerned with the following:
 - 1) a period of art prior to 1600
 - 2) a period of art after 1600
- ARTH 301: Methods of Art History
- One 400-level Seminar or 500-level Graduate Seminar (in addition this course may be used to satisfy the pre-1600 or post-1600 requirement)
- One additional ARTH course, at any level

The proposed changes are as follows:

1) One additional foundational (100-level) course. As a foundation for the major, students must currently take two of the following three courses: ARTH 101 (Art Through Time, Part I), ARTH 102 (Art Through Time, Part II), and ARTH 103 (Asian Art Survey: From the Land of the Buddha to the World of the Geisha). There is some awkwardness here because ARTH 101-102 is a single, year-long course for non-majors, but majors are allowed to break the course hyphen by taking either 101 or 102 and ARTH 103. ARTH 101-102 is grounded in the European/American tradition. The option to substitute one half of it for ARTH 103 gives majors the chance to study a non-European/American field at the 100-level – at least in theory. In practice, however, this option has not been a success (only one student has chosen to substitute 103 during the 3 years that the choice has been a possibility). In order to make a more robust commitment, within the major, to non-European/American traditions (which now include African art, thanks to a new faculty member), the Art Department proposes an addition at the 100 level: the new major will require ARTH 101-102 (both halves, thus preserving the integrity of the hyphen for all students) as well as an additional 100-level survey in a non-European/American tradition (currently ARTH 103 or ARTH 104, surveys of Asian and African art, with the future possibility of ARTH 105, a survey of Islamic Art).

2) The elimination of the geographic breadth requirement. This requirement is no longer necessary because it will now be satisfied, already, at the 100 level. (The department believes, moreover, that students, when exposed to non-European/American traditions at the lowest level of the curriculum, will end up taking additional courses in those fields as they move vertically.) The requirement has not been removed, but rather shifted to the 100 level.

3) The elimination of one of the historical breadth requirements. As with the second change above, one of these historical requirements is now satisfied by ARTH 101 and therefore no longer necessary. (ARTH 101-102 has recently been restructured to proceed chronologically, and thus ARTH 101 now covers art through 1600.) Again, this requirement has not been removed, but rather shifted to the 100-level.

Students will thus, henceforth, be required to take one course covering pre-1600 material (to ensure historical depth) and one covering post-1600 material (to signal the importance of modern art in the curriculum). Flexible and even, this change also rectifies a current problem with the major requirements, which is that courses in modern art (covering post-1800 material) do not satisfy any requirement for the major.

4) The replacement of the course-level elective requirement of an additional 300- or 400-level course with a free elective. The primary reason for this change is that the requirements were too tight with no space for a free elective course. This change solves that significant problem.

The proposed changes to the major are powerful in their ability to do several things at once. Most importantly, the department will be able to mitigate the curricular emphasis on European/American art by creating a substantially more robust emphasis on other artistic traditions at the 100 level. (Moreover, the major requirements no longer construct categories of desirability of fields based on geography or history: students are no longer required to elect courses we assume they would not elect on their own. All fields are now treated, and presented, equally, across the curriculum.) The changes also solve two significant problems: first, they eliminate the awkwardness of art majors having permission to break the hyphen of ARTH 101-102; second, they bring courses in post-1800 material in line with others (as they must be) in counting toward the major; and they bring a new and much needed flexibility to the major.

In sum, the new art-history major will now—without anomalies or infelicities, and while maintaining its rigor—take on a more substantial global spread while becoming significantly more flexible.

In Division I, 43 new courses are included in the course package.

DIVISION II

International Studies

1) Name change from International Studies (INST) to Global Studies (GBST). The existing program description begins with a bold declarative statement:

“In this era of cultural, technological and economic globalization and also of pressing international crises including environmental degradation, poverty and underdevelopment, terrorism and pandemics, knowledge of the world beyond the United States is an essential part of the liberal education that is the goal of the Williams experience.”

This language served the program well in launching the International Studies concentration at the college. However, as the program has grown and matured and as our student body has changed, to include much greater non-domestic diversity, the somewhat

narrow language of the program is no longer adequate. The program demands that all students, domestic and non-domestic, engage critically and comparatively with the world around them. First, the knowledge that the program asks our concentrators to engage with is not just of the world outside the US, but encompasses the US as a member of this world. Second, INST concentrators are not only domestic students whose starting point is the US, but also many non-domestic students for whom the reference point of the world is not the US. In the program's view, removing the language of "knowledge of the world beyond the United States [...]" and changing the program to Global Studies would address these issues.

2) Global Health Studies removed as a track. When the faculty voted in the new Public Health concentration, that decision called for the eventual elimination of the Global Health Studies track. Last year, the first year in the existence of PH, INST still had a few Global Health concentrators. However, this year the program has none. Students interested in that area seem to be going to PH. This seems like an opportune time to remove the track and minimize any confusion and duplication.

In Division II, 51 new courses are included in the course package.

DIVISION III

Geosciences

1) Change in the requirement for honors. The Geosciences Department's new requirement is that to be considered for the degree with honors in Geosciences, students must complete two semesters of thesis research, plus a winter study, in their senior year, *in addition* to the 9-course minimum for the major. The change is the "in addition to...". Per previous wording, it was possible for honors candidates to count thesis work as part of the 9-course major requirement. Rarely has it happened: most GEOS honors students are engaged with the major and the material and take more than the minimum number of courses. But GEOS is starting to see ambitious students try to short-sheet the system, and it is probably not a coincidence that this correlates with the increase in double majors. The department worries about this, because if students take only 9 courses, 2 of which are the thesis, they get a lot of depth in a small area, but they have less breadth in the major than non-honors students, which seems not right. The department therefore thinks it is appropriate to explicitly raise the honors bar a little, to signal clearly in the catalog that honors is something above the norm, and that an honors student should be especially strongly qualified in the discipline. This change brings GEOS into line with practice in other science departments.

2) Change in the senior seminar requirement. Until now GEOS has offered only one 400-level course, which all majors must take in the fall of their senior year. The recent increase in the GEOS number of majors (20 in the current junior class, which is 25% higher than the previous largest class; and about 18 in the class of 2017) makes a single seminar class unwieldy. So – although the department really liked having all majors together in a single classroom – GEOS has decided it makes more sense to offer two 400-level courses, either of which can satisfy the senior-seminar requirement. Students may

choose to take both if they wish. The department will give preference to seniors but qualified juniors will be admitted as space permits.

In Division III, 9 new courses are included in the course package.

