

FAS Senate

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

FAS Senate

Minutes

Thursday February 8, 2018, HGS 211

APPROVED

In attendance:

Senators: Chair Matthew Jacobson, Deputy Chair Karen Wynn, Sybil Alexandrov, Marijeta Bozovic, Alexandre Debs, Maria Doerfler, Emily Erikson, Beverly Gage, John Geanakoplos, Shiri Goren, Emily Greenwood, Brad Inwood, Jennifer Klein, Ruth Koizim, Maureen Long, Rajit Manohar, Reina Maruyama, Mark Mooseker, Charles Schmuttenmaer, Ian Shapiro, Mark Solomon

Guests: Dean Tamar Gendler and other guests

Absent: William Nordhaus, Rose Rita Riccitelli

Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FASS) Chair Matthew Jacobson called the meeting to order and noted that Rose Rita Riccitelli, the FASS Program Coordinator, is still on limited duties and he hopes she will be able to work her normal schedule soon. He noted that FASS Deputy Chair Karen Wynn is recording today's meeting and that there is no one to take notes and he asked for volunteers. Emily Erikson volunteered to be the note taker.

Mr. Jacobson noted that at the January 30, 2018 meeting of FAS faculty, those present voted in favor of revising Faculty Standards and Procedures (vote was 32/0/1) and noted that the FAS Faculty was well-represented at the various forums presented both on line and in person during the two-year process that culminated with the January 30, 2018 meeting and vote. He thanked Ms. Wynn and her committee for their work. Ms. Wynn thanked her committee.

Mr. Jacobson noted that at the December 14, 2017 FASS meeting, Michael Denning spoke about his interaction with Bruce Alexander about having a real university book store in New Haven. Mr. Jacobson said that Mr. Denning is happy to continue to work on this project and would like volunteers from faculty and the FASS to work with him on the project. Rajit Manohar, Ms. Wynn and Jennifer Klein volunteered to work on this project.

Mr. Jacobson noted that the Town Hall working group has met, and April 10, 2018 is the date for the Town Hall meeting that will focus on gender equity, harassment, campus climate, and bystander culture. Mr. Jacobson said that he and Emily Greenwood are meeting with Claire Bower to discuss the meeting, and the planned format will be a hybrid one between a panel of expert's model, and dramatized situations followed by discussions and comments from the audience and others who will be strategically located throughout the audience and offer commentary from legal, psychological, feminist, institutional and

political perspectives. He said that there will be comments from their angle of vision on what is presented in the vignettes, and what the range of options are for the bystanders, what their responsibilities are and how might they behave. He noted that the planning committee is still open for suggestions.

Jennifer Klein asked how vignettes will be selected.

Mr. Jacobson said the vignettes will be drawn from an existing canon and considered in more detail by the committee.

Mr. Jacobson said that he and Mark Mooseker participated in a meeting about the library, and Mr. Mooseker reported that this was a strange meeting with the main presentation by cultural anthropologist and there is not a sense that there is much freedom in terms of determining what is going to happen to the collections.

Mr. Jacobson said that he was happy to hear that there will be another opportunity of open comments in the spring for faculty and other interested parties to weigh in before the study is complete. He noted that it is dispiriting to hear that data shows undergraduates do not use books and the conversation seems to be about where to put the books rather than about getting undergraduates to use books. Mr. Mooseker noted that the attendance at the meeting was very small and he feels that the FASS should encourage faculty and all who care about books to become involved in the input on this issue.

Ruth Koizim asked if there was any data on the use of library session.

Ms. Klein said that she attended a session and felt was over-controlled by the use of exercises, and where faculty suggested that students should be trained in using the library as a serious intellectual space, and subsequently several faculty met with Yale College Dean Chung about the importance of training students to use the library because students are not trained to use library.

Mr. Jacobson suggested the FASS create a list of concerns, and on being vigilant about when to comment, and thinking about how students should orient themselves to books more broadly and what components should be brought into the conversation. He said that the University is going to update the library and it will be helpful if the FAS faculty can pitch an idea about how to make the collections meaningful to today's students. He noted that when the Bass Library collections were reduced a few years ago, it made the Bass Library outdated, and that the FASS could work on a suggestion that would bring that library up-to-date for students.

Ms. Klein noted that the news of the reduction of the Bass Library collections came to the faculty late in the process and so faculty did not have any input and given that the Bass library is integral to our teaching, we would like to be part of the process before any further decisions are made.

Mr. Jacobson and Mr. Mooseker said that they will continue to stay vigilant and encouraged all to think of suggestions we want to make.

