

FAS Senate

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

Minutes for the FAS Senate Meeting
Thursday, November 10, 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, Shiri Goren, Matthew Jacobson, Ruth Koizim, Christina Kraus, Kathryn Lofton, Reina Maruyama, Mark Mooseker, Yair Minsky, William Nordhaus, William Rankin, Charles Schmuttenmaer, Ian Shapiro, Katie Trumpener, Karen Wynn

Absent: John Geanakoplos, John Harris, Vesla Weaver

Guests: Stan Eisenstat, Tamar Gendler, Steven Stearns, Bethany Zemba, Charles Musser, Karen von Kunes

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences Senate (FASS) Chair Emily Greenwood called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM and noted apologies from Senators John Geanakoplos, John Harris, and Vesla Weaver who were not able to attend. Ms. Greenwood noted that there will be an effort to organize a meeting with Dean Cooley of the Graduate School on how to respond to various questions by different departments in FAS on the issue of graduate program size. She said that the FASS will try to schedule an additional event in its calendar for a discussion regarding President Salovey's comments on faculty excellence, and that the FASS needs to have a discussion about the role of the FASS and the state of faculty governance in FAS. Ms. Greenwood made note of the e-mail that the Yale community received from President Salovey regarding the dismay on campus in response to the recent election results, and said that she was particularly struck by the sentence - "*As members of a university community, we are obliged to engage fully with each other, speak frankly, listen carefully, and seek common ground.*" Ms. Greenwood said that it is one thing to write these words, and another thing for members of the administration to resist, push back at, critique, and question the authority of the FASS as it tries to do its representative work on behalf of the wider faculty. She said that the FASS is in its second year and that she has been troubled that its members, when speaking out in meetings around FAS, have had the legitimacy of their mandate questioned. She noted that the FASS mandate comes from its constitution as a representative body of the FAS faculty, set up and elected by the faculty. She said that FASS senators take their roles very seriously and that, whenever possible, the FASS makes every effort to consult the wider FAS faculty to find out what they think. However, she noted, the FASS does not do this for every situation. She said that it is very important for FASS senators, who give up their time as researchers, writers, teachers, advisors and mentors, and who are engaged in outreach to faculty colleagues, to be respected for their good faith efforts representing the FAS faculty. Ms. Greenwood said that she would like to see less divisiveness in some of the feedback from the administration. She noted that the tone of the FASS can sometimes seem somewhat harsh, but last year members of the FASS were told, when speaking out on issues of race and representation, that they did not represent the wider FAS faculty and decision-making

suffered as a result. She said that this is a very dangerous pattern of events and takes us back to the debates on the creation of Yale-NUS, when faculty were told that it was unbecoming to speak out and discuss decisions that the University had already made, or sham consultations in which faculty were consulted about matters when they had already been decided. She said that the FASS is not here as a spectacle or a game or a talking shop, and the University as a whole is not a talking shop. It is, rather, a place of learning, debate and consultation. If faculty members cannot speak frankly and ask if the University is making decisions as a result of the best judgements and deliberation and consultations, then we might as well absent the name of the University. Ms. Greenwood said that she hopes moving forward, that the FASS will be respected in its best faith efforts to represent the faculty as it tries to advise the administration on what Senators see and hear to be, and think to be, genuine faculty concerns.

Ms. Greenwood presented the minutes from the October 13, 2016 FASS meeting and asked for questions, comments or changes from the floor. There were none. Reina Maruyama made a motion to accept the minutes as presented. David Bercovici seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the minutes of the FASS meeting on October 13, 2016 were accepted unanimously.

Ms. Greenwood asked for brief reports from FASS Committees:

William Nordhaus, who represented the Committee on Elections and Nominations, requested that his update be presented at the time the report on the By-Laws was being presented.

Ms. Greenwood reported no update from the Committee on Yale Committees.

Ruth Koizim reported on the Committee on Yale College Expansion and said that the committee is still waiting for a reply from the deans on the committee's request for a list of the committees who are working on the expansion and the list of their members. Dean Tamar Gendler noted that the deans have been in consultation with one another to ensure that web pages are up-to-date with pertinent information. Ms. Koizim asked if web pages for faculty have been created and Dean Gendler said each group involved in getting this information updated is working on providing this information. Ms. Koizim said that she believed that there is going to be a web page for faculty to apprise them of developments and that she hoped it would have been up prior to the October recess. Dean Gendler noted that Dean Holloway's office was preoccupied with other issues on campus and therefore there was a delay in getting this page up before the October recess.

