

## FACULTY MEETING AGENDA

October 17, 2018  
Griffin 3 - 4:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order and Remarks *President Mandel*
2. Reminder about online election for Committee on Appointments and Promotions *President Mandel*
3. Reminder about online election for the Faculty Review Panel *President Mandel*
4. Update from the Curricular Planning Committee *Professor Nugent*
5. Remarks and Discussion about Faculty Hiring, Retention And Climate *Dean Buell and VP Haynes*
6. Remarks and Discussion about the Committee Structure from the Faculty Steering Committee (see attached memo) *Professor Dubow*
7. Questions and Announcements

### ACTIONS TAKEN AT THE SEPTEMBER 12, 2018 FACULTY MEETING

*The following faculty member has been elected to the Committee on Educational Affairs:*

Division II: Non-Tenured

Laura Martin

*The following faculty members have been nominated to the Committee on Appointments and Promotions*

Division I: Full

Gage McWeeny  
Edan Dekel  
Guy Hedreen

ACTIONS TAKEN AT THE SEPTEMBER 12, 2018 FACULTY MEETING CONTINUED

***The following faculty members have been nominated to the Faculty Review Panel:***

Division II: Non-Tenured

Justin Shaddock  
Mason Williams

***The following faculty members have been nominated to the Faculty Review Panel:***

Division III: Non-Tenured

Katherine Jensen  
Leo Goldmakher

***The following faculty members have been appointed to the Faculty Review Panel:***

Division 1: Non-Tenured

Amal Egeiq  
Corinna Campbell

Division 2: Tenured

Steve Nafziger  
Nate Kornell

*Note: Faculty with children at the Williams College Children'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. We also want to remind you that the college now has arrangements with the Williamstown Youth Center and Pine Cobble School for childcare during these meetings. If your child does not attend one of these afterschool programs and you would like childcare during the meeting, please contact Assistant Dean of Faculty Megan Konieczny (mtk2@williams.edu) by Friday.*

**Williams College**  
**Faculty Steering Committee**

Colin Adams (Division III), Michelle Apotsos (Division I), Matt Carter (Division III),  
Sara Dubow (Division II, Chair); Aparna Kapadia (Division II), Amanda Wilcox (Division I)

---

**The Committee Structure:  
Recent History, Continuing Challenges, Potential Solutions  
October 2018**

*Recent History*

For the past several years, the faculty and the Faculty Steering Committee have engaged in an ongoing conversation about the efficacy of our committee structure.

This conversation began in the 2010-2011, when the Steering Committee made several recommendations for changes to the composition and staffing of selected committees. These recommendations were, in part, a response to changes in the administrative structure of the college, changes which required re-thinking the administrative membership and reporting duties of particular committees.<sup>1</sup>

At the April 2011 Faculty Meeting, the faculty passed the following motions:

- To change the Advisory Group on Admission and Financial Aid to the Committee on Admission and Financial Aid.
- To remove and replace untenured faculty on the Faculty Review Committee at the beginning of the academic year in which they are considered for tenure.
- To remove the Dean of the College as an *ex officio* member of the Calendar and Schedule Committee.
- To replace the Vice President for Operations with the Director of Real Estate and Auxiliary Services on the College and Community Advisory Committee.
- To add a sentence to the Committee on Undergraduate Life that makes clear that the committee makes recommendations to the Dean of the College and the Vice President for Campus Life.
- To replace the VP for Operations with the VP for Finance and Administration as a Senior Staff member advised by the Faculty Compensation Committee. To formalize the fact that the FCC also advises the Dean of the Faculty.

That same year, the Steering Committee introduced an online committee preference form, which included a free-response question and included some non-standing committees.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Motions are in Minutes of Faculty Meeting, April 13, 2011. Memo, "Discussion of the Committee Structure," attached to Faculty Meeting Agenda, April 13, 2011.

<sup>2</sup> Faculty Steering Committee Final Report, 2010-2011.

In 2014-2015, two additional changes were made to the Committee Structure:

- In October of 2014, the Faculty passed a motion expanding the Faculty Interview Panel from 6 tenured professors (2 in each Division) to 9 tenured professors (3 in each Division).<sup>3</sup>
- In December of 2014, the Faculty passed a motion replacing the Committee on Educational Policy with the Committee on Educational Affairs and the Curricular Planning Committee. That CPC is composed of 6 faculty members –1 full professor from each division, and 1 assistant or associate professor from each division.<sup>4</sup>

Those two changes increased by nine the number of slots on standing committees, with all nine new positions having rank and divisional requirements.