Ms. Koizim said that when anyone hears that there is a meeting, we can use the FASS list to distribute this information among faculty.

Emily Greenwood suggested that the FASS Executive Council include an agenda item on the Library in their meetings with the Provost to signal that it is an important issue for FAS Faculty.

John Geanakoplos noted that the Cowles Foundation, which is part of the Department of Economics, was keeping the personal libraries of the faculty, which amassed a collection of amazing books for faculty and

students to access. Unfortunately, he said, this library was closed and its collections have been shipped to “who knows where?”

Mr. Jacobson presented the minutes from the January 18, 2018 FASS meeting for approval with the provision that if there are any edits not noted now, that they can be sent to him within the next week and they will be so noted. He then asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the January 18, 2018 FASS meeting “provisionally” with the understanding that any edits will be accepted and noted for the next week. There was a motion from the floor to approve the minutes provisionally and it was seconded, and the minutes from the January 18, 2018 FASS meeting were provisionally approved.

Emily Erikson said that the Nominations Committee will send out a blanket e-mail to the entire FAS faculty with a list of all persons who are eligible to be nominated and also who are eligible to vote. One issue arose about secondary appointments to FAS. Ms. Erikson said it is clear that primary appointments and dual and joint appointments are eligible. However, she noted, Jay Emerson who ran the process last year, remembers that secondary appointees were not included in the list of eligible voters or nominees last year. Ms. Erikson reviewed the FASS By-laws and did not see anywhere in the FASS By-laws mention of excluding secondary appointees and therefore would like to have them included as eligible for this year. Ms. Koizim asked for the definition of a secondary appointment. Ms. Greenwood explained that when a primary appointment is in a school, that person can have a secondary appointment in the FAS. FAS Dean Tamar Gendler noted that these appointments are issued with different degrees of care, and many faculty who have secondary appointments as part of their roles, were not vetted with the care that she assumes that this body (FASS) would like in determining whose voice they would want to bring to this FASS community. Ms. Greenwood further explained that last year some secondary appointees were included and some were not depending on the information the committee received from their chairs regarding if the appointee had exhibited an active role in FAS or not. She said it was a laborious process and, in the end, was not an even process for all considerations. Ms. Erikson suggested that this area be defined and added to the FASS By-laws. She said that the committee can take out the secondary appointments for this round before the information goes out, which will produce a much smaller pool of candidates for the nominations process. Mr. Jacobson asked if it might be the case that this population of faculty, if they were included at the point of the nominations process, that out of 200, only one or two would actually be nominated, and does this matter? Ms. Erikson noted that either way, we are going to have to make a decision on whether to include this group or not. Mr. Jacobson noted that what he is hearing is to exclude them in principle but weed them out in the nominations process and then revisit the issue and get it put into the By-laws and begin clean next year with a rule that is consistent. Ms. Koizim said that it her understanding that full-time faculty with their primary appointment in FAS are eligible, and with all due respect to our colleagues who serve primarily in administrative capacities with courtesy appointments as faculty - that is not the purpose of the FASS. She noted that the purpose of the FASS is based on representing people who are faculty. Ms. Greenwood noted that this is in the By-laws and that you cannot be nominated but you can vote. Ms. Wynn noted we are only going to have people from the professional schools if the faculty who are eligible to vote, vote for them in greater numbers than for other eligible candidates. So, she asked, who is the pool who are eligible to vote? It seems to her that this is where we want to pay most attention because if everyone who is voting has in mind the stake that we want to have of whomever they think is the most appealing of the ones who are willing to stand and be considered, do we want to constrain our hands in advance? She said she does not see us wanting to vote for someone who is off in a different school and not participating heavily in FAS. Ms. Greenwood pointed out that there still remain some ambiguities and that one is regarding faculty who are on phased retirement and no longer

considered full-time faculty, and she wonders if this constituency is eligible to vote and eligible to be nominated. Mr. Jacobson said that knowing that there are ambiguities and that whatever we say is going to be imperfect in some manner, proposed that we exclude the population that was discussed for this cycle and revisit the By-laws and come up with a more stable, consistent and workable definition that we can all live with, and taking the imperfection of this cycle on the good faith that we are going to deal with the problem before the next round of elections. Mr. Jacobson received positive acceptance from the group and he asked for any other updates from this committee. Ms. Erikson asked for suggestions on the wording of the letter that will be sent out listing the nominations and said she will send a copy of this draft letter to Mr. Jacobson who will in turn send it to FASS members for their review and comments. Mr.