Katie Trumpener commented that it was instructive to hear, at President Salovey's address to the FAS, that the president did not know about the proposed changes to the undergraduate library. She noted that there was a message sent to one of her departments (Comparative Literature/English) from the subject librarian stating that their collection housed in Bass Library will be shrunk and asking for information on what parts of the collection needed to be preserved. Ms. Trumpener wondered if this message was sent to other departments and if the decision (to shrink collections held in Bass) was still being reconsidered in light of the concern raised by faculty, and that she felt that this is an issue that relates to the college expansion.

Christina Kraus replied that she is on the Sterling Library Advisory Committee and its Sub-Committee to Discuss the Bass Library. She said that the charge to the sub-committee is to determine which books should be removed, which was not what the faculty who recommended the formation of this committee had in mind. She said that there was a Sterling Library Advisory Committee meeting recently where this was not mentioned. Ms. Kraus said that at the first meeting of the sub-committee, she will

ask for a discussion on wider issues.

Jill Campbell gave a report on the Peer Advisory Committee and said that there have not been any new inquiries this year. She suggested that the FASS publicize this committee as it has done useful work on behalf of FAS faculty concerns that were brought to their attention in the past. She noted that there has been one follow-up with a colleague whom the committee helped last year, and recently there has been some progress in providing a title for faculty who have not been promoted or who have reached the end of their appointment. This non-paying appointment, as department scholar or program scholar, will allow certain scholars to have access to the Yale Library and a Yale e-mail account while searching for another position. The FASS Peer Advisory Committee was one party that took part in this multi-party discussion. Ms. Campbell said that this was a very difficult and long process, and that she hopes that other issues can be dealt with more efficiently and more smoothly in the future. Dean Gendler said that what seemed to be an easy issue to deal with actually involved multiple offices, and that there were issues in the Provost's Office, the Office of the General Council, the Library, as well as correlation with other schools across the university. The process also involved consultation with other universities and institutions, to determine whether the university should provide this support for an interim period of one or two years. In sum, the process took many hours of thoughtful engagement in the hope of creating a solution that was sustainable. Ms. Campbell said that she is most appreciative of the process, but felt that the initial delay came when the Provost's Office deemed the process impossible to achieve. If the Provost's Office had stated from the outset that this was difficult instead of impossible and that they were committed to finding a solution, then the process would have been better and swifter.

Yair Minsky presented a report on the Committee on Faculty Advancement which he said met and talked about how this committee could contribute to the discussion of faculty excellence. He said that the committee feels it can achieve this by providing as much detail and substance to the discussion of what faculty excellence actually requires. To this goal, he noted, there are two areas they will pursue: 1) To organize and host a series of conversations with chairs and collect information from them on how they view the situation with their faculty and find out what is needed for faculty research to be as strong as it can be. This, he said, speaks to supporting faculty who are here and recruiting new faculty. He noted that the committee does not want to duplicate efforts already being done so there will be a collaboration with FAS Dean's Office to ensure this, and he would like this to happen at the beginning of the next semester. 2) The second effort is to have a questionnaire that will be distributed to faculty and the committee is hoping to create the questions after their conversations with chairs to get a sense of what types of questions to include on the questionnaire. However, he said, the committee hopes to have a draft of the questionnaire to present to the FASS at its December 8, 2016 meeting.

Charles Schmuttenmaer spoke about the Committee on Diversity and Inclusivity and said that the committee has established their goals for the year, and one is to create a dashboard with various indicators. He said that he met with Kathryn Lofton, Deputy Dean for Diversity and Faculty Development, and Bethany Zemba from the FAS Dean's office, and Ms. Zemba reported to him that Richard Bribiescas, Deputy Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity, has already set up a dashboard that includes demographics. Mr. Schmuttenmaer said that he was told that the FAS website has a section on diversity. He said that another committee goal is to set up a meeting with Mr. Bribiescas to talk about what might be coming out of his office and how the FAS will respond to this committee's report from last year. Another committee goal is to have a finer grained tracking of when and how faculty are promoted to various levels.