At the December 2014 Faculty Meeting, the faculty passed a motion asking the President and Dean of the Faculty to appoint a small special committee to “take up the issue of reconsidering the manner and method of voting for committee memberships.”<sup>5</sup> In October of 2015, the Faculty passed a motion to establish an ad hoc committee to review voting procedures and the composition of committees.<sup>6</sup>

In October of 2016, the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Committees (CFC) issued a report identifying some problems and some potential solutions.<sup>7</sup> The CFC’s work including reviewing the composition requirements for committees, and comparing the number of positions to be filled to the number of faculty actually available to fill them. The CFC also conducted a survey, which garnered 105 responses from the faculty. In the words of the CFC, “we sometimes entertained ideas for radical changes in faculty governance and service but concluded that these would entail innovations beyond our committee’s purview. In any case, we did not detect any grassroots desire for sweeping change in faculty governance.”<sup>8</sup>

The CFC identified and discussed the problem of a relatively smaller number of professors in Divisions I and III relative to Division II. This problem remains true today. The imbalance

---

<sup>3</sup> Minutes of Faculty Meeting, October 15, 2014.

<sup>4</sup> Minutes of Faculty Meeting, December 10, 2014.

<sup>5</sup> Minutes of Faculty Meeting, December 10, 2014.

<sup>6</sup> Minutes of Faculty Meeting, October 21, 2015.

<sup>7</sup> Report of the Ad hoc Committee on Faculty Committees, Meredith Hoppin (chair), Sarah Goh, Peter Just, Ngonidzashe Munemo, October 16, 2016, 1. The charge to the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Committees (CFC) was as follows: "Following these two faculty motions, we charge the CFC with examining both the methods and procedures currently used to nominate/elect faculty to committees as well as questions about the composition of all faculty committees. We ask the committee to consider how we can improve and expand faculty participation and representation on faculty committees, in order to assure strong and robust faculty governance.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, 1.

means that some faculty in Divisions I and III might be overburdened with committee work, while some faculty in Division II might not be appointed to the committee on which they expressed a desire to serve, or to any committee. It also makes it increasingly difficult to comply with the compositional mandates of particular committees. The CFC “considered addressing this problem by removing constraints of division and/or rank on at least some committee but could not find anywhere these constraints clearly lacked a sound rationale. In addition, the faculty who responded to our survey felt strongly that existing representation by division and rank should be retained on most committees.”<sup>9</sup>

The CFC identified a substantial level of concern about the efficiency and effectiveness of committees. More than 50% of faculty responding said that committees were “not usually efficient” or “hardly ever efficient,” and almost 50% of respondents said that committees were “not usually effective” or “hardly ever effective.”<sup>10</sup> Based on these concerns, the CFC recommended better record-keeping by committees and more communication between committees, and more attention to continuity of service on committees.

The main structural and procedural changes that came out of the CFC’s report were two motions debated and passed by the Faculty at the December 2016 Faculty Meeting: one implemented an electronic opt-out process for nominations to the Committee on Appointments and Promotions, the Faculty Steering Committee, the Curricular Planning Committee, and the Faculty Review Panel; and one implemented an online balloting process for nominations and elections to standing committees.<sup>11</sup>

The central argument for having online elections was to increase voter participation and make voting easier for faculty who are on leave or unable to attend a particular faculty meeting. The central argument for the electronic opt-out procedure was to allow faculty who are unwilling to serve on a committee to indicate that ahead of time, so that their names would not appear on the nomination ballot and so that faculty would only be voting for candidates who are willing to be nominated, elected, and to serve on that committee. This is the second year under which the election process is operating with these two changes.

Last year, the Steering Committee made substantial progress in streamlining the committee structure. Through reconfiguring the Committee on Undergraduate Life into the Committee on

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, 5.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, 11.

<sup>11</sup> Motions passed at December 14, 2016 Faculty Meeting: “To add the following paragraph between the second and third full paragraphs on page 7 of the Faculty Handbook (Section I-C: Faculty Committees and Panels): “At the beginning of each academic year faculty are asked if they are *unwilling* to serve on the Committee on Appointments and Promotions, Faculty Steering Committee, Curricular Planning Committee, and Faculty Review Panel respectively. The names of unwilling faculty will not appear on the respective nomination ballot for each of these committees during that academic year. Faculty members may, at any time, contact the Dean of the Faculty to reverse their current preference of service;” and “To replace all paper balloting at faculty meetings with online balloting.”

Student Life; reconfiguring Library Committee and Chapin Library Committee; and consolidating the previously distinct Lecture Committee and Faculty Lecture Committee into one combined Lecture Committee, the number of committee faculty positions on Standing Committees was reduced by 8. At the same time, the Faculty voted in a new standing committee, the Standing Grievance Panel, which added an additional 12 slots.

This is all to say that we've been talking, in some degree or another, about challenges in the committee structure since at least 2010. It is quite likely that going further back in the record would reveal that these kinds of concerns – and efforts to address them – have an even longer history.

The “Report to the Faculty, Administration, Trustees, Students of Williams College,” submitted by the Visiting Team in January of 2018 also identified faculty governance as an area of some concern. The visiting team described their perception that there “was a great deal of complacency in the nature of the existing structure,” and an “underlying lack of trust of faculty in administrative authority, and even lack of trust in some of the faculty committees.” These concerns led the Visiting Team to ask “if it is difficult to make either rapid or forceful decisions at key moments on key issues.”<sup>12</sup> Whether or not we agree with this assessment in whole or in part, it seems worth taking some time to consider these concerns.