Other items of interest

In this year of WhyLiberalArts, when faculty and students are reflecting with special deliberateness on the character and possibilities of the liberal arts at Williams, the CEP thought it appropriate to highlight a few new courses that both privilege collaboration and strike unusual and interesting connections across boundaries, both within the college and beyond it.

AFR 350 Organizing Resistance: Black Activism Then and Now. Taught by Shanti Singham (AFR), this course is focused on experiential learning, through involvement in local activism and a spring break activism trip.

CSCI 205-ENGL 203 Cinematography in the Digital Age. Team-taught by Morgan Maguire (CSCI) and Shawn Rosenheim (ENGL), this cross-disciplinary course offers instruction in both the aesthetics and the digital production of film.

ECON 227-ARTH 327 Acquiring Art: Selecting and Purchasing Art for WCMA. Team-taught by Stephen Sheppard (ECON) and Kevin Murphy (curator, WCMA), this course will culminate in students buying real works of art for the college museum.

MATH 300-AFR 333 Measuring Truth. Team-taught by Satyan Devadoss (MATH) and James Manigault-Bryant (AFR), this cross-disciplinary course will investigate different approaches to reaching truth, paying particular attention to the possible tensions between scientific modes of inquiry and the aims of the liberal arts.

ANTH 232 Town and Gown: Investigating the Relationship of College and Community. Team-taught by David Edwards (ANTH) and Chris Marcisz (journalist), this course teaches both ethnographic and journalistic research techniques, to enable students, through independent projects, to explore the relationship between this college and surrounding communities.

To: The Faculty
From: The Committee on Educational Policy
Date: February 26, 2015

Motion:

To adopt a new pass-fail option, for implementation beginning in the 2015-16 academic year; to include the description of the new option below in next year's course catalog; to revise slightly a number of academic regulations (Fifth-Course Option, Deficiencies, Separation for Low Scholarship, Eligibility for and Completion of Majors, Dean's List, and Music Lessons) to allow these regulations to accord with the new option; and to implement a five-year sunset clause with the option.

Proposed description of new pass-fail option for 2015-16 course catalog:

Pass-Fail Option

Students may take up to 3 courses on a pass-fail basis (but no more than one in any given semester). Students may designate a course pass-fail at any point after drop/add up to the tenth week of the semester. Once a course has been designated pass-fail, however, this designation cannot be changed. Students must achieve a minimum grade of D- in a pass-fail course to receive a "P". An "F" in a pass-fail course will be recorded as an "E" on students' records and will count toward the GPA, but a "P" will not.

Courses taken pass-fail cannot subsequently be used to fulfill distributional requirements (divisional, W, Q, and EDI). No course counting toward a major, certificate, or concentration can be taken pass-fail unless this course is the first one taken toward that credential. (In rare circumstances, chairs of programs or departments may grant exceptions to this rule.)

Students may designate a fifth course as one of their pass-fail options, similarly by the tenth week of the semester. Courses taken pass-fail as part of a four-course load or as a fifth course to make up a course deficiency will count toward graduation; courses taken pass-fail as an extra course will not count toward graduation.

Instructors have the option of designating any of their courses not eligible for the pass-fail option.

Revised descriptions of academic regulations affected by new pass-fail option:

Fifth-Course Option (limited to courses that can be taken pass-fail)

Except in the case of the unbalanced course program described above, a student may, by the end of drop/add, enroll in a fifth course that must be designated as an extra graded course. An extra course may be dropped at any time up to the sixth week of the semester. If a student chooses to continue in the course, that student must decide by the tenth week

whether to complete the course on an A-E graded basis or change the course to pass-fail. An extra course graded "Pass" may *not* be used to fulfill distribution or major, concentration, or certificate requirements (under rare circumstances, the chair of the relevant program or department may grant an exception to this rule) or to accelerate graduation, but may be used to make up a deficiency from a prior semester as one of the 32 semester courses required to complete the degree. An extra course completed as a fifth A-E graded course may be used to fulfill distribution or major, concentration, or certificate requirements or to make up a deficiency incurred in a prior term, but not to accelerate graduation. The grade received will be included in the calculation of the student's cumulative grade-point average.

Deficiencies

When a student falls behind in course credits because of a failure or course withdrawal, he or she has a deficiency. Deficiencies can be made up only by courses taken after the deficiencies have been incurred. Thus, for example, Advanced Placement credits may not be used to make up deficiencies.

A student must make up a deficiency in one of these ways:

- 1) obtain a grade of at least *C minus* in a summer school course, approved in advance by the Registrar, at a regionally accredited four-year college or university; (the grade will not, however, be included in the calculation of the student's cumulative grade point average).
- 2) pass an extra course, either on a pass-fail or on an A-E graded basis, at Williams in the semester following the withdrawal or failure.
- 3) in the case of a first-semester failure of a year-long language course, obtain a grade of at least a *C minus* in the work of the second semester of that course. The failure for the first semester will, however, remain on the student's record and will be included in the cumulative grade point average.

A deficiency must normally be made up before the start of the following academic year, or in the case of a deficiency incurred in the spring semester, no later than the following fall semester. A student may, in consultation with the Dean's Office, petition the Committee on Academic Standing with an alternate plan.

Separation for Low Scholarship

It is the policy of Williams College not to permit a student to remain in residence after it has become evident that he or she is either unable or unwilling to maintain reasonable standards of academic achievement. At the end of each term, the Committee on Academic Standing reviews all academic records that fail to meet the following minimum academic requirements:

For first-year students: *Three* grades of *C minus* or better and no failures each semester, and *at least Perfunctory Pass* on the Winter Study Project

For upperclass students: *Four* grades of *C minus* or better or *three* grades of *C minus* or better and a *Pass* each semester, and *at least Perfunctory Pass* on the Winter Study Project

Students whose records fail to meet these minimum academic requirements or whose records otherwise fail to show adequate progress may receive an academic reminder, be placed on academic probation, or be required to resign.

Students who are required to resign from the College for academic reasons are normally not permitted to return for at least one year from the date of their resignation. A student who has been required to resign from the College may petition the Committee on Academic Standing through the Dean for reinstatement on two conditions only: all deficiencies must have been made up and a letter submitted to the Committee that offers convincing evidence that the student is ready and able to complete work toward a degree at Williams without further interruption.

When required to resign, students must vacate their rooms promptly. Financial aid students must also see the Director of Financial Aid before leaving to discuss loan repayment and renewal of aid in the event of readmission.

A student who fails to meet minimum academic standards in his or her final semester at Williams may be required by the Committee on Academic Standing to meet them by earning grades of at least *C minus* elsewhere before the B.A. will be awarded. If such work is required, it must be completed within three years unless stipulated otherwise, and the courses must be approved in advance by the Registrar.