Mr. Nordhaus reported on the Committee for Budget and Finance and talked about the status of

discussions with the administration about obtaining information on the budget for the FAS and the University. He said the FASS was established to engage in shared governance of the FAS, and shared governance relies critically on shared information. Without an informed FASS, it is impossible for the FASS to do its business in advising with regards to the size and composition of the faculty, the economic status of the faculty, plans for improvement of faculty excellence, and competing priorities. He said that in recent years the University budget has become the most secret of secrets, and aside from what is required by law, there have been no details publically available. He said that in the past year the FASS Budget and Finance Committee has been engaged in discussions with the administration and the Provost's Office with the aim of obtaining details of the university budget, and has spent hours where the committee thought it was making reasonable requests, and actually thought it was making progress in getting at least some of the information requested. However, he said, this week the University provided a document on the University budget [Mr. Nordhaus distributed copies to each senator], and he noted that this document failed to provide any of the information on the University budget which the committee expected. It included no details or history of the FAS budget, no information on the deficit of the West Campus, and nothing about the details for the staffing of different units. He said that his committee has received no answer to its ongoing requests for detailed information, and he does not know why. Mr. Nordhaus then distributed a second document, a budget booklet for Stanford University, which he said has many similarities to Yale in terms of size, complexity, structure, and central administration, and Stanford's report contains 156 pages of rich, detailed information. In conclusion, he said that he feels that Yale has failed to provide information necessary for serious shared governance, and his committee will discuss how to proceed and report back to the faculty on how poorly Yale compares to other universities in providing budget information.

William Rankin asked if Mr. Nordhaus feels that the Yale report is the answer to the budget committee's questions that they posed last year.

Mr. Nordhaus responded that actually his committee has not received an answer, and that he found the Yale report independently of having it provided by the University. He said that the Stanford report will serve as a guide to what his committee would like to receive in the future.

Doug Rogers introduced Ms. Greenwood to lead the discussion on approving the make-up of the members of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status, Pay and Conditions of Non-Ladder Faculty. Ms. Greenwood noted that this committee was approved at the October 13, 2016 FASS meeting, that she and Shiri Goren are its co-chairs and that Ruth Koizim and Charles Schmuttenmaer also serve on the committee. When the committee was established, there had been a discussion about including non-senators on this committee because there is very little representation of non-ladder faculty on the FASS, and because no lecturers in FAS currently serve on the FASS. It was felt that the committee needed wider representation from the non-ladder community, especially in the sciences and social sciences. With this said, the committee solicited nominations from senators in the sciences and from other colleagues and received a long list of nominations. The committee met on November 1, 2016 to review the list and came up with a short list of three - Rona Ramos, a lecturer in Physics, Johnathan Reuning-Scherer, a lecturer in Statistics, and Joseph Wolenski, a research scientist and lecturer in Biology. The committee provisionally asked each of them if they would serve should the FASS approve their nominations and all replied yes. She said that the names were vetted by the FASS Executive Committee (EC), which gave its approval, and asked if there were any questions. Beverly Gage noted that when the College Expansion Committee met, there was a question on the pay and expansion of the non-ladder faculty, and asked if there is any information on this. Ms. Koizim said that she has been informed that this expansion is happening, however no details have been provided. Dean Gendler said that John

Mangan and Robert Burger oversee the Teaching Resource Advisory Committee and interact with departments that make requests for additional teaching support. In anticipation for the arrival of additional students next year, Yale will need to hire additional instructors, so Mr. Mangan and Mr. Burger are working with departments on this effort. However, there is no special process in place. Ms. Gage asked if there is a sense of how many people will be hired and if these will be full-time lecturers' positions or if they will be parceled out to graduate students. Dean Gendler said that her office does not typically provide that detailed information, and she explained that her staff review needs department by department so the details are not available and probably will not be until September, 2017. Dean Gendler asked what specific information Ms. Gage wants to know and that she will be happy to provide it. Ms. Gage said that she would like to know approximately how many non-ladder faculty will be added to the number that we have and what kinds of positions they will be and if they are full-time benefit level positions. Mr. Rogers asked if there were further questions on the membership of the committee.