Schmittenmaer said that he hopes that since we are getting started early with the nomination process, that there will be more nominations from the FAS faculty (5 people have to nominate a person for them to be put on the ballot). He feels that the chance of someone who does not have a primary appointment receiving 5 nominations is small so we do not have to worry about this detail, but at the same time he feels it needs to be put into the By-laws. Mr. Schmittenmaer encouraged people to talk with their colleagues and encourage them to run for the FASS. Ms. Erikson said that building the pool of candidates will hopefully be completed by February 23, 2018. Mr. Geanakoplos said he feels it is crucial to get current senators to run again.

Mr. Jacobson asked Ms. Greenwood to report on the Diversity Committee and there was no report from this Committee.

Mr. Jacobson asked Ms. Goren for a report on the Instructional Faculty Committee and there was no report from this committee.

Mr. Jacobson asked Ms. Koizim to report on the College Expansion Committee. Ms. Koizim said the committee tried following up on issues of oversubscription to some classes, and where classes that were in HGS are going to be held and has not received any information.

Mr. Jacobson asked Ian Shapiro for an update from the Faculty Advancement Committee. Mr. Shapiro said there is the issue of Yale falling behind their peer institutions in faculty salaries, and at the suggestion of William Nordhaus, Mr. Shapiro met with Tony Smith, and Mr. Smith suggested that the FASS not act without coordinating with him because there are still issues with refining the data. Also, Mr. Shapiro noted that in addition to the faculty survey, the committee interviewed department chairs and that their responses revealed a similar story to the ones that came out on the survey. Brad Inwood talked about his experience as a member of CESOF (Committee on the Economic Status of Faculty) and that the committee is still looking at, refining, validating data and integrating the information with other sources of data (that are not publishable), and he believes that this will produce powerful information that will validate what has already been seen. Mr. Schmittenmaer said that he was on CESOF a number of years ago and he does not believe that the committee's recommendations were (taken seriously) and acted on. His experience was that the committee was thanked by the administration for their hard work, however there was no actions taken on their recommendations. Mr. Inwood said that the current committee is working on items that can be actionable, and that they will work with the administration to see that these items are acted on. He also noted that we now have the FASS working with us towards this goal.

Mr. Jacobson asked Maria Doerfler and John Geanakoplos to report on the survey that was created by the members of the Faculty Advancement Committee and that was sent to all FAS faculty. Mr. Geanakoplos noted that the survey process closed a week ago and that the committee now has access to 579 responses,

some of which were blank, so that we have 400 genuine responses to look at. He noted that the committee has begun to review these responses, however they are not ready to present summary. He shared that one striking revelation was that 70% of the faculty do not believe that their department is in the top 5. He also said that there is a consensus that there are too many administrators at Yale, and the numbers have grown too much. He was surprised to see that FASTAP (Faculty of Arts and Sciences Tenure and Appointments Policy), which are the new rules on how to do tenure, has made the process clearer to most faculty, when Mr. Geanakoplos thought it made it more confusing. He said that the overall feeling is that FASTAP has made the tenure process easier than before. Maria Doerfler noted that the committee found that we have very different constituencies among the people being surveyed and that the data looks different for faculty who are on the tenure-track than for faculty who are already tenured, and the committee will look at the differences in constituencies, including non-ladder faculty and teaching faculty. Mr. Geanakoplos noted that this information is a preliminary glance of what has been reported. One thing that he said was interesting was that over 50% of faculty feel that they do not understand undergraduate admissions and feel that faculty should play a larger role in setting the priorities for undergraduate admissions. He noted that there have been several times in Yale's history where admissions completely changed – from the 50's when they were not so merit-based, and then they became extremely merit-based, and now we are going through a process where the admissions committee, with very little input from faculty, is doing some social engineering and some major engineering (bias more towards sciences) and these are important changes where the faculty should have a weigh-in – especially with the changing majors. He also noted that there is some irritation and confusion about how the administration is going to improve excellence, and Faculty feel they are not being heard on this issue. He said that many people complained that departments did not have funds to invite outside speakers or have lunches or teas for the faculty – things that would improve departments without spending too much money. He said the committee is dividing the problems into various categories and assign people on the committee to look at the categories and proceed to refine the work that we do. For example, he said, one category is faculty perception of rank and trend of departments, another faculty impressions of recruitment and retentions. Mr. Geanakoplos noted that although many faculty commented that they appreciated the survey and appreciated the opportunity to share their thoughts on the various parts of the survey, many faculty contested the use of the word “excellence” saying that they did not know what it meant and were weary of hearing this word being used. He asked the FASS if they had any questions or had areas that they would like the committee to address from the responses received. Ms. Goren asked if there were any other observations on major issues of concern that the committee would like to share. Mr. Inwood said that admissions was an important issue and there was also a strong sense that the reason one would choose to come to Yale is quality of undergraduates. Ms. Doerfler noted that spousal considerations weigh enormously across the board in terms of retention right alongside the quality of undergraduates., and many faculty reported that they turned down external offers because of Yale's spousal considerations or that they did not want to move their families. Also, she said, transportation was a problem, especially between New York city and New Haven, and there have been requests for a shuttle between Yale and the Yale Club in NYC. She also said that there was quite a number of faculty who love living in New Haven. Marijeta Bozovic said that there was a good number of faculty who responded to the question of what they would do if they had a large number of funds/resources available and who answered that they would hire more faculty, and Mr. Geanakoplos said that specifically, the answers were to hire more junior faculty. Jennifer Klein noted that the issues around the academic leave policies came up several times. Ms. Doerfler said that the issue of academic leave was significant because of its importance of freeing up teaching time for faculty so they can focus on research.