Eligibility for and Completion of Majors

To be eligible for any major, students must have received grades of *C minus* or better in each course in the major taken in the first two years of college and *Honors* or *Pass* on any Winter Study Project taken in the major department or program. (To determine students' eligibility, department or program chairs may look at grades behind pass-fail courses.) A senior may enter a major only upon the approval of the department or program chair and the Committee on Academic Standing.

All semester courses in the major must be taken on an A-E graded basis, unless a course is the first in the major; in that case, it can be taken pass-fail. (In rare instances, and only with the permission of the relevant chair, students may be allowed to count a second pass-fail course for the major.) In addition to passing each major course and, where required, a major Winter Study Project, the student must maintain an average in the major of 1.67 or higher. Seniors who have an average below 1.67 in the major field normally will not be allowed to continue. A senior who receives a grade of E in the first semester of a required major course may be dropped from the College at mid-year. A student who falls below these standards may continue in the major only with the approval of the Committee on Academic Standing.

A senior major exercise is not required by every department or program but is by some. All departments or programs requiring such an exercise specify it as such in the description of their majors in the "Courses of Instruction" section, and all students in those departments or programs must complete the exercise satisfactorily.

Dean's List

All students who attain a semester average of 3.50 or higher in a program of four or more courses taken on an A-E graded basis are placed on the Dean's List for that semester. (Note: students with three courses taken on an A-E graded basis and one pass-fail course are not eligible for the Dean's List).

Music Lessons (MUS 281)

Individual lessons in voice, keyboard and most orchestral and jazz instruments are offered as a partial credit fifth course. Students are encouraged to take this course for a letter grade, but as with all fifth courses, pass-fail is also an option. (Note: partial credit music lessons taken pass-fail do not count as one of the three pass-fail options available to students for regular semester courses.) Students are required to prepare for 10 lessons during the semester with a minimum expectation of one hour of practice per day and to perform publicly on at least one departmental studio recital during the semester. Lessons are scheduled TBA based upon instructor schedule. Make-up lessons given at the discretion of the instructor. Grading will be based upon lesson preparation, public performance, and progress throughout the semester. All individual instruction involves an extra fee, partially subsidized by the department. To register for the course, a student must first contact the appropriate teacher (see Music Dept. for list), fill out a registration/billing contract, signed by both teacher and student, and turn that in to the assistant to the chair. This replaces the need to register online. Registration is for course number 281, with the appropriate section number from the following list. Students will be reassigned to course numbers 281-288 based on the number of semesters of instruction already taken in one particular section. Specific instrument or voice sections are as follows: 01 Bassoon, 02 Cello, 03 Clarinet, 04 Bass, 05 Flute, 06 Guitar, 07 Harpsichord, 08 Horn, 09 Jazz Piano, 10 Oboe, 11 Organ, 12 Percussion, 13 Piano, 14 Classical Saxophone, 15 Trumpet, 16 Viola, 17 Violin, 18 Voice, 19 Jazz Bass, 20 Jazz Vocal, 21 Trombone, 22 Harp, 23 Jazz Drum, 24 Jazz Saxophone, 25 Jazz Trumpet, 28 African Drumming, 29 Jazz Guitar, 30 Mbira, 31 Vocal/Songwriting, 32 Jazz Trombone 33 Sitar, 34 Tabla, 35 Erhu, 36 Yangqin, 37 Zheng, 38 Liuqin/Pipa, 39 Zhongruan.

Rationale:

The proposed new pass-fail option carries a number of benefits. First, the new option would provide Williams students with a few more opportunities than currently exist to explore the curriculum on the basis of intellectual interest alone. Second, even for those who need no such encouragement, this pass-fail option would offer students a mild pressure release from concerns about grades and grade-point averages – a release that could have a range of positive consequences for the quality of student life, academic and otherwise. Third, the proposed option would result in a decrease in the number of

deficiencies incurred by students – who could choose to designate a course pass-fail, when encountering difficulties up to the tenth week of the semester, rather than withdraw from that course. Such a reduction would lead to fewer summer courses and fifth courses having to be taken by our students to make up deficiencies, an outcome that would have both academic and financial advantages for our students and for the College.

The new option, as configured, is intended to be as simple and as flexible as possible (it was formulated in this respect with the lessons learned from the soon-to-disappear Gaudino Option very much in mind). It would nonetheless affect a few other academic regulations that as a result would need to be modified. The new catalog descriptions of these revised regulations are also included in this proposal (to identify the revisions, please compare the new texts to those in the 2014-15 catalog).

The most significant of these changes concerns the fifth-course option. Currently, students must designate a fifth-course pass-fail at the time of registration. In the sixth week, students must decide whether to continue the course and, if so, whether on a pass-fail or regularly graded basis. In the proposed new scenario, students may still take a fifth course (designated at registration as an extra graded course) and may drop it at any time up to the sixth week. But otherwise, the same rules and opportunities for the pass-fail option apply to fifth courses as apply to other courses. That is, students taking a fifth course can designate that course as pass-fail at any point up to the tenth week of the semester. Further, a fifth course designated pass-fail by a student would count as one of the three available pass-fail options for that student.

The CEP listened carefully to the concerns raised by faculty at the February Faculty Meeting. In an attempt to address those concerns, the committee has revised the proposal in the following ways.

First, we have changed the original proposed arrangement of 3 courses, with one to be taken in the first semester on a use-it-or-lose-it basis, to 3 courses, to be taken at any time (though still with no more than one to be taken in any given semester). First-year advising will take the opportunity to explain to incoming students the potential value of the pass-fail option for exploring the curriculum – with a conversation with a dean or advisor being required before a first-year student can designate a course pass-fail. The CEP, however, was persuaded by faculty arguments that 3 pass-fail courses, available any time, would make for a simpler and more flexible option; specifically, these features would make the option both more understandable to students (and so more accessible) and of wider potential benefit.

Second, the CEP decided to shift the deadline for designating a course pass-fail from the sixth week (the original proposed deadline) to the tenth week. This change, we believe, will: a) encourage students to remain engaged longer in courses they might ultimately designate pass-fail (and the CEP feels that this tenth-week deadline would be much more effective in encouraging engagement than would raising the grade floor to a C-, an elevated threshold that seems counter to the principles of a pass-fail option); b) allow students to have more evidence of their academic standing in a course before making that

decision; and c) synchronize the designation deadline with that of withdrawals. This last feature should help maximize the value of the pass-fail option as an alternative to a withdrawal in that students could have – in that tenth week – a single conversation with an advisor about these two options.