Charles Musser asked if there would be a member on this committee from Theater Studies. Ms. Greenwood responded that she received an e-mail from Daniel Harrison, acting chair of Theater Studies, who chaired a Yale College ad-hoc committee on the arts in 2012 for which he had gathered a lot of information on the position of non-ladder faculty in the creative/performing arts, and that he had offered to share this information with the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status, Pay and Conditions of Non-Ladder Faculty. Since the committee will be able to draw on information like this, and in the interests of keeping the committee relatively small and nimble, they had decided not to appoint an additional member to represent non-ladder faculty in the creative/performing arts. Ms. Greenwood added that this committee will also meet with, and consult with, other units in the University. Shiri Goren added that the plan is to consult with the Dean's office and with John Mangan about specific questions and that the committee will interview many non-ladder faculty in FAS so we plan to have as broad a picture as possible of the various kinds of teaching faculty that we have at Yale. Mr. Rogers asked if there were any other questions. There were none so he asked for a motion to accept the proposal to add three external members to the committee. Kathryn Lofton made a motion to accept the proposal. It was seconded by Mr. Rankin. A vote was taken to accept the list of external committee members (Rona Ramos, Johnathan Reuning-Scherer, and Joseph Wolenski) for the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status, Pay and Conditions of Non-Ladder Faculty, and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Rogers introduced a discussion on the Revised Recommendations for the Procedures for Selecting Divisional Deans and asked Ms. Greenwood to present on this topic. Ms. Greenwood said the initial report that was presented at the FASS meeting on October 13, 2016 was revised in light of feedback from the FAS Dean and that there were now two recommendations instead of five with much more flexibility built into them. She asked for questions or comments. Ms. Trumpener commented that there was a question at the last meeting on why it would be important to have an outline procedure when it seems that our peers have a highly articulated process on a shared governance path. She noted that questions arose because of the speed, rapidity and confusion in which administrative positions at Yale have been multiplying, sub-dividing, and proliferating, which has created faculty bewilderment and unease. And, she said, she has heard that there is enthusiasm about the sub-dividing of the decanal roles and that these people will be working closely with faculty who are pretty happy with who these individuals are. However, she noted that if this is going to be the structure going forward, from an administrative point of view faculty should have a say in the criteria for choosing appointees. She also noted that the FASS exists partly because of concerns about the process used in previous decanal appointments.

Mr. Bercovici asked if he could be reminded of what was removed from the document.

Ms. Greenwood explained that the revised document eliminates steps 3-5, which were thought to pose unrealistic constraints.

Ruth Koizim noted that in its reports, the FASS does not call for required action on the part of the administration, and the FASS is very careful to make recommendations with the understanding that, in most cases, this is the most the FASS can do. She said that to be told that FASS recommendations are inappropriate and too detailed, when the administration is free to respond to them in any way that they want, is somewhat puzzling to her. Ms. Koizim then posed the question of why the FASS as a body is not allowed to make recommendations as detailed and as stringent it feels appropriate, since the FASS cannot force the administration to act on them.

Ms. Greenwood said that the EC has been having discussions with the FAS Dean and the President during the course of the semester about a two-way process of collaboration, and the FAS Dean and the President have said that sometimes the FASS asks or expects things that are hard for them to comply with and puts them in a very difficult position. And, Ms. Greenwood said, that in this particular case, especially after hearing Dean Gendler's comments at the last FASS meeting, the EC felt it was important to take those comments into account and issue a new set of recommendations.

Mr. Rogers asked if Dean Gendler had additional comments. Dean Gendler said that she appreciated the way in which this conversation had proceeded, and her understanding of the flexibility in the current version of the recommendations is that it is in part a recognition that a certain degree of flexibility is the best way to ensure achieving the shared goals that all of us have: to be able to identify people who are best able to carry out the responsibilities associated with decanal positions. She noted that she is most appreciative of this set of recommendations and that she feels she can work with it. Dean Gendler noted, however, that she does not like documents like this one because, in general, she likes to operate in a communicative, non-legalistic mode, and the document, though its content reflects everything that she plans to do, takes the form of a genre that she finds problematic. She emphasized that this is just her own feeling and recognized that others may disagree. Ms. Goren noted that there is a need for a process to be put in place for the future when Dean Gendler is no longer dean.