### *Continuing Challenges*

This year's Steering Committee is continuing the effort begun by last year's FSC to assess and improve the efficacy of the current committee structure. We are sharing some data (provided at the end of this memo) with the faculty as a starting point for a discussion that we hope will generate improvements we can implement before the Spring 2019 cycle of committee appointments and elections.

This data includes the current number of faculty in different divisions and ranks; the current number of standing, non-standing, and ad-hoc committees; the current number of committee slots on each committee; the current compositional requirements for committees in terms of division and rank; and the current processes through which committees are constituted. You'll see that the system is somewhat arcane and complex. We also share with you the percentages of faculty who were enthusiastic, willing, or unwilling to serve on particular committees in 2018-2019, or who opted-out of running for election for particular committees.

This data is inevitably imprecise. The existence, status, size, and composition of standing, non-standing, and ad-hoc committees – both in practice, and as defined and left undefined in the Faculty Handbook and on the website of the Office of the Dean of Faculty – is surprisingly difficult to track. There are also multiple undocumented working groups and subcommittees

---

<sup>12</sup> “Report to the Faculty, Administration, Faculty, Trustees, Students of Williams College, Williamstown, Massachusetts by An Evaluation Team representing the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the New England Association of Schools and of Colleges,” Prepared after study of the Institution's self-evaluation report and a site visit on October 22-25, 2017, quotes from p. 14 and 4.

requiring faculty involvement. We also recognize that there is an enormous amount of less visible, less documented service that falls outside of the committee structure.

Tracking the opt-out percentages and committee preferences of faculty is also inexact for a variety of reasons. One of the most obvious reasons is the fact that this is the only the second year that we've had the online opt out option for the CAP, FSC, CPC, and FRP. We can't compare it to any other year, and can't say with any certainty that the problem is worse than it has been in the past. Another cause for imprecision is the fact that faculty members sometimes designate themselves as willing to serve on or run for a particular committee, and then subsequently decline an appointment or nomination.

That said, we are confident that the data, with all of its imprecisions, demonstrates the inarguable fact that there is mismatch between the number of committee slots that must be filled, the composition requirements of particular committees, and the number of faculty who are available, eligible, and willing to serve on these committees.

We have not parsed the data in a way that reveals patterns that could tell us whether any particular group of faculty – by department, division, or rank – is more or less likely to opt out or be unwilling. Impressionistically, it seems that the unwillingness is quite evenly distributed.

We also understand that there are completely legitimate reasons why someone might be unwilling to serve on any particular committee – or any committees – in any particular year. These reasons could include having a particularly intense teaching schedule; a pressing research project; or family or health reasons that necessitate pulling back a bit. Someone might need a break from committee service after having done it for years; or someone might be doing service in other ways that we are not talking about today. All of these reasons, and doubtless there are others, are reasonable and understandable. What we aim to document is simply the fact that the number of slots we have to fill, and the number of faculty whose availability to fill those slots is limited for any number of reasons, make it extremely difficult – almost impossible – to staff our committees according the composition and procedural requirements mandated in the handbook.

We can continue to live with things as they are. Although the data does suggest that the current committees structure is reaching – or has almost exceeded – its capacity to sustain itself, we can continue to try to make it work, more or less. That said, we believe that if this committee structure no longer reflects our goals for faculty governance, we can and should fix it.

With this background history and data in mind, we want to share with you some possible changes that this year's FSC has begun to discuss. These are preliminary ideas that require considering what problems these changes would solve and imagining – as fully as we can – what new problems these changes might create. We will have more conversations at future faculty meetings, we have begun talking with past Steering Committee chairs, and we will also be reaching out to current and past chairs of standing and non-standing committees for their insights.

We hope you will take this information, and particularly our preliminary suggestions, as an open invitation: anyone who is interested in this issue and has ideas about how we might proceed

should contact anyone on this year's Faculty Steering Committee. For now, we offer five possible changes that we have tentatively begun to consider, listed from the smallest to the most substantive.

### *Potential Solutions*

- 1) Add to the handbook a provision that, in cases when someone needs to step down from an elected committee mid-year or mid-term, would allow Steering to appoint a replacement for the remainder of their year or their term. This suggestion is meant to mitigate the problem that it can take two months to elect someone (one month to nominate and a second month to elect), and then, if the person elected as a replacement is already serving on another committee, another two months to replace them. This provision could exclude certain committees – like CAP or FSC, for example.
- 2) Add to the handbook a provision that, in cases when there are not enough eligible and willing people who meet the compositional requirements of a particular elected or appointed committee in terms of division and rank, would allow the FSC some discretion to suspend one or both of those requirements for the duration of a term. This provision could, if we decide it is necessary, exclude certain committees as well.
- 3) A more substantial change, but one that does not involve a radical rethinking of the entire committee structure, would be to change to the current process of preferences and opt-outs. Instead of the electronic opt-out system sent to faculty in August for the FRP, CPC, CAP, FSC, we would add those four committees back to the general committee preference list that is distributed in the spring in order to plan for appointments and elections in the following year. From that list, faculty could identify some limited number (3-5) of committees that they absolutely don't want to be on. For all of the remaining committees, they would designate whether they were willing or enthusiastic. Of course, if there were particular circumstances that precluded a faculty member from any committee service in any given year, they could communicate those circumstances to the Dean of Faculty or the Steering Committee, whether in the comment box already included on the form or by another means. This proposal is both practical and philosophical. The current system leaves us without an adequate pool of faculty who are eligible and willing to serve on particular committees. As a practical measure, this change would deepen that pool. Philosophically, we are motivated to correct any misperception that the current system may have unintentionally contributed to that committee service is itself purely voluntary or optional, rather than an essential element of the faculty's responsibility to the college.
- 4) A second more substantial change we have talked about addresses the selection process for the Faculty Review Panel. Instead of having a panel of 12 on Faculty Review Panel, all faculty would automatically be in the pool available to be drawn on to serve on appeal committees. FSC would constitute appeal committees in the same way that they do now, but could draw members from the entire faculty. The appellant and the Dean of Faculty would still be able to review the make-up of the appeal committee for potential conflicts of interest, the same way they do now, and faculty members who were tapped to serve would be able, and in some cases, obligated, to recuse themselves from service in a