Third, the CEP (in full agreement with those who raised this issue at the last faculty meeting) has added a five-year sunset clause to the option. This means that after five years – a length that will allow one student cohort to experience the option for a full four years – the CEA will have to bring a proposal for a renewal of the option to the faculty for a discussion and vote. Such a deadline will guarantee that the option is monitored, and that any problems be identified and corrected – if the option is to survive – at that five-year point.

To: The Faculty
From: Working Group on Sexual Misconduct Policy
Date: March 4, 2015
Re: Grievance Procedures for Complaints of Sexual Misconduct

As announced in the September faculty meeting, the College adopted an interim sexual misconduct policy in the fall in order to comply with changes in federal law due to the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act as well as guidance from the Office of Civil Rights about compliance with Title IX. Because there was insufficient time for the faculty to review and approve this interim policy, the Faculty Steering Committee acted in place of the faculty and approved the interim policy, with the expectation that it would stand until the faculty adopted a permanent policy consistent with federal requirements. Throughout this year, a group consisting of Sarah Bolton, Karen Swann, Bernie Rhie, Cathy Johnson, and Martha Tetrault has continued to work on a proposal for a process by which the College would investigate and adjudicate complaints of sexual misconduct brought against members of the faculty and staff.

To date, the working group has focused on the process that would be used if a student complained of sexual misconduct by a College employee because our procedures here were most out of step with federal requirements. In our work we have encountered several important issues for the faculty to consider before we turn our attention to the grievance process that would be used if a case involved only College employees. This memo provides background information on the federal requirements and summarizes the draft process involving a student complaint against a faculty or staff member. It also identifies important questions for our discussion at the March faculty meeting.

Accompanying this memo is draft language for the *Faculty Handbook*, which describes the process the College shall follow if a student complains of sexual misconduct by a faculty or staff member. Additional information about sexual misconduct policy, including definitions of various types of sexual misconduct, is available at the College's Title IX website: <http://titleix.williams.edu/>.

Summary of federal requirements

The federal requirements involve a thicket of statutes, regulations, and guidance from the Office of Civil Rights. Some of the most important requirements specify that the College's processes for handling complaints of sexual misconduct must:

1. Use trained investigators and adjudicators;
2. Have a means of proceeding even if the complainant does not wish to participate;
3. Strongly discourage direct cross examination;
4. Not require the complainant and respondent to be in the same room at the same time;
5. Not require the complainant to retell his or her story multiple times;
6. Use "preponderance of evidence" rather than "clear and convincing" as the standard of evidence.
7. Ensure that any right of appeal accorded to one party to the complaint is similarly accorded to the other party.

A summary of the proposed policy for cases involving a student complaint against a faculty or staff member.

Before an investigation begins: The Title IX coordinator must take several steps to protect the rights and responsibilities of both the student and the College employee (See II. Aa-c in the proposed policy, included at the end of this memo).

Investigation: An investigation may move forward even if a student reporting an incident does not participate in it. The faculty or staff member will be informed of the charges in writing, and the College will use a person trained in sexual misconduct investigations to determine the facts of the case. The investigator will produce a written report of the findings. Each party will have the opportunity to respond to that report in writing (See II. Ba-h).

Primary adjudication: Using preponderance of the evidence, the hearing panel decides whether there has been a violation of the College's sexual misconduct policies and recommends a sanction (See II. Ca-e).

Appeal of the finding of the hearing panel: Both parties may appeal the finding of the hearing panel on grounds of either significant procedural lapses or the availability of substantive new evidence (See II. Da-c).

Final determination of sanction for members of the faculty: The process used to determine the sanction varies depending on the nature of the recommended sanction as outlined in Sections II.V. and II.W. of the *Faculty Handbook*. In order to comply with federal requirements, these processes have been changed in some ways for cases involving sexual misconduct (See II. Ea-f).

Final determination of sanction for members of the staff: The Director of Human Resources is responsible for this decision (See II. F).

Major questions for discussion

One important question for the faculty to consider is whether or not the College should prohibit sexual or romantic relationships between faculty and students. Other institutions, including Harvard and Yale, have done so.¹ Our current policy, described in section II. S. of the *Faculty Handbook*, says that a sexual relationship between an employee and a student is almost always inappropriate but deems it unacceptable only when a faculty or staff member has teaching, evaluative, advising, or supervisory responsibilities for a student. On the one hand, one could argue that consensual relationships among adults (including students) should not be prohibited by the College. On the other hand, one could argue that the recent changes in federal policy put an employee in any such relationship at so great a risk that the College should take a stronger

¹ The language at Harvard is: "No [Faculty of Arts and Sciences] Faculty member shall request or accept sexual favors from, or initiate or engage in a romantic or sexual relationship with, any undergraduate student at Harvard College." Sexual and Gender-Based Harassment Policy and Procedures for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University, January 13, 2015. The language at Yale is: "Therefore, no teacher shall have a sexual or amorous relationship with any undergraduate student, regardless of whether the teacher currently exercises or expects to have any pedagogical or supervisory responsibilities over that student."

www.yale.edu/equalopportunity/policies/

stance and prohibit these relationships. Circumstances may also arise in which a student who was in a relationship with a professor finds that he or she needs to take a course from (or otherwise be evaluated by) that individual at a later time. As a result, it can be difficult to say with certainty that a given student/professor relationship falls outside the realm of teaching, evaluative, advising or supervisory responsibilities.

The proposed process for cases in which a student complains of the behavior of a faculty or staff member differs in some important ways from the grievance procedure the College developed to handle charges of discrimination. First, it relies on trained investigators to gather evidence and determine the facts of the case. Second, it places fewer burdens on the complainant, i.e., the student charging that sexual misconduct occurred, to move the process forward, gather evidence, and call witnesses. Third, the role of the hearing panel is more like that of a jury because it is responsible for deciding if a violation of the College's sexual misconduct policy occurred and recommending a sanction.

These differences lead to questions about whether and how we should adjust the grievance process used in cases involving only members of the faculty and staff. An outline of that process is in section II.T of the *Faculty Handbook*. A more detailed description is in VII. Appendices, section A.² As the working group shifts its attention to the grievance process involving only College employees, we would like your feedback on adjustments to this process.

First, should we change the grievance process in cases of sexual misconduct to be more akin to that proposed for cases involving student complainants? That is, should the fact-finding be done by an investigator rather than the hearing panel? Should the role of the hearing panel be focused on a determination of fault and recommendation of sanction?