Ms. Campbell saluted all the participants in this two-way collaboration and said that this is a model for the kind of work that the FASS ought to do. She commented on Ms. Trumpener's comments and Dean Gendler's remark that she does not like bureaucratic documents, pointing out that the experience of FAS faculty is ongoing with recent and distant cases of policy recommendations and decisions that should have involved consultation and did not. She said that she is pleased to hear that Dean Gendler believes in talking with people who will be affected and who know about a situation, and hopes that this will be the case going forward. Ms. Campbell noted that, in the case of the graduate student size issue, graduate students had not been included in the conversation and this is one reason the FASS took up the issue and made its recommendations. She went on to say that a document recommending a process of how to proceed in the future may seem too rigid in detail, but that the context for this detail is a lack of faith that consultation will happen and that FAS faculty want provisions on paper that will ensure the process of consultation on important matters that affect FAS faculty and students.

Mr. Rankin commented that it is important to see the role of the FASS as both having a relationship with the Dean's office, for which this kind of document may seem too structured, and with the FAS faculty, for which the FASS has ways of communicating its work to the FAS faculty, and so this document has these two audiences.

Mr. Rogers asked for a vote to accept the FASS's Revised Recommendations for the Procedures for

Selecting Divisional Deans. Mr. Minsky moved to vote on this document, Ms. Gage seconded the motion, the vote was taken and it was unanimous to accept the FASS's Revised Recommendations for the Procedures for Selecting Divisional Deans.

It is noted that Ms. Greenwood and Christina Kraus left the FASS meeting at this time, due to a prior commitment, and Mr. Rogers took over as chair for the rest of the FASS meeting.

Mr. Rogers introduced Ms. Lofton to present an update on the work of the provostial Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Conduct and Standards. Ms. Lofton noted that as a result of the FASS's Report on the Faculty Conduct and Standards that was issued last year, a new committee was formed by the Provost – the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Conduct and Standards that she is chairing. She noted that there will be a draft report from this committee in February or March of 2017. Ms. Lofton distributed draft documents on sample vignettes of possible faculty misconduct that the committee will be working on and asked that FASS members review the content and offer any comments and/or suggestions they may have. Ms. Lofton noted that she is pleased with the committee and its membership (Kathryn Lofton, Chair, FAS; Theodore Cohen, School of Public Health; Bryan Garsten, FAS; Sohrab Ismail-Beigi, FAS; Patrick Kennedy, School of Medicine; Edieal Pinker, School of Management; Robert Post, Law; Nancy Reynolds, School of Nursing; Karen Seto, School of Forestry & Environmental Studies). She noted that the Provost has given this committee wide latitude and solicited the committee's own reflections on what would be workable on a University-wide level. Ms. Gage asked if these vignettes were actual examples of things that happened. Ms. Lofton said that they are things that have happened, however they have been anonymized so that they would be difficult to trace back to the actual situation. Ms. Lofton asked for a conversation on how to manage situations that are challenging that are brought to our leaders, and especially chairs and deans, and a discussion about how to respond to these issues. She hopes that this committee will use at least two of these examples in their February/March report in order to encourage a transparent conversation and said that, although some might say it would be better to offer a statistical list of the frequency of these types of events, showing what has transpired is a way that helps demonstrate the difficulty in recording these events and the difficulty of the events themselves. She would like conversations on what the issues are, how we are currently handling them, and suggestions about how to respond appropriately to these types of issues. She noted that this committee is putting together a report on the types of issues that have taken place, and is looking into how peer schools are handling similar issues. The committee hopes to record existing policies in a way that differs from the way the current standards list them (by linking them back to other things that are in the faculty handbook). The committee's current intention is to summarize existing principles and the current procedures on misconduct, and then to propose revisions and new approaches to handling very serious issues. She noted that the committee needs to have a lot more information in order to do its work and they are looking at other schools, considering a broad range of incidents, and having conversations with various groups throughout the university. In doing its work, the committee is equally mindful of difficult, delicate politics of interaction and not just policies and procedures. Ms. Lofton asked for comments.

Ms. Trumpener asked if there will be some training sessions for chairs and deans where these types of scenarios will be discussed, noting that especially older faculty do not have the vocabulary in their minds for these types of issues. Also, she asked, is there a plan to share these scenarios in departments as talking points to bring these kinds of issues to their attention?