particular case, as they are now. This new system could include a provision that after serving on an appeal committee, a faculty member would have a certain number of years off before being asked to serve again. Our motives are again both practical and philosophical. Currently, FRP is a committee for which a particularly high number of faculty opts out of standing for nomination. The widespread choice to opt out of service on this committee has made it difficult to staff it with members who meet its requirements for rank and division. Philosophically, the current FSC agrees that availability to serve on appeals committees is a fundamental element of faculty citizenship.

- 5) A more radical change that addresses the entire committee structure would think about the committee structure in terms of a budget, recognizing that we have a limited amount of time and a limited number of bodies. We could decide that our budget of time and bodies can support a certain number – let's just say ten – committees. Then we would need to figure out how to restructure and consolidate the existing committees into ten. This would probably create a larger workload for each of those ten committees, but within a leaner overall structure, committees might be able to work more effectively, and would also, hopefully, make the overall structure more efficient and more substantive. Of course, something would be lost in this restructuring. Every committee we have was brought into existence for good reasons. Eliminating a particular committee, or folding it into an existing committee, implies that that good reason no longer exists, or that there is different way to accomplish that original goal. But we should also recognize what would be gained. Articulating more clearly the mandate of each committee and making governance less diffuse could give standing committees more authority. It would also mean that more faculty would be able to rotate in and out of committee service and have some years where they have no committee obligations, and other years where their service is more time consuming but also more meaningful and substantive. This new structure would also leave a much larger pool of faculty not serving on standing committees who would thus be more available to serve on working groups or ad-hoc committees that could be constituted (and dissolved) in response to limited, specific, and time-sensitive issues.

**PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF COMMITTEE STRUCTURE**  
**October 8, 2018**

**Total Number of Tenure and Tenure Track Faculty, 2018-2018 (Data from DoF Office)**

Division I:	80 (22 on leave for at least one semester; 5 AP leave) (53 Full – 6 Assoc – 21 Asst)
Division II:	119 (19 on leave for at least one semester; 7 AP leave) (69 Full – 21 Assoc – 29 Asst)
Division III:	77 (24 on leave for at least semester; 1 AP leave) (42 Full – 8 Assoc – 27 Asst)
Total:	276
On Campus:	211
Minus Fac Admins:	11 (Provost, DoF, DoC, Pres., 2 Assoc. Deans; Hyde Fellow, WEPO, 3 Mystic)
Available for Comm:	200

*These numbers do not reflect the fact that faculty in their first year are not asked to serve on college committees. These numbers do not include Lecturers, Sr Lecturers, Visitors, or Artists-in-Residence. While lecturers are not required to serve on committees, some do, and this year, 5 lecturers are serving in appointed positions to committees. These numbers also do not include Athletics faculty, some of whom do serve on committees. There are four slots that are required to be filled by Athletics Faculty, and this year, 7 committee slots are filled by members of the Athletics Department.*

**Total Number of Committee Positions (Listed in FHB and/or DF website)**

Standing Committees:	111 members (19 committees, plus Faculty Secretary)
Non Standing Committee:	44 members (11 committees)
Ad-Hoc Committees:	10 (2 committees: CPC Working Group on AAS; SCS Implementation)
TOTAL:	165 (+14 since 2015-2016 Committee on Committees Report)

*This does not include temporary and informal committee work that faculty are called upon to do throughout the year, including but limited to: various “working groups,” the interview committees for WEPO, selected committees that administer various endowed funds and positions, the committees that reviews Bolin and Post-Doc Applications, and various search committees for staff positions.*

**Electronic Opt-Outs on August Inquiry for 4 Elected Committees (from Justine Beringer, DoF Office)**

- 198 faculty responded
  - FRP: 69% of the those responding opted out (undifferentiated by rank)
  - FSC: 58% of those responding opted out (undifferentiated by rank)
  - CPC: 62% of those responding opted out. 69% of full professors responding opted out
  - CAP: 62% of the 85 full professors responding opted out

*These numbers do not reflect the additional fact that a faculty member who did not opt-out on the online form may nevertheless decline a nomination, decide to not to run once nominated, or to withdraw after being elected.*

**Voting Participation Rates for Online Elections (from James Cart, Office of Inst. Research)**

There are 335 faculty eligible to vote. Between 160 and 195 ballots were completed/submitted in each of the online elections in 2017-2018, and September 2018. The voting participation rate ranged from 48-58%. In around 70% of the elections, more than 180 ballots were submitted, which is a participation rate slightly above 50%.

