

FAS Senate

AN ELECTED BODY OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
YALE UNIVERSITY

Minutes for the FAS Senate Meeting

Thursday, October 13, 2016

HGS211, 322 York Street

4:00 PM – 6:00 PM

Approved

In attendance: Chair Emily Greenwood, Deputy Chair/Secretary Doug Rogers, David Bercovici, Jill Campbell, Beverly Gage, John Geanakoplos, Shiri Goren, John Harris, Matthew Jacobson, Ruth Koizim, Christina Kraus, Kathryn Lofton, Mark Mooseker, Yair Minsky, William Rankin, Charles Schmuttenmaer, Ian Shapiro, Katie Trumpener, Vesla Weaver, Karen Wynn

Absent: Reina Maruyama, William Nordhaus and staff Rose Rita Riccitelli

Guests: Tim Barringer, Stan Eisenstat, Pat McCreless, Roberta Frank, Milette Gaifman, Tamar Gendler, Brian Kane, Gundela Kreuzer, Ian Quinn, Mari Stever, Karen von Kunes, Bethany Zemba

Chair Emily Greenwood called the meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Senate (FASS) to order at 4:07 PM and reminded everyone of the open conversation, with President Peter Salovey, about the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS) taking place on October 27, 2016 at 4 PM in Davies Auditorium. She then addressed the Teaching and Learning Committee Report that was presented for a vote at the last Yale College Faculty meeting and noted that along with her, Senators present were Charles Schmuttenmaer, Jill Campbell, John Harris, Ruth Koizim, Mark Mooseker and Yair Minsky. Ms. Greenwood reported that there was a lively debate with many comments from the floor, and that the debate would continue at the next Yale College Faculty meeting on November 3, 2016. She explained that the proposed new question #11 on the revised on-line evaluation form – to introduce an individual numerical score for faculty members for their overall teaching performance – was rejected by vote. A discussion about open access of questionnaire forms followed. She said that there are eight questions on the existing on-line evaluation form with four where the responses are visible to all faculty and students, and that in the new proposed form, there would be ten questions where the Committee wants to make responses accessible to all faculty and students. She noted that concerns expressed by some faculty in FAS included anxieties about how those questionnaire responses might circulate and how they might be used, particularly for faculty who are up for tenure and promotion, and the ways in which the free circulation of this material might open the way for less than responsible treatment of the data. She said that the FASS is serving as one conduit for faculty concerns and is working with Scott Strobel, who was chair of the Teaching and Learning Committee last year, to make sure that concerns are heard. Ms. Greenwood asked for comments and suggestions about this issue and mentioned that Mr. Strobel said that now that question #11 was abolished, the chief outstanding issue raised at the YCF debate involved question #10, pertaining to the performance, character and organization of the faculty instructor, and that the other nine questions relate to the content of the course. He had asked if a feasible compromise would be to make responses to question #10 protected, and to have open access to the other nine questions. Ms. Greenwood noted that the FASS would not be taking any formal vote on this matter because there was no Senate report or resolution to debate. However, she asked for senators' thoughts on the matter to convey them to Mr. Strobel. Matthew Jacobson asked what the argument is in favor of