Ms. Gage remarked that this way of beginning the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Conduct and Standards charge sounds transformative – the idea that there is going to be a report that will lay out the logic for the conclusions that it comes up with, produce a public record of the issues these standards are

supposed to address, and will draw broadly on conversations on campus is great news, and different from what was presented last year. She suggested that the committee make as much of this narrative part of the report as possible, and asked if there was a way to create a public, on-going record of what is unfolding. The more information people have, the more people can see the challenges that are presented.

Ms. Lofton commented that Dean Gendler is for the first time organizing chairs' training. Responding to Ms. Trumpener's question, she said that she has requested time at the chairs' meeting in January or February to present these vignettes and ask chairs if they would agree to take these vignettes to their departments at their faculty meetings and begin a conversation on situations in which people do not always see both sides. She also responded to Ms. Gage's comments, noting that the committee does not want to be linked to the previous standards and procedures documents, and that this committee may radically alter the previous list of conduct and standards. She also said that the committee is considering asking for anonymous comments from faculty on the kinds of situations relative to this document that they may have experienced, and welcomes feedback from the FASS on whether this would pose a new set of difficulties. The committee may share a draft of the message it will send out to faculty with the FASS members to ask for feedback on its wording.

Mr. Nordhaus asked for clarification of the things that are intersections of voids in existing rules and regulations and business practices and so on, and if they will be combined or worked on separately. Ms. Lofton commented that it is evident to her new committee that the conduct and standards as presented last year was formulated too quickly and this committee is not certain how they will handle the procedures list. However, they will, in some form, propose a set of procedures that relate to the standards when the report is completed. Mr. Nordhaus asked Ms. Lofton about the FASS and how and at what point it could help, and asked that perhaps she could comment on the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Conduct and Standards. Ms. Lofton said that by the beginning of March, the committee will have a document to be circulated to a broader community, including the FASS, asking for comments. In advance of this report, she said, she is planning to contact members of the FASS committee for their input on the process. Mr. Rankin said that he found the Sexual Harassment Training helpful and pointed out that before this type of training that included vignettes of hostile work environment issues, such a concept of a hostile work environment did not exist in any kind of legally, enforceable framework. He would like to see a historical framing of these types of issues, and Ms. Lofton agreed. Steven Stearns commented that he was present at a meeting where Ms. Lofton talked about these matters with members of the graduate student assembly, so he pointed out that these kinds of conversations are going on and there will be input from the graduate student assembly on these issues. He also pointed out that the abusers don't often know that they are abusing, and the abusees don't often know that they are being abused, which speaks to the depth in which this problem is embedded in our culture and this is where vignettes can really help and where education can help, so it is a matter of cultural change as well as developing procedures. Ms. Goren urged Ms. Lofton to consider non-ladder faculty as another constituency because of the different ranks that may make them more vulnerable. Ms. Lofton responded that she found it difficult to write vignettes regarding this constituency because it was difficult to anonymize them. However, the committee is working on trying to compose a vignette on a non-ladder faculty case.

Mr. Rogers presented a document containing proposed revisions to the FASS By-Laws and asked Mr. Nordhaus (in the absence of committee chair Vesla Weaver) to address the section on elections and nominations. Mr. Nordhaus noted that change 4-a splits the Elections and Nominations Committee into two separate committees and explained that the task of the Elections Committee is quite a different task