**Enthusiastic/Willing/Unwilling Numbers from Spring Committee Preference Form**

*Separate Tables Provided*

*Sorted Alphabetically by Committee (in percentages)*

Committee	Enthusiastic	E+W (W)	Unwilling
ACSR	1	28 (27)	71
Athletics	5	37 (32)	64
Bookstore	11	50 (39)	49
British Fellowships	11	49 (38)	50
CAFA	18	60 (42)	39
C & S	3	38 (35)	62
CAS	11	40 (29)	59
CEA	12	46 (34)	53
CEAC	6	50 (44)	49
Chapin	11	53 (42)	46
Claiming Williams	3	25 (22)	74
College and Community	7	51 (44)	48
Div'y & Com'y	5	52 (47)	48
CPR	20	57 (37)	42
CUL (CSL)	1	24 (23)	76
Fac Prog Director	1	18 (17)	80
Fac. Int. Panel	26	58 (32)	43
Faculty Lecture	14	61 (47)	38
FCC	11	52 (41)	48
Honor & Discipline	7	31 (24)	67
Honorary Degrees	15	58 (43)	42
IT	6	42 (36)	57
Lecture	13	53 (40)	48
Library	11	58 (47)	41
Schapiro-Hollander	5	34 (29)	63
Standing Grievance	3	32 (29)	63
Winter Study	5	37 (32)	63

*Sorted by Descending Order of Unwilling (in percentages)*

Committee	Enthusiastic	E+W (W)	Unwilling
Fac Prog Director	1	18 (17)	80
CUL (CSL)	1	24 (23)	76
Claiming Williams	3	25 (22)	74
ACSR	1	28 (27)	71
Honor & Discipline	7	31 (24)	67
Athletics	5	37 (32)	64
Schapiro-Hollander	5	34 (29)	63
Standing Grievance	3	32 (29)	63
Winter Study	5	37 (32)	63
C & S	3	38 (35)	62
CAS	11	40 (29)	59
IT	6	42 (36)	57
CEA	12	46 (34)	53
British Fellowships	11	49 (38)	50
Bookstore	11	50 (39)	49
CEAC	6	50 (44)	49
College and Community	7	51 (44)	48
Div'y & Com'y	5	52 (47)	48
FCC	11	52 (41)	48
Lecture	13	53 (40)	48
Chapin	11	53 (42)	46
Fac. Int. Panel	26	58 (32)	43
CPR	20	57 (37)	42
Honorary Degrees	15	58 (43)	42
Library	11	58 (47)	41
CAFA	18	60 (42)	39
Faculty Lecture	14	61 (47)	38

*Sorted by Descending Order of "E+W" (in percentages)*

Committee	Enthusiastic	E+W (W)	Unwilling
Faculty Lecture	14	61 (47)	38
CAFA	18	60 (42)	39
Honorary Degrees	15	58 (43)	42
Fac. Int. Panel	26	58 (32)	43
Library	11	58 (47)	41
CPR	20	57 (37)	42
Chapin	11	53 (42)	46
Lecture	13	53 (40)	48
Div'y & Com'y	5	52 (47)	48
FCC	11	52 (41)	48
College and Community	7	51 (44)	48
CEAC	6	50 (44)	49
Bookstore	11	50 (39)	49
British Fellowships	11	49 (38)	50
CEA	12	46 (34)	53
IT	6	42 (36)	57
CAS	11	40 (29)	59
C & S	3	38 (35)	62
Athletics	5	37 (32)	64
Winter Study	5	37 (32)	63
Schapiro-Hollander	5	34 (29)	63
Standing Grievance	3	32 (29)	63
Honor & Discipline	7	31 (24)	67
ACSR	1	28 (27)	71
Claiming Williams	3	25 (22)	74
CUL (CSL)	1	24 (23)	76
Fac Prog Director	1	18 (17)	80