access. Ms. Greenwood said that she understood that it came in part from surveying what our peers are doing, and that Yale College is on the low end of access to data. It has also been explained in terms of our pedagogical contract with students and trying to ensure that they have as much information about courses as possible, and that the committee was concerned that in the past there has been information that student groups have passed around to each other with pockets of informal advising based on information that was not available to all students. From the perspective of the faculty, she noted, the rationale for open access would be to enable faculty to reflect on each other's teaching and get a sense of how one is doing in relation to others. Mr. Schmuttenmaer noted that with team-taught courses, in the current system there is no provision for students to allocate different scores for individual instructors. Ms. Campbell noted that during the Yale College Faculty meeting, there was an amendment passed by a majority to eliminate the numerical rating of the instructors, however there was no decision reached about access. Also, she said, during that discussion there was mention of team-taught courses and allowing open access to each team member to see how their team members were evaluated. Mr. Minsky noted that there have always been a couple of questions that were open to everyone: one was, "What advice would you give to other students who were interested in this course?" He believes that people then cut and pasted their responses to all the questions into this one area making information on all questions available, and therefore it does not make sense to have all of this information floating around for students to see and not available to faculty. He noted that it makes more sense to him that all of this information be made available (to students and faculty) in a clean and predictable way. William Rankin noted that in the background is the bias that often exists with respect to gender, race and other identity categories, and he feels that it is one of the hopes of the reform that this can be seriously addressed. He would like to make sure that all of the questions surrounding bias are addressed and evaluated before releasing all of the information on the forms to everyone. Ms. Greenwood said that Mr. Strobel addressed this concern by saying that the Teaching and Learning Committee did a lot of research on implicit bias in evaluation responses, and that they are proposing that the students have to answer questions about their own performance in the course before evaluating aspects of the instructor's performance. Mr. Rankin clarified that he would also like to see a clear statement educating students about the impact of bias on course evaluation forms included on each form. Katie Trumpener noted that the changes proposed were presented as small, logical changes, when in fact they are very big and go to the heart of the social contract in the University, they pose a big loss of privacy for the faculty, and there could be arguments that this should be totally transparent, but that would have to be argued out as a principle first. She added that the University could decide tomorrow to report on all salaries, as some universities do, but many people would also be uncomfortable with that because we are used to having this type of information be private. Ruth Koizim said that she noted to Mr. Strobel that if the University is asking to craft a faculty conduct policy in order to protect people from bullying and being treated unfairly, opening up information that could be potentially used in a negative way against somebody strikes her as contradictory. She said that when students are given the opportunity to express themselves, we know that some of them do so in a dispassionate way and others get in their "digs," and so giving people the opportunity to evaluate does not necessarily mean that it will be done in a fair-minded way. Matthew Jacobson said that in his experience as a chair, the data gathered has been treated as potentially bad data at every level and he is skeptical about what is to be gained by making this information public. He noted that he is in favor of transparency, however why be transparent with bad data – who does it serve and in what way? Ms. Greenwood said that these comments are extremely helpful, and that there clearly needs to be more discussion on this issue at the next Yale College Faculty meeting. Mr. Mooseker suggested that if we accept Mr. Strobel's comment in eliminating question #11, that would defeat the purpose of having open access to all questions. Mr. Schmuttenmaer said that you would not make all information available to all faculty, but it would be available to specific groups – to all Chairs, DGS's, DUS's,

promotion/tenure committees, and perhaps others. John Geanakoplos asked if the students actually see more information than faculty and Ms. Greenwood said no, they all see the same information.

Ms. Greenwood closed this discussion and went on to present the minutes from the FASS meeting on September 22, 2016 for questions, comments or corrections. There were none and Kathryn Lofton made a motion to approve the minutes and Karen Wynn seconded that motion. A vote to approve the minutes for September 22, 2016 was taken and unanimously passed.

Ms. Greenwood asked for brief reports from FASS committees.

Vesla Weaver said there was no report from the Committee on Elections and Nominations.

Ms. Greenwood reported on the Committee on Yale Committees saying that the committee had received a request from the FAS Dean to put forward nominees for the new FASTAP Implementation Committee and passed on nominees to the Dean. Christina Kraus – also a member of the Committee on Yale Committees – added that she is a member of the Sterling Library Advisory Committee and that she had liaised with the Senate committee to provide Susan Gibbons with nominees for the advisory committee.

Ms. Koizim reported that the Committee on Yale College Expansion is drafting a note of appreciation and response to the message from the Deans in which they will be asking for more detailed information on the committees that are involved in the planning process on classroom and schedule planning and urging that the expansion website be up sooner rather than later so that there is an opportunity for people to weigh in while these plans are being made. She said that the committee is also asking for greater specificity in procedures in hiring and working conditions for non-ladder faculty. She added that the committee would preface its requests for further information with a statement of appreciation for recent communications, and the information which the Deans have already shared with the committee.

Ms. Greenwood noted that William Nordhaus, chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, is away and she reported that there is no new business to report, other than that this Committee is forming a sub-committee to work on a report on the budget and structure of the FAS Dean's Office and its management. Ms. Wynn added that another subcommittee of the Budget and Finance Committee will look at the all-funds budgeting and spending issues in FAS departments.

Ms. Campbell reported on the Peer Advisory Committee and mentioned that the committee is working on on-going cases from last year.

Mr. Minsky reported that the Committee for Faculty Advancement's agenda remains the same and they continue to work on the faculty excellence project and the FASTAP implementation process and there are concerns with the way the OPAC office reports on the humanities and sciences. He noted that the Divisional Dean of Humanities, Amy Hungerford, is also interested in this topic.