Second, should we try to retain what is now called “the informal grievance procedure”? The use of the term “informal” is somewhat misleading because a person alleging discrimination does have to file a complaint to begin this process. The informal grievance procedure allows a case to be resolved by executive officers (e.g., the Dean of Faculty, the Director of Human Resources) and does not require that a case be determined by a hearing panel.

We are well aware of the complicated nature of these processes, and we do not expect everyone to have immediate responses they can voice at the March faculty meeting. If you have additional thoughts, reactions, and questions, please do not hesitate to contact a member of the working group.

² The *Faculty Handbook* is at <http://wiki.williams.edu/display/handbooks/Faculty+Handbook>

March 4, 2015

DRAFT Sexual Misconduct (including sexual assault) Investigation and Adjudication Process

Anyone who experiences conduct that he or she believes violates the College's Sexual Misconduct Policies is encouraged to report that conduct to Campus Safety and Security, the Office of the Dean of the College (in the case of a student), or to the College's Title IX officer. He or she is also encouraged to make a report to the police for legal action. Both of these processes can happen simultaneously. College processes are outlined below.

The College's procedures seek to ensure a prompt, fair, and impartial investigation and resolution. Procedures will be conducted by College officials who receive annual training on issues related to domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, sexual exploitation and sexual assault, as well as on conducting a hearing process that protects victim safety and promotes accountability.

The standard of proof used in adjudication of cases of sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment, sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence and stalking, will be preponderance of evidence, as required by Federal regulation. Possible sanctions if a student or employee of the College is found responsible for violation of the College's Sexual Misconduct Policies include the full range of disciplinary sanctions available at the college, up to and including suspension from the college for one or more semesters and expulsion, in the case of a student, or dismissal in the case of a College employee.

I. Cases involving students only or student respondents

A staff or faculty member who experiences conduct on the part of a student that he or she believes violates the College's Sexual Misconduct Policies should contact the Dean of the College or the Title IX Coordinator. The Title IX Coordinator will ensure that the staff or faculty member is provided the information and support stipulated by the College's Title IX policies. The investigation and adjudication processes will be those outlined in **the College's Sexual Misconduct Policy relating to student sexual misconduct.**

II. Cases involving a student and a faculty or staff member

A student who experiences conduct on the part of a staff or faculty member that the student believes violates the College's Sexual Misconduct Policies is encouraged to report that conduct to Campus Safety and Security, the College's Title IX Coordinator, or the Dean of the College. A student who reports an experience of sexual assault or other sexual misconduct is called the "complainant." The staff or faculty member who is accused of committing sexual assault or sexual misconduct is called the "respondent." Both the complainant and the respondent are encouraged to participate in the process of investigation and adjudication.

A. Before the process of investigation and adjudication starts, several steps are taken:

- a. The Title IX Coordinator, in consultation with the relevant Title IX deputy or deputies (for students, the Dean of the College; for faculty, the Dean of Faculty; for staff, the Director of Human Resources) will assign the complainant and the respondent each to a different trained advisor from the College staff (the “trained College advisor”). This advisor will explain to them the process and will also serve as a resource for any questions or concerns.
- b. The Title IX Coordinator will provide to both the complainant and the respondent a written statement of their rights and responsibilities, and a description of these processes, including the requirements of confidentiality and the rules forbidding retaliation.
- c. The Title IX Coordinator will make available at any time, before, during or after the hearing process, and whether or not the complainant participates in the investigation and adjudication, reasonable and appropriate accommodations to increase the complainant’s safety and wellbeing on campus. These may include no-contact orders with the respondent and/or other parties, changes of housing accommodations, and academic accommodations such as extensions, tutors, and changes of class schedule. Accommodations may also include changes of class modality (for example, switching to an independent study) if needed in order to ensure access to academic opportunity for the complainant in a class taught by a faculty member who is the respondent. The Title IX Coordinator will inform the complainant in writing of the College’s obligation to provide these accommodations and resources as soon as the complainant comes forward.

B. Investigation:

- a. Both the complainant and respondent have the right to have an advisor of their choosing (either the trained College advisor or any other person, including an attorney) present with them for all parts of the process. The advisor can speak to the complainant/respondent at any time during the process but cannot speak for them to the investigator or to the hearing panel.
- b. If a student reports an incident but does not wish to participate in the investigation and adjudication process, the situation will be reviewed by a committee comprised of the Title IX Coordinator, the relevant Title IX deputy or deputies, and the Director of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response. That committee will determine whether there is sufficient information to proceed with an investigation and adjudication without the participation of the complainant. If the committee determines that the case should proceed without the complainant, it will make every effort to protect confidentiality (see [Confidentiality and Privacy](#)).
- c. If it is determined that a process will go forward, the Title IX deputy relevant to the respondent will inform the respondent of the charges in writing.
- d. If a respondent chooses not to participate in the investigation and adjudication process, the process will proceed without their contribution to the determination of the facts of the

case. The respondent should note that the appeal process based on appearance of new information not available to the hearing panel does not apply in cases of deliberate omission of information by the respondent, including refusal by the respondent to participate in the investigation.

e. The Title IX Coordinator, in consultation with the relevant Title IX deputy or deputies, will assign a person trained in sexual assault investigations to determine the facts of the case as completely as possible. This investigator will hear statements from the complainant and respondent, ask follow up questions, reach out to and collect statements from others who have evidence/information relevant to the question of violation of the Sexual Misconduct Policies, and ask follow-up questions as needed. The complainant and respondent may each direct the investigator toward people to interview and may frame questions to be asked of others. The investigator will respect these directives unless they violate standards of good practices for sexual misconduct investigations or are clearly redundant or irrelevant. If the investigator decides not to pursue a question or interviewee submitted by one of the parties in the case, he or she will so inform that party in writing of the decision. All of those contacted by the investigator will be required to maintain the privacy of the investigation. The investigator will also gather any additional evidence available (for example, health care records, with permission of the person to whom they refer). The investigator may consult with the Title IX Coordinator and relevant deputies in decisions regarding the investigation process. The statements of the complainant and respondent will be recorded (audio). The investigator will produce for the hearing panel a report of his/her findings, which will include a list of those interviewed and copies of any additional material referenced.

f. The Title IX Coordinator, in consultation with the relevant Title IX deputy or deputies, will review the report and may request that additional information be gathered. These Title IX officers will also ensure that the report does not contain material that is inadmissible in the decision process, such as irrelevant prior sexual history.

g. The investigator's report will be shared with the complainant and respondent once it is complete. The complainant and respondent each have 10 days following the receipt of the report to write a response to it if they wish to do so; at that time, both may request that further information be gathered. Responses will be included in the official materials sent forward to the hearing panel for adjudication. If the Title IX Coordinator agrees that further information should be gathered, the investigator will be charged with pursuing the additional information and, if appropriate, issuing an amendment or supplement to the report. The complainant and respondent will be given an additional ten days to respond to any such additional or supplemental report.

h. The Title IX coordinator and each of the deputies relevant to the complainant and respondent will review the report and the responses of both parties, and determine whether the alleged behavior of the respondent is properly within the purview of the sexual misconduct policies.