Committee	Membership (fac – ad – stu)	Divisional Requirements	Rank Requirements	Staffing Procedures	Notes	% NO 2018	Total # Fac
<b>Standing Committees</b>							
Committee on Appointments & Promotions	3-3-0	1 from each division	Only full professors	Elections. Nomination Ballot; election ballot with top three on slate, using preference voting	3-year term; must commit to two years; First3 coordinators not eligible for 6 years after their term.	62%	3
Faculty Steering Committee	6-0-0	2 from each division	By Div: 1 Tenured 1 Untenured	Elections; chair chosen by committee	2-year term; can't serve consecutive terms	58%	6
Curricular Planning Committee	6-3-0	2 from each division	By Div: 1 Full 1 Assoc/Assist	Elections; chair chosen by committee	3 year term; must serve 2 Started in 15-16.	62%	6 (+6)
Faculty Review Panel	12-0-0	4 from each division	By Div: 2 tenured and two non- tenured	Elections; May and September, but rolling as needed.	2-year term, but cycle off after a case. No one on FSC can run. No one in their tenure year. People on FSC and SGP (and CAP and First 3?) not eligible.	69%	12
Committee on Educational Affairs	7-5-6	2 from each div.; plus chair	By Div: 1 Tenured 1 Untenured	Election from slates of two nominated by FSC; chair apt. by Pres.	2-year terms, many serve 1. No longer review line requests bc of CPC	53%	7
Faculty Compensation Committee	8-10--0-0	2 from each division; 2-4 more FSC apptd.	By Div: 1 Tenured 1 Untenured	Election for 6; slate nominated by FSC; 2-4 appointed by FSC	Advises Provost, VP for Fin/Admin, and DF	48%	10
Committee on Priorities and Resources	4-6-3	At least one in each division	No rank requirements	Appointed (not specified in FHB)	Advises President. Staggered two year terms. Chair serves two-year terms. Not clear in HB who appoints chair.	42%	4
Committee on Academic Standing	6-4-0	No Divisional requirements	No Rank requirements	Appointed (not specified in FHB)		59%	6
Committee on Student Life	3-2-6	No Divisional requirements	No Rank requirements	Appointed (not specified in FHB)	One of Faculty must be from Athletics; reduced by 2 when CUL became CSL in 18-19	76%	3 (-2)
Athletics Committee	6-0-0	At least one member from each Division; two from athletics	No rank requirements	Appointed (not specified in FHB)	Two faculty must be from Athletics; Chair is faculty rep to NCAA/NESCAC	64%	6

Committee	Membership (fac – ad – stu)	Divisional Requirements	Rank Requirements	Staffing Procedures	Notes	% NO 2018	Total # Fac
Calendar and Schedule Committee	3-2-3	At least one for each division	No rank requirements	Appointed (not specified in FHB)		62%	3
Campus Environmental Advisory Committee	3-3-6	No divisional requirements	No rank requirements	Appt. by Dean of Faculty in consultation with FSC	Reports to President and community. Meetings are open to community, at discretion of chair	49%	3
Honor & Discipline Committee	8-1-8	FSC strives for balance across Division	FSC strives for a “mix of experience”	Appointed (not specified in FHB)		67%	8
Faculty Interview Panel	9-0-0	3 from each division	All must be tenured	FSC consults with CAP; appt made by DF		43%	9
Lecture/Faculty Lecture	3-1-3	No requirements; ideally one from each division	No rank requirements	Appointed (not specified in FHB)	Only Faculty members are on Fac Lec Series. Combined in 18- 19	38%	3 (-3)
Information Technology Committee	4-5-3	1 from each division, plus chair	No rank requirements	Appointed (not specified in FHB)		57%	4
Library Committee Special Collections	3-4-4 3-3-0	1 from each division; one is chair	No rank requirements	Appointed (not specified in FHB)	Same three on both, but chairs can be different. Combined in 18-19	48%	3 (-3)
Faculty Secretary	1-0-0	No divisional requirement	No rank requirements	Appt by President			1
Standing Grievance Panel	12-12-0	2 from each Division	By Div: 1 Tenured 1 Untenured	6 elected from slate nominated by FSC; 6 appointed by FSC;	1 must be from athletics; FSC and FRP members not eligible. Also CAP and First 3? New in 18-19	63%	12 (+12)
Winter Study Committee	5-4-5	1 from each Division	No rank requirements	Appointed (not specified in FHB)		63%	5
<b>SUBTOTAL for Standing Committees</b>					<b>Changes since 15-16 (+6 for CPC, FY: 15-16) (+12 for SGP, FY: 18-19) (-2 for CUL to CSL, 18-19) (-3 for Library/Spec, 18-19) (-3 for Lecture/Fac Lec, 18-19)</b>		<b>111 (+10 since 15- 16)</b>

Committee	Membership (fac – ad – stu)	Divisional Requirements	Rank Requirements	Staffing Procedures	Notes	% NO 2018	Total # Fac
<i>Non Standing Committees</i>							
Committee on Diversity and Community	8-2-8	No divisional requirements	No rank requirements	VPSPID solicits nominations from SC		48%	8
College and Community Advisory Committee	3-5-3	No divisional requirements	No rank requirements	Appointed 2-year terms; no process specified in FHB	Advises Senior Staff	48%	3
Bookstore Advisory Committee	3-3-3	No divisional requirements	No rank requirements	Appointed – no specified how in FHB.	Not in FHB. Is this an ad-hoc committee?	49%	3
Bronfman Advisory Committee	5-2-0 Where is that information?	No divisional requirements	No rank requirements		Not in FHB or on DF website. But it is on list from Committees on Committees. Open to faculty teaching in Jewish-studies related areas. Doesn't seem like FSC appointed anyone last year? What is the status of this committee?		5
Dively Committee for Human Sexuality and Diversity	Unspecified	No divisional requirements	No rank requirements	Not specified in FHB	DF website lists membership from 15-16; from list of appointed members, doesn't seem like FSC appointed anyone last year?		3? (# on 16-17 report from C on C)
Honorary Degrees Advisory Committee	3-2-10 plus College Marshall	One from each division	No rank requirements	Appointed; not specified how in FHB		42%	4
Claiming Williams Steering Committee						74%	5 (+5)
Schapiro-Hollander Users Committee					Not in FHB or on DF website, but it looks like FSC appointed. What is the formal status of this committee?	63%	4
British Fellowships Committee					Does this committee still exist? Not in FHB or DF website.	50%	3
Advisory Committee on	2-2-2-2 alums			Appointed by Pres in consultation with FSC;	In FHB this is listed in Section I-D, "Administrative Advisory		2