Mr. Schmuttenmaer reported on the Committee on Diversity and Inclusivity and stated that there was nothing new to report, however he is working on a short-list of priorities drawn from the Committee's longer report and then will work on follow up with appropriate university offices.

With respect to the Senate's parenting report from last year, William Rankin reported that there were meetings with the FAS Dean's Office, the Provost's Office and the Medical School Senate, who will be releasing their own parenting report in two weeks. He anticipates coordinating with the Medical School

as the FAS Senate continues its conversations with the Provost's Office.

Ms. Greenwood called on Doug Rogers who introduced the topic of forming an ad hoc committee on the Status, Pay and Conditions of Non-Ladder Faculty in FAS. Mr. Rogers explained that the FASS would be asked to vote to approve the committee and then to vote on whether to allow the Senate to invite non-senators to join the committee. He noted that Ms. Greenwood and Shiri Goren have agreed to co-chair this committee. Ms. Greenwood said that senators had received a description of the charge for this committee, as follows:

Yale's non-ladder faculty play an integral role in FAS, contributing to teaching, advising, research, and wider academic citizenship. Many core areas of the academic curriculum in Yale College are sustained by non-ladder faculty and they will be called on to play an even greater role as the College expands. This ad hoc committee will examine the status of non-ladder faculty in the round, paying attention to issues such as pay, benefits, job security, opportunities for career development and progression, research support, and wider issues of inclusion in departments and programs. It takes as a starting assumption that Yale's commitment to excellence involves ambitious plans for supporting non-ladder faculty in their teaching and research and ensuring that they are adequately recognized and valued. The committee will examine existing data, work with the office of OIR to obtain fresh data, compare the status of non-ladder / teaching faculty across different units at Yale, and at other universities. Members of the committee will also consult non-ladder faculty in different departments, divisions, and in different roles within FAS. The committee will aim to produce a report for discussion by the Senate, and ultimately a vote, in Spring 2017.

Ms. Greenwood noted that at the last FASS meeting, one of the conditions that senators set in welcoming the creation of this committee was to put one of our existing committees on hold, and the ad hoc committee on Faculty Standards has therefore been put on hold until such a time as the Provostial committee that has been appointed has a report for the FASS to engage with. The FASS has already discussed the forming of the Ad hoc Committee on the Status, Pay and Conditions of Non-Ladder Faculty in FAS at two previous meetings and all agreed that this is one of the more pressing issues for FAS faculty and that we all want to work in an atmosphere of equity and collegiality for all faculty. The committee wants to work closely with the FAS Dean's Office to make sure we can put together a helpful and constructive report. She asked for comments or suggestions. Mr. Geanakoplos asked if the committee is going to consider the question of what positions are appropriate for non-ladder faculty – will the University transform the existing ratio of ladder to non-ladder faculty? Another question he posed is regarding hierarchy and his sense that the committee's charge seems to concentrate more on compensation and encouragement to do research and resources to do the research. He noted that there are lots of decisions that are made in departments by tenured and junior faculty and asked if there will be a discussion on whether non-ladder faculty will participate in those decisions. Ms. Greenwood said that the committee will be conscious of hierarchy, since one of the findings of the FASS report on diversity and inclusivity in FAS was that the hierarchical division of ladder and non-ladder faculty is one of the greatest barriers to inclusivity in FAS. She conceded that there are rules that exist in FAS about, for instance, rights to vote in promotion and tenure cases, but that beyond that there are many initiatives and events within departments that are part of the core academic business and are not as inclusive as they could be. She said she is also aware that the Faculty Advancement Committee is

interested in the status of the faculty and the number of the ladder faculty, and that this committee does not want to play off questions about the total number of ladder faculty against the conditions and status of non-ladder colleagues. Mr. Geanakoplos asked if this was a yes or no to his question. Ms. Greenwood said that invariably this will come up, but that the committee's focus is on the status of non-ladder faculty and their participation in FAS, rather than implications for numbers of ladder faculty in FAS. Beverly Gage said that as a member of the College Expansion Committee she noted that we still do not know how the hiring process for non-ladder faculty is going to work so it is good that this new committee will investigate this and other related matters. She also drew attention to the sentence from the committee charge, "It takes as a starting assumption that Yale's commitment to excellence involves ambitious plans for supporting non-ladder faculty in their teaching and research and ensuring that they are adequately recognized and valued" and noted that the committee may wish not to take this as an assumption, as it may or may not find this to be the case. Mr. Rogers asked if there were any further comments. None were offered so he asked for a motion to create this committee. Mr. Jacobson made a motion to create the Ad hoc Committee on the Status, Pay and Conditions of Non-Ladder Faculty in FAS. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rankin. A vote was taken and it was unanimously approved.