than the Nominations Committee - the Nominations Committee looks at the FAS for nominations for the FASS, and the Elections Committee, a more technical committee, makes sure that the mechanics of the elections work well. He said this change is relatively uncontroversial. However, he pointed to another change that was more complicated - the section on the composition of the FASS Executive Council (EC), section 7, paragraph 2. He noted that there were a number of different possibilities and that, in this proposal, the committee recommended that the EC have six members who are tenured - two from each division - and one who is non-tenured (non-ladder). The other change was the voting for the FASS leadership, which will be on an annual basis in late spring or early summer. There was a question on who the voters will be. He said it is clear who the hold-over senators will be, and the committee thought that the new senators should become electors and not the out-going senators. Mr. Rogers asked Mr. Nordhaus to speak to the change on page 4, lines 22 through 26, which reduces the length of terms on the EC. Mr. Nordhaus said that the original By-Laws have term limits on senators to three consecutive two-year terms and in original by-laws, the EC was also term-limited to three consecutive two-year terms. He said that the recommendation was that the FASS move from two-year terms for the EC to one-year terms, up to a total of four consecutive one-year terms for EC members. Mr. Rogers asked for questions and comments on the set of changes regarding the changes in the elections and nominations parts of the By-Laws. Mr. Schmuttenmaer was glad to see that there was a discussion on who will be allowed to vote, noting that there are good arguments for doing it where everyone gets to vote, even the outgoing senators, versus only the ones who will be serving in the upcoming year. He said that he received a message from an election expert who said if you have more people voting, it may be helpful and also said that outgoing senators have more experience from serving on the FASS and therefore their vote may be more valuable. He noted that Mr. Nordhaus stated that one of the reasons for the change is that other legislative bodies do it, and Mr. Schmuttenmaer asked why they do it this way. Mr. Nordhaus responded that the logic can go in many different ways, however he noted that the problem with the last election was that there were too many constraints, and now that the process of voting is simplified, we are no longer over-constrained. Mr. Nordhaus agreed with Mr. Schmuttenmaer that having outgoing senators vote because they know the people is right, and another consideration was to have all three groups vote – the outgoing, the incoming and the ones serving for another term. Mr. Nordhaus said that, to him, the logic was to have people voting for the EC who are the people that the EC will be working with throughout that year, and they should be the ones to select their leadership. Ms. Gage talked about the EC having 6 tenured people and one non-tenured, which, she said makes sense to her, however she wonders what the logic is of stating that there will be 6 tenured people and only one non-tenured person. Mr. Nordhaus said that the original EC was structured to have at least five tenured members, and this model seemed to come closest to the original make-up of the EC, with fewer practical constraints than the others we considered. Mr. Rankin spoke on the question of who would be voting, noting that if there are people up for election each year, not all of the members of the FASS are being replaced and so that the expertise in question will be that of experience. He then spoke to Ms. Gage's point and said that he feels that the current proposal does a good job of disaggregating the roles of each person on the EC so that an untenured person is not simultaneously representing their division and their rank. Ms. Gage then said that the current language specifies that a senator can only serve three consecutive terms, but it is unclear if one pauses for one year, can one come back and serve another three consecutive terms. Mr. Nordhaus said that it is possible for one to return after a period of not serving and to be elected again. Ms. Goren asked what if two non-tenured people get more votes than a tenured person. Mr. Nordhaus explained that the proposed procedure would count votes using four "piles" of votes, selecting EC members from three tenured piles (one for each division), and then one non-tenured EC member from a separate pile of votes. Mr. Rogers asked if there were any other questions on the changes to the elections part of the By-Laws. There were none. He asked if there were any questions pertaining to other changes in the By-