If the Title IX coordinator and deputies determine that the respondent's alleged behavior is not within the purview of the college's sexual misconduct policies, the Title IX coordinator or

relevant deputy will so inform the complainant and respondent in writing, and will direct the complainant to any other relevant college or legal processes that may address the behavior. The complainant may bring the investigator's report over into other relevant college processes (such as the discrimination grievance process).

If the Title IX committee determines that the respondent's alleged behavior is within the purview of the college's sexual misconduct policies, the case will move forward to the primary adjudication process, described below.

C. Primary adjudication:

The decision about whether there has been a violation of the College's Sexual Misconduct Policies will be made by a hearing panel of five trained members. Four "yes" votes are necessary for a finding that there has been a violation. If such a violation is found to have taken place, then the same panel recommends an appropriate sanction. Sanctions are ultimately determined according to the rules in the Staff and Faculty Handbooks as described and modified below.

a. For each case the panel will be appointed by the Title IX Coordinator in consultation with the relevant Title IX deputy or deputies. The panel will ordinarily consist of a member of the office of the Dean of the College plus four additional members, drawn from the President's Standing Panel, at least two of whom are from the same job category as the respondent. The complainant and respondent will have the opportunity to state whether there are those they feel should not participate in the panel due to bias or any other reason which would prevent them from making a fair assessment of the evidence. The final decision on any such requests for recusal will be made by the Title IX Coordinator in consultation with the relevant Title IX deputy or deputies.

b. The panel will start its deliberations by reading the statements gathered by the investigator and the investigator's report, along with the responses to the report (if any) from the complainant and respondent. After discussion, the panel will decide whether there are additional questions that need to be asked. If so, the investigator will go back to the parties to ask those questions. The panel may ask questions of the Title IX coordinator or other relevant college officials.

c. The panel will decide whether there is a preponderance of evidence showing a violation of the College's Sexual Misconduct Policies.

d. If the panel determines that there has been a violation of the College's Sexual Misconduct Policies, the complainant and respondent will each be so informed in writing, and each then will have the opportunity to briefly address the committee, either in person, by media communication, or in writing, before the sanction is considered. (The two parties would do this separately – neither one in the presence of the other. It is optional rather than required to make such a statement.) This opportunity is not one in which the facts of the case are discussed or questions are asked by the committee. Rather, it is an opportunity for both parties to present directly to the panel in their own "voice" any additional information, including information about the impact of the incident in question. This opportunity is limited to 15 minutes or the written

equivalent thereof. Each party's trained College advisor will provide them with guidelines on what is and is not permitted in this part of the process.

e. The panel will then recommend a sanction to the relevant senior officer (Dean of Faculty for respondents who are members of the faculty, the Director of Human Resources for respondents who are members of the staff.) The complainant and respondent will each be informed in writing of the recommended sanction. Sanctions are ultimately determined by the processes described in the Staff and Faculty Handbooks, modified as described below.

D. Appeal of the finding of the hearing panel:

Both parties have the right to request an appeal of the finding made by the hearing panel on whether or not there was a violation of the College's policy on Sexual Misconduct. This right to appeal of the finding is limited to (a) significant procedural lapses or (b) the appearance of substantive new evidence not available at the time of the original decision. Each party has 15 days following the receipt of the written decision to indicate their intention to appeal. Requests for appeal, with reasons, should be sent in writing to the Vice President for Institutional Diversity and Equity.³

a. If either the complainant or the respondent wishes to have other people interviewed to determine whether they have substantive new information pertinent to the appeal that was not available at the time of the original decision, the following process will be followed. (1) The person wishing to appeal will write to the Vice President for Institutional Diversity and Equity describing whom they wish to have interviewed and on what topic. (2) The Vice President or a designee will ask the person whether they do, in fact, have information on that topic. (3) If they do, the investigator will ask them questions or request a written statement. The appeal process will be suspended until the completion of these steps.

b. The Vice President for Institutional Diversity and Equity will grant appeals only in cases where the procedural problems or new evidence are considered substantive enough to have had a significant effect on the outcome of the initial hearing. If the appeal is granted, its disposition is determined by the Vice President for Institutional Diversity and Equity who may affirm the decision of the panel, return it to the original committee or summon a new committee, and who may task those committees with reviewing the decision either in whole or in part.

c. The results of any appeal will be communicated simultaneously and in writing to the complainant and the respondent by the Title IX Coordinator.

³ If this position is empty, this role will be filled by the Vice President for Finance and Administration.

E. Final determination of sanction in cases in involving respondents who are members of the faculty.

If the recommended sanction is termination of the respondent's appointment for cause, the Dean of the Faculty will initiate proceedings pursuant to section II.V. of the Faculty Handbook. If the recommended sanction is a major sanction, such as suspension from service for a stated period, the Dean of the Faculty will initiate proceedings pursuant to section II. W., "Major Sanctions," of the Faculty Handbook. If the recommended sanction is a minor sanction, the Dean of the Faculty will initiate proceedings in accordance with section II.W., "Minor Sanctions," of the Faculty Handbook. In order to comply with federal law, regulations, and guidance regarding Title IX, sections II.V. and II.W. of the Faculty Handbook must be changed in some ways for cases involving sexual misconduct. Those changes are delineated below.

- a. In all cases covered by this policy the sole determination to be made according to the processes described in section II.V. and II.W. of the Faculty Handbook will be the final sanction to be imposed on the respondent. The determination by the hearing panel that the respondent committed a violation of the college's Sexual Misconduct Policies shall be final and shall not be subject to review or reconsideration in the sanctions process.
- b. The hearing panel convened at this stage of the process will receive as evidence the letter of findings and recommended sanction from the original hearing panel described in section C. They will also have access to the report of the investigator and to previous disciplinary records of the respondent, if any. The hearing panel may request assistance from the Title IX coordinator or other college officials.
- c. The faculty member does not have the right to compel the complainant to appear before the panel. The complainant's testimony may be represented by the investigator's report.
- d. Although the complainant cannot be compelled to appear before the hearing panel, in all cases covered by this policy the complainant will have an equal right with the respondent to be heard by the Dean of the Faculty, any hearing committee convened pursuant to the provisions of section II. V. or W., and by the Board of Trustees.
- f. Final decisions as to sanctions will be reported in writing simultaneously to the complainant and the respondent, as well as to the Title IX officer.