Ms. Goren spoke on membership for the committee and noted that in this cycle, there are no lecturers serving as senators and the perspective of lecturers needs to be represented on this committee. Ms. Greenwood noted that the committee needs to represent all non-ladder faculty roles and also wants insights from non-ladder faculty colleagues who have spoken passionately about these issues for decades and who have a good overview of the conditions for non-ladder faculty. Mr. Schmuttenmaer wanted to know what exactly their role on this committee would entail, given that they are not members of the FASS and therefore have no voting rights. Ms. Greenwood said that she feels that anyone invited to be a member of this committee would be a full member of the committee and fully engaged in preparing the report. She also noted that once a report is created, it goes before the FASS for vote of approval so that a member of the committee who is not a senator would not be voting on the report. Ms. Trumpener noted that she feels that this is a special situation that merits their inclusion and that tenured and ladder faculty have representation across the University for governance purposes, but that non-ladder faculty do not have this representation, and so it is more important than ever that they are included in deliberations with and for themselves. Ms. Gage noted that the FASS has legitimacy because it is an elected body so we need to be careful about choosing the right process for selecting non-senators for this committee. Mr. Rankin noted that we have a committee to help find people to serve on committees and asked if there is a way to use the FASS Committee on Committees to do this for this committee. Ms. Greenwood said that she feels that the committee will lack credibility if it does not have this representation. Mr. Rogers asked if there was any objection to move to a vote to allow two non-senators to serve on this committee without setting precedent for other committees. Ms. Gage wanted to clarify that the Committee on Committees will figure out who those people will be and then it will go to the FASS Executive Committee (EC) and that the EC will approve the membership. Mr. Jacobson suggested that as a rider to the vote we are about to take, to leave it to the EC to decide on the procedures. Mr. Rogers said that can be added to the understanding. Ms. Wynn said that there seems to be the need for a balance between having representation of the group that the committee's charge is about, and having elected members of the FASS on that committee, so she asked what the size of the committee will be and if the majority of its membership will be elected senators. Ms. Greenwood said that at the moment, the committee has she and Ms. Goren as co-chairs and members are Mr. Schmuttenmaer and Ms. Koizim. Mr. Geanakoplos asked if we could call the non-senators consulting

members. Ms. Greenwood said that she thought that these individuals should be full members, in the spirit of inclusivity. David Bercovici said whether we say it is not a precedent or setting precedent, it probably will be looked at as such. He also noted that it is difficult to take a vote on this without knowing what the mechanism is for choosing the non-senate members. Mr. Rogers asked if it is the general consensus in the room that we will need a clearer procedure in order to vote on this. Mr. Rankin said that another way would be to have the vote and charge the EC to figure out the procedure. Mr. Rogers said that there are enough concerns so that it would probably be best to bring this issue back to the FASS either by e-mail or by discussion at the next FASS meeting. He said that we have voted to establish the committee, and there will be further discussion and we will bring the matter of non-Senators on the committee back to the FASS for further consideration after deliberation by the EC.