Committee	Membership (fac – ad – stu)	Divisional Requirements	Rank Requirements	Staffing Procedures	Notes	% NO 2018	Total # Fac
Shareholder Responsibility				Advises Investment Committee of BoT.	Committees,” instead of under “Faculty Committees and Panels” (Section I-C). Does FSC appoint?		
Committee on Admission and Financial Aid	4-11-0			Appointed by Provost in consultation with FSC Advises Provost and Dean of Admission and Financial Aid.	In FHB this is listed in Section I- D, “Administrative Advisory Committees,” instead of under “Faculty Committees and Panels” (Section I-C). Does Steering appoint?		4
<b>SUBTOTAL FOR NON-STANDING</b>					+ 5 for Claiming Williams + 4 for Schapiro Hollander  <i>Committees not in FHB</i>		<b>44</b> (+9 since 16-17)
Ad Hoc Committees							
SCS Implementation							4
CPC Working Group on AAS							6
<b>SUB TOTAL FOR AD-HOC</b>							<b>10</b>  (-2 since 16-17)
<b>TOTAL FOR COMMITTEES WITH FSC INVOLVEMENT</b>					Standing: 111 (+10 since 15-16) NonStanding: 44 (+9 since 16-17) Ad Hoc: 10 (-2 since 16-17)  <i>Comparison Years</i> 15-16: Addition of CPC 16-17: Analysis by Committee on Committees 18-19: Reduction in three standing committees; Addition of SGP		<b>165</b>  (+17 since 15- 16)

**Williams College**

**Faculty Steering Committee**

Colin Adams (Division III), Michelle Apotsos (Division I), Matt Carter (Division III), Sara Dubow (Division II, Chair); Aparna Kapadia (Division II), Amanda Wilcox (Division I)

---

**FACULTY BULLETIN**

**FROM: The Faculty Steering Committee**

In April 2016, the faculty approved the proposal of "simple (editorial or technical) revisions to the Handbook" by the Dean of Faculty and the Faculty Steering Committee. These revisions do not require a motion and full vote by the faculty. A faculty member "may move to have any simple revision addressed under the substantive revision process." Otherwise, this revision will be considered approved and go into effect on July 1.

Below is a revision to Section III-I (The College Tuition Grant Program) of the Faculty Handbook that falls under this guideline, the rationale for the change, and the current language edited to highlight the proposed changes.

**Revised Section III-I: The College Tuition Grant Program, to replace the current Section III-I.**

Dependent children of benefit eligible faculty and staff at Williams College who are enrolled in accredited college programs leading to an academic degree (excluding secondary and graduate schools) are eligible after five years of full-time service for a grant that covers the tuition costs plus any fees normally covered under the Williams College tuition, up to an annual maximum dollar amount of one-half the prevailing tuition at Williams. The Tuition Grant Benefit is payable for a maximum of four years per dependent child. The terms of the benefit are detailed on the [tuition grant webpage](#) maintained by the Benefits Office.

**Rationale**

The rationale for this revision is two-fold.

1) The dates and dollar amounts in the Faculty Handbook are currently two years out of date. Changing the Faculty Handbook, even with simple updates, is a cumbersome process. The webpage maintained by the Benefits Office, on the other hand, is automatically updated with new dates and dollar amounts each year.

2) The lengthy content currently in the Faculty Handbook duplicates exactly the content that appears on the Benefits webpage. Thus, abbreviating the Faculty Handbook results in no loss of information or clarity.

### **Section III-I in the 2018-2018 Faculty Handbook, edited to highlight the proposed changes:**

As part of the Williams College employee benefits package, eligible employees can receive tuition support for dependents to attend a college or university. This benefit is equal to the lesser of, the tuition amount at the college/university the employee's child is attending plus any fees normally covered under the Williams tuition amount or one half of Williams' tuition for 2016-2017, the maximum Tuition Grant Benefit amount will be \$25,745. If both parents work at the college, the benefit will apply to one parent.

If your dependent is planning on using the benefit during the 2016-2017 academic year either for the **FIRST TIME** or is **CURRENTLY** receiving the benefit and plans on continuing to utilize it, please complete the Annual Tuition Grant Benefit Request Form. If you have questions about this benefit, please call 597-4478 or e-mail [kmaloney@williams.edu](mailto:kmaloney@williams.edu).