F. Final determination of sanction in cases in involving respondents who are members of the staff.

Final determination of sanctions involving respondents who are members of the staff will be made by the Director of Human Resources, in consultation with the Title IX officer and relevant supervisor(s) of the staff member. The Director of Human Resources may take into account previous disciplinary records of the staff member in making his/her decision regarding sanction.

Final decisions as to sanctions will be reported in writing simultaneously to the complainant and the respondent, as well as to the Title IX officer.

IV. Additional matters:

- a. Support. The complainant and respondent will each be assigned a trained College advisor to help them navigate the process. Each party can bring this advisor with them for all parts of the process, including the investigation. These trained College advisors will not be part of a hearing panel regarding the case. Both the complainant and respondent have the right to have another advisor of their choosing present with them for all parts of the process, including any meeting with campus officials, with the hearing panel, and with the investigator. This advisor can speak to the complainant/respondent at any time during the process but cannot speak directly to the investigator or to the hearing panel. The complainant and respondent may bring one advisor with them – either the trained College advisor or the other advisor of their choosing – to any part of the process.
- b. Both parties have full access to the support services provided by the College throughout the process. For students, this includes the resources of the Health Center and Psychological Counseling Services; for faculty and staff, the employee assistance program, LifeScope.
- c. Retaliation. Retaliation of any kind against the complainant or any witness is strictly prohibited. Any retaliation will be treated as a new and additional violation of the Sexual Misconduct Policy.

To: The Faculty
From: Faculty Compensation Committee
Date: March 4, 2015
Re: Summary of Parental Leave Proposal

Summary

The Faculty Compensation Committee (FCC) proposes making several changes to the College's maternity and parental leave policies. The proposed modifications would eliminate the vesting period for faculty eligibility, make eligibility independent of whether a spouse works at Williams, and make it easier for all parents to devote time to child rearing during the period following a new birth, fostering, or adoption. The most important changes are listed below.

- **Immediate eligibility:** under the current rules, faculty are only eligible for maternity or paternity leave if they have been at Williams for more than one year on a non-visiting appointment. We propose that faculty members become eligible for parental leave benefits on their date of hire.
- **Remove the “penalty” for spouses working at Williams:** under the current rules, if both parents work at Williams, only one is eligible for paid parental leave. We propose that all parents be eligible for parental leave, regardless of whether the other parent works at Williams.
- **Allow parents to take a full semester of leave at 3/4 pay for the semester:** under the current rules, birth mothers can take a full semester of paid leave by combining maternity leave with a parental leave. Our proposal leaves this benefit unchanged. In addition, the current rules allow other parents to take the equivalent of one course off at full pay and request a second course off without pay to achieve a full semester leave at 1/2 pay. Under our proposal, these parents would now have the option to take either one course off at full pay or the entire semester off at 3/4 pay.

Background and justification

At the start of the 2013-2014 academic year, the FCC reviewed the College's maternity and parental leave policies, primarily in response to concerns about the treatment of adoptive parents. In particular, while the current rules allowed birth mothers to take a full semester of paid leave by combining maternity and parental leaves, parents in adoptive families could only do so at reduced pay and only with the approval of the Dean of the Faculty. Given the demands of early parenting, the FCC felt that it made sense to make adoptive or foster parents eligible for a full semester of leave without imposing a steep cut in pay. But once we considered increasing the leave benefits for adoptive and foster parents, it became clear that we needed to address the concerns of all families, including cases where the birth mother is not the primary caregiver in the early months of child rearing.

It soon became clear, however, that any of the changes we considered making introduced a new set of concerns and tradeoffs. The first set of complications arose when we considered extending more generous parental leave benefits to “primary caregivers,” which had the appealing feature of confining benefits to those in greatest apparent need. This, however, raised the thorny issues

of whether and how the College would monitor if someone was actually a primary caregiver and what it would do if it determined, after the leave had been granted, that someone was not. After consulting several members of the administration, we determined that the challenges of monitoring and enforcement were enough to rule out a path that involved parents declaring themselves to be primary caregivers. Moreover, we came to realize that the term “primary caregiver” may not aptly describe the full set of child-rearing circumstances that our proposal was meant to address. This led us in the direction of making changes that would not require people to identify the extent of their caregiving role in parenting.

Another complication involved the comparative benefits of birth mothers and other parents. Several voices inside and outside the FCC underscored the importance of maintaining greater leave benefits for birth mothers relative to other parents, given the unique medical nature of pregnancy, birth, and recovery. In addition, many felt that the current rules make it too difficult for other parents to balance intensive child rearing with their career goals and obligations. We struggled as a group for several months to arrive at a compromise that would maintain greater relative benefits for birth mothers but still make it easier for other parents to take an active role in early child rearing. At the same time, we wanted to be careful not to expand the scale of the parental leave benefit as a whole, lest it distort the ratio of College benefits extended to all faculty members, including those not raising families. The proposal to allow parents to take a full semester off at 3/4 pay represents a compromise that achieved unanimous support within the FCC.

In contrast to the proposal to increase the compensation for parents taking a full semester of parental leave, the proposed changes to vesting and spousal the eligibility of partners generated little controversy within the Committee or among other faculty members we consulted. We decided to propose the elimination of the vesting period because we could not see how the current rules improved either the retention or motivation of full-time faculty members, which is the usual argument in favor of vesting arrangements. While vesting does lead to a modest reduction in the College’s costs of financing leave benefits, we did not feel that the cost reduction was enough to outweigh the inequity of first-year faculty receiving substantially lower benefits than faculty who had been at the College for one year or more. The FCC believes that the vesting period for parental leave should be eliminated, regardless of whether any other proposed changes are adopted.

We propose making the eligibility independent of the partner’s employment because the current rules penalize couples with both members employed at Williams. Under the current rules, a parent with a partner working at Amherst College, for instance, and receiving parental leave benefits at that institution would be eligible for paid parental leave at Williams College. Meanwhile, a parent with a partner receiving parental leave benefits from Williams would be ineligible for paid leave at the College. We could not see a compelling argument for disadvantaging couples with both members employed by Williams.

Maternity and Paternity Leave Proposal

Faculty Compensation Committee

March 2, 2015

Paid Medical Leave, Maternity Leave and Parental Leave

During the first year of appointment, medical leave with full pay shall continue for six months from the commencement of a disability caused by illness or accident, or until the end of the term contract, whichever occurs sooner.