Mr. Rogers introduced the next topic – a discussion and vote on recommendations for the selection procedure for Divisional Deans in FAS and first asked Senators for their comments before opening up the conversation to the floor. Ms. Greenwood introduced the document noting that this is the FASS's first experiment with the genre of the brief report. She said that on June 22nd, the FAS faculty received an announcement about the creation of new divisional dean posts, and questions were raised about the selection procedures. The EC felt it would be helpful to do a survey of other universities that have similar posts to find out what selection procedures they have in place. She wrote to deans, provosts, and Senates of eleven universities, and of these eleven, Brown, Chicago, Columbia, Duke, Harvard, Michigan, Notre Dame, NYU, UPenn, Princeton and Stanford, nine have divisional deans, while two – Princeton and Brown – do not. Of the nine that have divisional deans, seven appoint those deans either by a combination of the Dean of Faculty (the equivalent of our FAS Dean) and the Provost making the appointments in consultation with departmental heads and other members of the administration, and two, including Chicago which some consider the Gold Standard, appoint their divisional deans by an elected faculty committee, elected from within the division by the division. The EC considered all the information gathered and the Chicago model was recommended to us by several FAS faculty who were in touch with the committee. Since we do not have anything close to this standard at Yale, The EC concluded that it would be a stretch to recommend this process and instead focused on what it thought were the core principles of issues of shared governance and transparency. She said that leaving aside the selection of divisional deans, there has been a concern in other areas about the transparency of high level committees and how people get chosen to serve on these committees. Therefore, she said, the EC thought this was a good opportunity to make some suggestions about how to introduce shared governance into this process, most notably with an advisory faculty committee where half of the members of the selection committee could be put forward by the FASS. Ms. Greenwood noted that the proposal is a series of five steps: 1) In the interest of transparency, it is important to have formal job descriptions for these positions, and the description would be a collaborative effort between the FAS Dean and the existing Divisional Advisory Committee. 2) That the FAS Dean appoint a six-person search committee, five of whom would come from the division in question and one of whom would be external to the division but part of the FAS faculty, and in the FASS report, it is suggested that three of the six nominees come from suggestions from the FASS's Committee on Committees. One of the roles that the committee is to play is to ensure that the job description and opportunities to apply and nominate are circulated widely within FAS. The report also considers opening searches like this to external candidates, however this is not a strong recommendation. 3) The search committee would conduct a search using the job description as a guideline, with the committee meeting pro-actively with members of the division from all ranks to solicit feedback. 4) The committee would put together a short-list which they

would pass to the FAS Dean who would interview candidate/s, and the final appointments would be made by the FAS Dean. 5) In the past, occasionally members serving on high-level search committees have ended up being appointed to the position in question and the EC recommends that this is a practice to be avoided.

Ms. Greenwood asked for questions, comments and suggestions from the floor.

Mr. Jacobson asked if the composition of the search committee described in step two is open to all or is it dependent on University experience. Ms. Greenwood said that we did not take a position either way in order to leave this to the FAS Dean to determine. Ms. Weaver asked if the selected dean then selects the divisional committee. Dean Gendler replied that Divisional Committees are appointed by the President. Ms. Weaver asked if there is any precedent at any other universities for these committee positions being elected positions. Dean Tamar Gendler said no universities have the same Divisional Committee structure as Yale. Ms. Lofton said that she would like to talk about process, mutuality, and what we expect to hear back on this report. She asked about whether the FASS would welcome reciprocal suggestions on governance from the Dean's Office. Ms. Greenwood said that we want to hear from Dean Gendler regarding this report and that the FASS is an advisory body and has no power to dictate process, however this report has arisen because we are representing concerns that some of our faculty colleagues have put to us. She said the EC acknowledges that the process of selecting deans is complicated and that it is up to the FAS Dean to steer and guide the process. She said that the question of two-way feedback is one of the FASS themes for the year, and one which the EC has discussed with the President and FAS Dean.

There were no other comments from Senators and Mr. Rogers opened the discussion to the floor.

Dean Gendler said that she received a copy of the report including the appendix, and said that she also surveyed other institutions, commenting that the FASS might check with her in the future to ensure that we do not duplicate efforts. She said that she is grateful for the thought that went into this report, but was struck by the rigidity of the suggestions. She noted that she has been thinking very hard about what the structure of the Dean of Sciences should be, and has met with thirty-two colleagues in the sciences, with every current department chair, with those who have served in a divisional director role, and also with other faculty, to get their input on the question as she thinks about whether this will be an internal search or an external search. She would like much more flexibility in what kind of advisory committee is appointed than is contemplated in the Senate report. She said that it may be a case where six is the right number or ten, or maybe a preliminary committee of three followed by a larger committee. Therefore, she said, she agrees entirely with step one, but feels that the suggestion on committee selection is overly restraining. Dean Gendler also concurred with point number five. Ms. Greenwood noted that it is obvious that Dean Gendler wants this to be a collaborative process and that the report proposes strong representation of faculty opinion. The Senate wants to improve the culture of trust and transparency in FAS, which is the spirit in which this report is offered. Ms. Trumpener noted that we have come from a position where step five has already been a given and the large majority of our peer institutions do use a formal search committee made up of faculty members in the process of getting to a short-list, and she feels that this is an extremely important factor. She recalled that in the search for the graduate dean, a faculty search committee used a procedure similar to what is described in the report. Ian Shapiro said as he understands it, the issue is not whether there should be a committee, it is whether it should be designed as is stated in this report. He feels it is no different from the way the FASS