### **The Williams College Tuition Grant Plan Summary**

Dependent children of benefit eligible faculty and staff at Williams College who are enrolled in accredited college programs leading to an academic degree (excluding secondary and graduate schools) are eligible **after five years of full-time service** for a grant that covers the tuition costs plus any fees normally covered under the Williams College tuition, up to an annual maximum dollar amount of one-half the prevailing tuition at Williams. The Tuition Grant Benefit is payable for a maximum of four years per dependent child. **The terms of the benefit are detailed on the [tuition grant webpage](#) maintained by the Benefits Office.**

The terms of the benefit are as follows:–

- The employee must be benefit eligible in a regular faculty or staff position, and must have completed five years of full-time service at Williams. Faculty members with appointments other than full-time should refer to the *Faculty Handbook* for eligibility.–
- The program covers children of retired, deceased, or disabled employees, subject to the five-year service requirement. If the spouse of a deceased employee remarries, the eligibility for the benefit will be reviewed.–
- In order for the child to be considered a dependent of the eligible employee, the child must meet the "qualifying child" criteria established by the IRS. The tests to determine dependency are explained in the IRS' instructions for completing Form 1040 U.S. Individual Income Tax Return. The College reserves the right to request documentation of a child's dependency at any time.–
- The Tuition Grant Program is not applicable to secondary or graduate schools.–
- No more than four dependents per eligible employee family may use this benefit.–
- The grant can be applied to tuition costs plus fees that are normally covered under Williams College tuition, for any accredited college program leading to an academic

degree. An itemized bill will be required each semester from all state institutions to determine the amount of the tuition grant payment.

The five-year service requirement is counted from the employee's date of hire in a fully benefited eligible position. If the service requirement is satisfied after the dependent child has started a semester, the grant will be available at the start of the next academic period.

New regular faculty and staff hired into benefit eligible positions will be credited with years of service and be eligible for the Tuition Grant Program if their employer immediately prior to Williams College had a tuition support program for which the employee was eligible. The College will request verification of such a program by requiring a copy of the prior employer's policy statement describing details of the benefit.

Each spring the Office of Human Resources will send a memo to all employees reminding them of the benefit and request that employees who plan on using the benefit in the next academic year to indicate which school their child(ren) will be attending by completing a form above.

Tuition checks are mailed by the Benefits Office directly to each college in early August for the fall semester and in December for the spring semester. If an institution operates on a trimester schedule, the third payment is sent in early March. The Benefits Office will notify the Bursar of dependent(s) who will attend Williams and the appropriate accounts will be credited. The employee should contact the benefits office if they resign from Williams after the tuition payment has been made.

Currently these grants are not considered taxable income for federal or state purposes. However, if there is a change in the tax laws, or a need to restructure the College's benefit package for any reason, the nature and applicability of this benefit will be reviewed, and upon approval of the Board of Trustees, may be changed. The College cannot, in any case, guarantee the after-tax value of the tuition grants.

To obtain further details of the College Tuition Grant Program or to apply for the benefit, faculty and staff members should contact the Office of Human Resources at 4478.

## Faculty Meetings

Once each month during the academic year, faculty meetings take place at 4:00 p.m. in Room 3 of Griffin Hall. The President and the Faculty Steering Committee convene the meetings and work together to set the agenda. Faculty meetings include reports from the President, other administrative officers, and from faculty committees with active business. Those in attendance include faculty, representatives of several administrative offices, student representatives of the College Council, *The Williams Record*, and student members of those committees on the agenda for that meeting.

## Motion Chart

	Debatable	Non-Debatable Amendable	Non-Amendable	Second Required	Second not Required	Majority Vote	2/3 Vote	May Reconsider	May not Reconsider
<b>Motions</b>									
1. Point of Order		✓			✓				
2. Previous Question Terminate Debate "calling the question"		✓	✓	✓			✓		✓
3. Lay on Table		✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	□
4. Amendment	✓		✓	✓		✓		✓	
5. Accept & Adopt	✓		✓	✓		✓		✓	
6. Consider Article Out of Order	✓		✓	✓		□	✓	□	✓
7. Adopt a Resolution	✓		✓	✓		✓			✓

## Voting Procedures

Please Note:

- i. On October 6, 2010, faculty approved the motion replacing voice votes and votes by show of hands at faculty meetings with votes by electronic voting devices.
- ii. On May 11, 2011, faculty voted to determine the results of votes on motions at faculty meetings by the majority of those voting. An abstention is not a vote and is not counted as a vote.

## Voting Membership

The voting membership of the faculty consists of all Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant professors, and Senior Lecturers, as well as those Lecturers and Instructors who hold full-time appointments. Faculty holding part-time appointments may vote only if they have been notified by the Dean of the Faculty that they have met the requirements to be voting members (see Policies Governing Part-time Faculty). Faculty holding appointments called "Visiting" do not vote. All voting members in the professorial ranks who do not hold major administrative appointments are eligible to be elected to those standing committees with elected faculty membership, according to the rank and divisional categories prescribed for those committees. [*Faculty Handbook*, Section I: B]