Mr. Jacobson moved to the topic of the chair's survey and pointed out that many of the same issues that appeared in the faculty survey came up in the chair's survey. He distributed a copy of the survey that was sent to chairs, which served as a companion survey to the faculty survey and to the one that the Budget Committee has done. The survey, he said, was an e-mail that he sent out to chairs asking them to describe any hindrances and obstacles that they felt hindered their core mission as a partner for their program. The responses, he said, are not scientific, rather they give an interesting narrative contoured to the kinds of challenges that chairs are finding, and he broke it down by division, by small department/big department, etc. The version, he noted, he has distributed, is a summary and is broken down by the most common things that were mentioned, and at some point, he will offer a version that will append the actual commentary that people sent. He noted that this survey points to things that have already been mentioned that were reported on in the larger faculty survey and said that we do not want to take the data and turn it into a big "gripe session," nor do we want to look at it and say that these are things that are too big to be changed. He said many of the things that come up, like the size of the faculty, are things that will require a lot of study and thought and are long-term things and structural things – FASTAP was a long-term, structural thing and the University got it done, so we should not turn away from something just because it seems too big. He then asked for comments from the FASS. Mr. Shapiro noted that so many of the issues discussed have been here for so long – the quality of life issues, spousal and travel issues – and he has been involved in trying to resolve these issues over many years. He said administrations come and go and nothing gets addressed and resolved. He said that he stopped being a department chair in 1999 and noted that at that time, it was still possible to be a department chair and still do your teaching and research, and it is his feeling that the University should be run by people who are actively involved in teaching and research. However, he said, in today's atmosphere being the chair of a substantial department at Yale has become a full-time occupation and the person will lose six years of their active teaching and research life doing administrative work, and Yale will lose out because it will not have the benefit of the expertise that the person was originally hired for. Ms. Koizim commented that when she looks at the diversity in the dean's office, it means that these individuals are out of active contact with students and research streams and this precludes them from mentoring doing research and teaching, which are areas that they were hired for. Mr. Jacobson said that the most predictable comment is the number of people who said that we need more faculty, and what is interesting when answering why – there were about 20 different reasons – sometimes it is curricular, sometimes it is staffing the various officerships of the department, and other various things mentioned were people feeling the burdens of too small a faculty base. Mr. Inwood said that he was struck by responses at departmental level and of the lack of discretionary tools that make it difficult to track and allocate services in a way that is fair. He noted that CESOF is trying to get a handle on these issues, however there is not much data and they are trying to collect data but it is difficult to get the level of service information at FAS or at the department level. Beverly Gage said that we don't want this to be a long list of gripes and complaints and if we want the results of the survey to be taken seriously, we need to think about creating a list of actionable points and recommendations that address the important issues that came out of the survey. Mr. Jacobson noted that the thing that he hears from people who have recently come to Yale is that they love the students and they are happy to be here, but that they are working harder than they have ever worked in their life – across the board with junior faculty, senior faculty, administrators – everyone at Yale is working harder than they have ever worked before – and Mr. Jacobson is trying to understand how this happened. Ms. Goren said that we all know that being a chair of a department is a full-time job, however there are some roles where instructional faculty can take a part helping to ease even 10% of the burden, and this will create for them a more active role in the department. Mr. Manohar said there are items of very low cost that can be