has input in the formation of other committees and therefore wonders why we need another set of specific instructions for this committee in particular. Ms. Gage said that her understanding of the creation of divisional deans was simply a renaming of divisional directors and a change in nomenclature and not a restructuring of the job, its position or role. If this is true, she asked how the divisional directors were chosen – was there faculty input or were these administrative decisions? Ms. Campbell noted that there were several steps where the divisional directors' positions, as they existed for many years, became enhanced divisional directors and there was an announcement that they had a number of new responsibilities and authority, so instead of calling them "enhanced" divisional directors, they were to be called divisional deans. Ms. Campbell spoke about the FASS recommendation for the committee make-up as an effort to connect the position with the faculty in the division that the appointee would be working in. Dean Gendler noted the importance of step one and the job description for what these positions represent. She explained the transition from the divisional director role to the divisional dean role. She also said that just as the FASS is a work in progress, so is the role of the FAS Dean a work in progress, and in her first year as FAS Dean, she worked on academic oversight and was responsible for a small portion of the FAS budget with the Provost having oversight for the rest of the budget, and the divisional directors roles were akin to the traditional divisional director roles – overseeing the tenure and promotion process and playing a role in faculty hiring, but did not have oversight of budgets or faculty salaries and research account within departments. She said that in the second year of her administration, budgetary authority of the FAS was passed from the Provost's Office to the FAS Dean and her office inherited work that used to be done by people with full-time positions in the Provost's Office, mainly the deputy provosts, and the work that used to be done by three deputy provosts passed to her office, and a portion of the work that is still done by the deputy provost for science and research passed to her office, while some portion has stayed in the Provost's Office. Last year half-time divisional directors' roles, which have responsibilities that well exceed the responsibilities of many of the deans of our professional schools, were switched to full-time positions in recognition that their work could not be done on a half-time basis, and thus divisional director roles were shifted to divisional dean roles. When she put the current divisional deans in place, she did not conduct a search. She did this by interviewing at least twenty faculty for each of the positions and did not use an advisory committee. Dean Gendler said that her goal as FAS Dean is to ensure that our faculty can thrive, and that, while those in the FAS Dean's office need to be responsive to concerns that are raised by and on behalf of the faculty, their effectiveness in fulfilling their roles also depends on their being effective communicators to the central administration and particularly to the Provost and the President, the Vice Presidents, and those involved in development, and not just being effective communicators to faculty. Mr. Jacobson noted that there is a widespread sense among the faculty that if the structures that produce the people chosen as divisional deans are not broadly perceived as being wise and legitimate, then the person chosen cannot be 100% effectual, which he feels is an important part of the conversation. Ms. Gage said that there seems to be agreement that faculty need to take an important role in choosing divisional deans. Ms. Gage suggested that, in light of the discussion, the short report on the selection process for Divisional Deans be withdrawn for further work before a vote.

Mr. Rogers agreed and concluded the discussion on the Divisional Deans in FAS report and suggested that the EC hold further discussions with the FAS Dean on this report, with the goal of bringing a revised version to the next Senate meeting.

Ms. Greenwood introduced Dean Lynn Cooley to address the Graduate School's Total Program Size

Initiative.