In subsequent years, medical leave with pay shall continue during disability for twelve months following the commencement of a disability caused by illness or accident, or until the end of a term contract, whichever occurs sooner, at the following rates: six months at full pay, followed by six months at 60%, medical documentation supporting the need for the leave must be provided to the Benefits Office.

Maternity Leave

Paid medical leave benefits for childbirth are based on the assumption of an eight-week disability in the absence of complications. This is consistent with federal guidelines and will be reviewed should those guidelines change.

The maternity leave policy for faculty at Williams on a non-visiting appointment provides alternatives to the disability arrangement described above. In order to accommodate the educational program of the College and to respond to the particular timing of the faculty's teaching responsibilities, faculty with such appointments have the option of being released from all or part of their teaching and administrative duties in the semester during or following the birth of a child. The maternity leave provides a full semester of leave at full pay, which includes one course release for parental leave (see below). Faculty members anticipating the birth of a child should discuss their leave plans with the Dean of the Faculty as soon as possible so that the range of options can be fully explored and arrangements approved.

The general college rule that faculty members will be in residence and teaching for no less than three consecutive years (six semesters) between leaves of any kind (see Professional Leave) will be waived in order to grant a maternity leave, and the maternity leave will be considered equivalent to time in residence and teaching for the purpose of determining the timing of leaves.

Faculty Parental Leave

A non-visiting, benefit-eligible faculty member who becomes a parent of a newborn or adopted child under the age of 18 while employed at the College is entitled to paid parental leave in the form of a one-course teaching reduction. Foster parents may also be eligible for leave benefits and are encouraged to discuss their leave options with their Department Chair and the Dean of the Faculty. The parental leave is available during the semester the child is born or adopted, or during the semester immediately following the birth or adoption. In addition, parents who are not also eligible for the disability portion of maternity leave may elect to take a second course off at half pay to achieve one semester's leave at 3/4 salary for the semester. Parents who elect to take both courses off are also free of any administrative responsibilities, as would be the case if

they were taking a sabbatical. Individuals taking a full semester of parental leave will be expected to teach their standard load during Winter Study and the non-leave semester.

The general College rule that faculty members will be in residence and teaching for no less than three consecutive years (six semesters) between leaves of any kind (see Professional Leave) will be waived in order to grant a parental leave, and the parental leave will be considered equivalent to time in residence and teaching for the purpose of determining the timing of leaves.

To: The Faculty
From: Faculty Steering Committee
Date: March 4, 2015
Re: Parenthood and delaying the tenure decision

Currently, the College gives biological mothers the option of delaying the tenure decision for one year if they take one or two maternity leaves prior to the tenure decision. All other parents have the option of delaying the tenure decision for one year if they take more than one parental leave prior to the tenure decision.

The Steering Committee would like to discuss whether or not we should change this policy. The questions to consider vary depending on which parental leave policy is in place.

If our parental leave policy does not change:

- Should we maintain current policy about delaying the tenure decision, or
- Should any parent who takes a parental leave, whether it is one or two courses off, have the option of delaying the tenure decision for one year, or
- Should only those parents who take two courses off, regardless of whether this is paid or unpaid leave, have the option of delaying the tenure decision for one year?

If the Faculty Compensation Committee's proposal is adopted by the College:

- Should we maintain current policy about delaying the tenure decision, or
- Should a person who takes two courses off at 3/4 salary be able to delay the tenure decision for one year, or
- Should a person who takes one course off also have the option of delaying the tenure decision for one year?

Regardless of whether we keep or change parental leave policy:

- Should a person be able to delay the tenure decision more than once?

Williams College

Faculty Steering Committee

Lois Banta (Division III), Mea Cook (Division III), Edan Dekel (Division I), Nicolas Howe (Division II), Cathy Johnson (chair; Division II), Benjamin Rubin (Division I)

FACULTY BULLETIN

College and Community Advisory Committee

(Contact: Jim Kolesar, jkolesar@williams.edu)

- We recently discussed the college's involvement with several of the important processes that Mount Greylock Regional School is undertaking. These include settling on a particularly tight budget for the coming year, moving forward with a building project, searching for a superintendent, and determining whether to continue to share administrative functions with Williamstown Elementary School and Lanesborough Elementary School.
- Regarding the immediate budget challenges, the college has announced that it will cover in the coming year Mount Greylock's \$139,000 bond payment and \$11,000 of other one-time costs. The bond is for work done several years ago to repair a fallen ceiling and replace failing boilers. This \$150,000 is in addition to the \$150,000 currently budgeted to be spent at the school from the Williams Fund for Mount Greylock and to the college's expenditures on the Williams Center at Mount Greylock. (For a sense of scale, the school's annual operating budget is roughly \$10 million.)
- Regarding the superintendent search, a donor has given Williams sufficient money to reimburse the school for the whole cost, and to help spread word about the opening, the college has sent the position description to all alumni and parents who work in K-12 education, asking them to share it widely and even, as appropriate, consider applying themselves

Committee on Academic Standing

(Contact: Ngoni Munemo, nmunemo@williams.edu)

- This fall CAS discussed existing guidelines for granting students exceptions to make up deficiencies with online courses. The issues confronting CAS are twofold. First, the number of petitions for online courses has increased substantially and quickly as online offerings have become numerous and student awareness of their existence has increased. Second, in applying existing guidelines, CAS finds it difficult to ascertain from the petitions which students truly face *financial* and *geographic* constraints to making up deficiencies in a more traditional manner. CAS asked CEP for a clearer, workable policy to guide the committee with regard to online courses.
- CAS met throughout Winter Study to review the records of all students who failed to meet minimum academic standing. We want to thank faculty for getting most of their grades in on time and for submitting narrative comments for students with grades below a C- in their courses. As we approach pre-registration, CAS would like to urge faculty to

remind students of the early concentration rules, which limit the number of courses with the same prefix that first-years and sophomores may take.

Office of the Vice President for Finance and Administration

(Contact: Fred Puddester, fpuddester@williams.edu)

- The college continues to work toward the building of a new Williams Inn on or near the bottom of Spring Street in a way that will add life to the town's main commercial district, increase the town's tax base, not use college educational funds, and in fact generate some college revenue. It will be designed for use by both visitors and those of us who live and work here. We are currently working with town and state agencies to determine how best to situate it on the site. Regarding the long-term use of the current inn site, since the building was neither well constructed nor renewed over time, we can imagine its possible use for a year or so as swing space for a dorm renovation but in general the lot would become a green space, banked for the future.

If you would like to contribute an item to the April Faculty Bulletin, please e-mail it to Cathy Johnson (cjohnson@williams.edu) by April 10, 2015.