listed as such, and bigger items that can be identified as such, to make the list more organized and doable, especially for the lower cost items. Ms. Wynn said that she was struck when reading the area about university governance and that there seems to be a tone of low morale and underappreciation, and she wonders if this is a warning cry that things are really bad or is it people responding to a question of what is not perfect that is just them answering a question and is less frightening. Mr. Jacobson said there were people who responded and said things in their department were going really well, and there were others who were relieved to unburden themselves of their concerns. He said we received responses from roughly half of the chairs, and people were grateful for a chance to be heard, and that the frustrations and the burdens are real and come through in the prose of the responses. He said people are hopeful that things can be changed and people have stories to tell about things that they see as having gone quite awry – personnel issues, budget issues, people who used to have endowed funding in their department and no longer have it, and he said that the tone of low morale is really there. Ms. Doerfler asked if there is a sense among chairs if there are actionable items that can be addressed within departments and others that need help from outside. Mr. Jacobson said that some items are field specific and also what we may need is another survey or more discussions with chairs. Mr. Geanakoplos wants to see if we can find out why people feel that they are working harder than ever – perhaps we need another survey. Mr. Jacobson asked Mr. Shapiro to comment on what it was about his recent experience of hiring a junior faculty that took more time than previously. Mr. Shapiro said that when he was department chair, the department would agree on how many searches there would be and they would run them and the administration did not know who was on the search committee, who was on the short list, or how many people were brought to campus – they did not know anything until the end of the search. Now, he said, there are numerous details that need to be vetted outside of the department before one can proceed with a search. Before, he said, Chip Long would help him draft an offer letter and subsequently he would say to use the template that was used previously. Now, he said, when writing an offer letter, there are multiple back-and-forth drafts vetted through the General Counsel’s Office to avoid worst-case litigation. This, he said, has dragged down the system by worst-case situation, and if we cannot have active research faculty running departments, he feels that this is a huge problem. Ms. Greenwood said there seems to be an overload of paperwork that could be centralized and taken care of in a much more efficient manner and would relieve some of the pressure for chairs. Mr. Shapiro noted that the “donkey” work has been decentralized and the “important” work has been centralized, and this should be reversed. He pointed to the search he recently ran where his department wanted to interview 5 candidates instead of 4 and they had to negotiate with the administration to add one more candidate to the interviewees, and he questioned why this had to be, and said that this speaks to the accretion of paperwork that has been added to the search process. Ms. Greenwood agreed that the search process is not ideal, however there are problems on the departmental level that require oversight and this process needs to be done in a more agile way. Mr. Jacobson said that there are many things in our lives that are taking more steps to accomplish than they did before and it is not just associated with searches, so he asked the FASS to think about how we can take the information and translate it into recommendations, action items, items for further study, methods of study, and the Executive Council should think about this material for our meeting with the Provost, and the Budget Committee and the Faculty Advancement Committee should be thinking about it in how it relates to the survey and taking steps in a productive way. Ms. Gage asked if the FASS will have access to the Faculty Survey and Mr. Geanakoplos said that it can be done.

Mr. Jacobson noted that Edward Kamens raised his concern about the fate of the Yale College Faculty meeting and the fact that very few people now attend. Mr. Jacobson said the intention of creating the

FASS was not intended to implode other instances where faculty get together, however it appears that the FASS has made such an impact on the Yale Faculty Meetings and the question is, can we as a FASS help with this issue? Ms. Koizim noted that one of the reasons for Yale to have a senate was that when attending Yale Faculty Meetings, faculty felt that we were basically marionettes who were asked to raise their hands in approval of things that were already decided on without consulting us. She also noted that the reason we have a FASS is in part because there was not a lot of opportunity for discussion at the Yale Faculty Meetings. Mr. Mooseker suggested that the inclusion of a discussion on a topic of unsettled business of interest could increase attendance. Ms. Wynn asked if he meant inclusion of a topic before the outcome is determined, and he replied "yes." Ms. Gage commented that she does not think the poor attendance at Yale College Faculty Meetings is the result of the formation of the FASS however is why the FASS was created. She said that the FASS is in fact addressing this problem and she does not know if it needs another solution and is not sure what the concern is. Ms. Wynn noted that there are important things that come up that need to be voted on by the faculty and given that faculty are so busy and some are feeling a heavy burden of service as it is, to help weed out the issues that are of little importance to most faculty and encourage them to attend meetings that are dealing with important issues is something to consider. Ms. Gage agreed that the FASS could be part of mobilizing faculty when important issues do come up. Mr. Geanakoplos said that the purpose of the Yale College Faculty Meeting is to remind everyone that the University is run by the faculty. Mr. Jacobson said he likes the idea of putting more important items on the meeting's agenda that would encourage larger attendance. Ms. Greenwood suggested that the FASS suggest some issues that might be of concern to the faculty.

Mr. Jacobson adjourned the meeting.