Dean Cooley said that the motivation for doing the Graduate School's Program Size (GPS) project was to enhance excellence in graduate education at Yale to support outstanding graduate education in all programs. She said that the size of graduate programs had not been systematically investigated for at least two decades, and there have been many changes, with new disciplines emerging and some waning, job markets changing, and financial structures changing, especially in the sciences. She noted that admissions resources in the Graduate School have been fixed since 1992, with minor adjustments in 2008 due to the recession and said that the way the size of graduate programs was determined was by annual admissions targets, how many students came in each year, how long they spent in the program, and that admission targets were fixed with no significant latitude in adjusting the size of graduate programs, which made it difficult to respond to emerging intellectual fields or to make changes in any of the number of parameters. She said that we were also constrained in our budget, that the size of programs exceeded our financial aid budget, and there was some financial pressure to look at the number of students in the graduate school. Dean Cooley said she convened a GPS working group comprised of faculty across all divisions to help define the criteria by which we should determine graduate program size as well as the mechanisms by which we could annually adjust size in response to contextual factors so that the GSAS be responsive to the changing intellectual landscape. She said the committee met many times during the academic year and thought about how we could move away from an annual admissions target model to a total program size model and what criteria to use to accomplish this. The Graduate School now has data that will help to accomplish this – longitudinal information about things like admissions pools, offers of admissions, yield on those offers, time-to-degree, attrition from programs, and is in the process of collecting what it hopes will be up-to-date information on placements of our students. She said that her office found that this type of information is being made public by our peers on their respective web sites, and that they want to find a way to make this information available for Yale to help recruit students to our programs. She said that the committee reviewed different programs and it was interesting for committee members to see how graduate programs ran in divisions that were not their own divisions; the committee then thought about what the most important drivers are for program size. They looked at all of the data, including the amount of support needed for students. She said that the working group made recommendations to move away from establishing admission targets and moving toward a total program size, although in the science division this is also a matter of "total budget size." She said that her office has begun a review of total program size by beginning to meet with every DGS and Chair to discuss the strengths, weaknesses, plans for faculty hiring, how students are doing, where the challenges are, and how the Graduate School can help, which is proving to be valuable to our goal of moving forward with this project. She noted that to get to total program size it was necessary to identify an appropriate number, and that a lot of discussion in the GPS working group concerned the question of how to arrive at that number. They decided to start with the historical target, which departments are used to, and to multiply that number by six, or less than six in some cases (sciences), because six years is the expected time to degree. This formed the starting point, and was followed by a discussion about variables. Once the Graduate School and the department in question come to a consensus about the appropriate number, then they can arrive at a target for admissions for the coming year. She said that nothing dramatic will happen in each of the programs, and that there will only be small adjustments in the first year while people are getting accustomed to thinking in terms of a total program size model, even if there might be bigger changes in the future. She stressed that the Graduate School is not trying to accomplish this all-at-once and disrupt

the cohort number that departments are used to or that they know they need to have in their program in order to maintain a vital program. Another recommendation of the committee is to capture a small number of admission slots into a central pool that will be open to the humanities and social science divisions, and the Graduate School is still in the process of finalizing how this will work. Details will soon be ready to circulate. She said that the challenges that are still being worked on are collecting placement data in a way that it can be incorporated into databases that can be kept up-to-date, to untangle the complicated funding arrangements in the science division and to think about how tuition is charged in the science division.

Ian Shapiro, who was a member of Dean Cooley's committee, noted that this was a very data-rich exercise and the data gathered was extremely useful and that he strongly seconds the move that this data should be accessible to people involved in all other aspects of running the University. He also noted that this committee was not budget driven but about excellence in the graduate school.

Brian Kane expressed concern with this effort, especially having six years as the standard time for a student to finish their degree. He is also concerned and worried with restricting program size and feels this is indeed more budgetary than about promoting excellence. He expressed the concern that not all tracks within the music program are interchangeable, and that graduate students admitted to one subfield are often not able to teach courses relevant to another subfield. Reducing the number of graduate students could thus adversely impact teaching.

Tim Barringer spoke and said he agreed with everything that Mr. Kane said, and noted that the total program size project was rolled out in the Summer months, on July 22nd without any broad consultation or wider discussion with faculty. In his department, they tend to have graduate students who take on ambitious projects and, for example, if they have 10 students working on these types of projects and extending their work beyond the proposed six-year standard time, their program size will be reduced due to these "slots" being occupied. The total program size initiative, that is, may well act as a disincentive to graduate students taking on cutting-edge work that is difficult to accomplish (in multiple languages, or in multiple research sites) and likely to advance knowledge and earn the most competitive jobs. He said that this is an extremely problematic aspect of this new initiative.

Millette Gaifman asked about the process of this effort and if it is looking into the very different needs in some areas that do not fit into the criteria that are being put into place.

Dean Cooley said that she had a faculty committee and consulted regularly with department chairs and DGS's and kept them up-to-date with what was being discussed and planned by her committee. She also said that the mechanism for funding students from the Graduate School budget has to her knowledge never been subject to a vote. She is trying to be as good a steward as possible of the money that she has available to her for supporting graduate education. She also said that she hears all of the comments about the time-to-degree and is working with departments to address this issue.

Ms. Greenwood thanked the commenters and proposed that the EC discuss whether there should be an ongoing dialogue regarding this issue by the FASS and especially about the six-year period and budgetary concerns. The meeting was adjourned at 6:04 pm.

*After FASS approval of these minutes at the November 10, 2016 FASS meeting, edits were received on November 11, 2016 by Dean Lynn Cooley and inserted into the approved minutes on November 16, 2016.