Laws. Ms. Trumpener asked if there could be a provision for not requiring senators to serve on sub-committees during their leave time, and also if the By-Laws need to specify that people who are on medical leave do not have to serve during this time. Ms. Trumpener also asked why teaching relief for childcare is not called a leave. Mr. Rankin noted that teaching relief for childcare is not a leave and doesn't count against various things, however there is also a debate about what then is expected if you have this relief for childcare, and there is disagreement among the schools on how this is to be interpreted. Mr. Rogers said that the EC is responsive to senators' requests and if a senator does not want to serve on a sub-committee during their leave, the senator should state this to the EC. Ms. Trumpener said it would be nice to accept this as the culture. Mr. Rogers said that it is already acceptable to put in a request and expect to have it granted and feels it does not have to be put into the By-Laws. Ms. Trumpener was asked to propose an amendment. Dean Gendler asked a question about the description of the Faculty Advancement Committee and what it means when it says that it concerns itself with hiring targets and resources, support for research and teaching programs, and support for living and working conditions for all faculty, and what the conception of the mandate of that sub-committee is. Mr. Minsky said that the committee is interested in any matters that have a bearing on the excellence and strength of the faculty. Dean Gendler said that it seems to her that there is a Faculty Resource Committee that is already taking care of this area, and questions for support for research and teaching programs is also done by the Faculty Resource Committee. Mr. Minsky said there is a difference between a committee of the FASS and something like the Faculty Resource Committee which is plugged into the administration. Dean Gendler asked in what way the Faculty Advancement Committee will concern itself with hiring targets and resources, support for research and teaching programs, and support for living and working conditions for all faculty. Mr. Minsky responded that it will help the FASS form a stance on these questions. He noted that the FASS is an advisory and advocating body. Dean Gendler said that the way in which the sentence she is questioning is written, it sounds to her like the Faculty Advancement Committee is going to address an area that is already being addressed by the Faculty Resource Committee. Mr. Rogers asked that Ms. Trumpener propose language to the EC to address the medical leave issue, that Mr. Minsky revisit the language of the description of Faculty Advancement Committee so that it will not be misread, and that the FASS move to another portion of the meeting as soon as possible. Karen Wynn said that the Faculty Advancement Committee is working at a broader level and focusing on trends, and is not being specific about initiatives of the university. Mr. Rogers said that the Faculty Advancement Committee will come back with a better description of its charge, and he asked if there were any other questions about the By-Laws. There were no questions. Mr. Rogers asked for a motion to vote on the changes to the By-Laws with the understanding that there will be an amendment written by Ms. Trumpener on the medical leave issue and that there will be new language describing the charge of the Faculty Advancement Committee. Mr. Nordhaus made a motion to approve the By-Laws as amended with the understanding that the FASS will come back to the two issues of the language in the description of the Faculty Advancement Committee and possibly an amendment to the medical leave portion, both to be reviewed by the EC and to be brought up for approval at the next FASS meeting. Ms. Trumpener seconded the motion. A vote was taken and it was unanimous to accept the By-Laws as written with the exception of the language in the description of the Faculty Advancement Committee and a potential amendment on the medical leave to be written by Ms. Trumpener, with both to be presented for approval at the next FASS meeting.

Mr. Bercovici was introduced to talk about President Salovey's messages regarding the results of the election that occurred on Tuesday. He said that Yale as an institution should be doing something instead of going about business as usual. He said that one political issue which he feels compelled to look at is the deep divisions that were exposed during this campaign, and that Yale, as one of the leading institutions in the country, should start a conversation towards doing something constructive. He said he

wondered if Yale could have been doing something different to change the horrible divisions that were exposed by this election, and what can be done in the future to address these divisions. He asked what Yale can be doing in the case of public education and looked at New Haven Promise that was started by then President Richard Levin in 2010 to provide scholarships for New Haven city school children for college, and suggested this type of initiative could be expanded to have some impact. He said that the Yale community has things to do to protect intellectual freedom and that we know that research is going to be affected horribly in the next administration. What are the things that Yale can be doing that are outward looking? Matt Jacobson remarked that this is something that educators across the country have to be soul-searching about because many things were thrown into a bonfire Tuesday night and they are things that we do – science, empirical investigation, expertise of all sorts, things that an institution like Yale is invested in that just got torched. This has been coming for some time, he noted, and it is reaching a crisis point for the whole enterprise of education. He said that we have to think about how half of our compatriots think that all we do is produce elites and make things up. He thinks that we are now being called upon to think about how we present ourselves to the wider world and make ourselves more useful to them. Mr. Rogers said that in our FASS leadership roles, one of the things that senators may likely see is the formation of different kinds of coalitions across the campus to deal with these issues and a new kind of campus politics. And, he said, to the extent the FASS is one of the bodies that can put in the same room people from all over the university and bring people together that might not otherwise be speaking to each other, we should aim to do this, and to collaborate with the FAS Dean's office. And, he said, if Senators or other faculty are working on these kinds of issues, he hopes that Ms. Greenwood, and the EC are informed so that they can coordinate with other schools and other initiatives that are going on, whether or not these initiatives involve formal FASS action. Ms. Trumpener said that her way of regrouping is to think that a full 50% of the population did not vote for the incumbent and so that half the people in this country actively want to live in a diverse, democratically supported society, and we do not know the motivations of the other half, so what we are going to have to do is protect the values that we know are going to be torched. Another thought was that we are in a blue state, a blue region, and it would be great if we went the extra distance now to try to demonstrate what a civil society means here.

Mr. Rogers thanked the speakers and asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Nordhaus made a motion to adjourn, Mark Mooseker seconded the motion, and the meeting was adjourned at 6:05 PM.