

**FAS-SEAS Senate Meeting
Thursday, April 20, 2023
3:30 PM – 5:30 PM
HQ276 and Via Zoom**

**Minutes
APPROVED May 18, 2023**

Senators Present: Paul Van Tassel, Chair

Sybil Alexandrov, Jill Campbell, Oswaldo Chinchilla, Michael Fischer, Alessandro Gomez, Greta LaFleur, Valerie Horsley, Maria Piñango, Ruzica Piskac, Maria Kaliambou, Kathryn Slanski, Mark Solomon, Jason Stanley, Dara Strolovitch, Rebecca Toseland, Jing Yan

Staff: Rose Rita Riccitelli

Absent:

Elisa Celis (on leave), Gerald Jaynes, H el ene Landemore, Paul A. North, Larry Samuelson, Julia Titus, Meg Urry, Mimi Yiengpruksawan (on leave)

Guests (open session):

Pilar Asensio, James Berger, Jeff Brock, Richard Deming, Michael Farina, Marion Gehiker, Fadia Habchi, Miki Havlickova, Jennifer Klein, Timothy Kreiner, Elka Kristo-Nagy, Nakamura Kumiko, Ninghui Liang, Mary O'Brien, Lourdes Sab e, Constance Sherak, Lieselotte Sippel, Mari Stever, Camille Thomasson, Jessica Thompson, Karen von Kunes, Alan Weide, Orit Yeret,

Closed Session: 3:30 PM – 4 PM

Paul Van Tassel, chair of the FAS-SEAS Senate, began the closed session of the FAS-SEAS Senate meeting at 3:30 PM. He presented the minutes from the March 30, 2023 FAS-SEAS Senate meeting for review, comments, and edits. With none noted, a vote was taken to approve the minutes from the March 30, 2023 FAS-SEAS Senate meeting, and the minutes were unanimously approved.

Mr. Van Tassel talked about the upcoming election and said that we have a slate of confirmed candidates. He hoped to start the election today but we're a bit behind so it will start in one week on April 27th. **Michael Fischer** asked about election procedures and how candidates are chosen. Mr. Van Tassel said that nominations come in and the Elections Committee goes through the nominations and selects the slate based on how many nominations were received and then contacts the person to ask if they are willing to run. He noted that the Committee also keeps the number of candidates as a few number above that seats open. Mr. Fischer said he finds this unusual. **Valerie Horsley** commented that we need to consider changing the By-laws which say that a candidate needs 8 nominations before being put on the ballot, and it appears that this has not happened in the past few years – candidates have much fewer people nominating them than was happening in earlier elections. **Mr. Van Tassel** agreed and will have the Nominations Committee take up this suggestion next session.

Mr. Van Tassel talked about the FAS Dean **Tamar Gendler** and SEAS Dean **Jeff Brock** reappointments of their 5-year terms, both which are scheduled to take place next spring. He said there are two options for us as a Senate – one is to do nothing, and one is to request being involved in the process or recommend forming a committee and being part of that committee. **Alessandro Gomez** said at the very least we need to let **President Salovey** know that we are aware of these reappointments, and **Mr. Gomez** suggested that we further ask to be part of the process – perhaps appointing a special committee to review the details. **Michael Fischer** suggested having a questionnaire sent to faculty and have decision-maker/s use this as part of the process. **Mr. Gomez** suggested that we send a letter to **President Salovey** asking to be part of the process but not offer suggestions of how this should happen. **Ms. Horsley** said that we should ask what the process is and then, based on that information, decide how the Senate would like to be involved. **Mr. Van Tassel** will work on a letter and circulate it to senators for their suggestions. **Mr. Van Tassel** called on **Ms. Horsley** to talk about the Executive Council’s upcoming meeting with Faculty Liaisons of the Yale Board of Trustees. **Ms. Horsley** said that one topic we will discuss is faculty governance and making sure that faculty voice in major decisions is highlighted and encouraged. Also, we want to focus on budgetary items – salaries, etc. She asked for suggestions of any other items to bring up. **Mr. Solomon** mentioned that President Salovey’s term as President will be reaching its 10-year anniversary in 2023 and wonders if the Corporation is discussing his serving another term. **Rebecca Toseland** reported that after the Senate meeting featuring **Dean Lewis** and **Dr. Hoffman** on the topic of student mental health and the changing of demographics of our students, she has set up a meeting in May with them to further discuss what kind of training faculty need to deal with these issues. **Ms. Toseland** asked that anyone who wishes to join that meeting, to let her know. **Mr. Van Tassel** adjourned the closed session at 4 PM and began the open session.

Open Session:

Paul Van Tassel, Chair of the FAS-SEAS Senate, began the open session of the FAS-SEAS Senate meeting at 4 PM. He introduced Sybil Alexandrov, Co-chair of the Committee on Instructional Faculty and Academic Support to present an update of on the committee’s recent survey of instructional faculty sent in November/December 2022. **Ms. Alexandrov** explained that the update is information that will ultimately be in the committee’s report on the survey. Today she is presenting information and asking for feedback from the audience that will help the committee to complete the report.

Acknowledgment

Background: 2017 Report on the Status, Pay, and Condition of non-ladder faculty

Positive Changes

Survey 2022

Analysis

Recommendations

Report: Work in progress

Ms. Alexandrov listed the members of the Committee:

Sybil Alexandrov and Rebecca Toseland, Co-chairs

Miki Havlickova, Mathematics

Maria Kaliambou, Hellenic Studies
Brian Macdonald, Statistics and Data Science
Ethan Meyers, Statistics and Data Science
Greta LaFleur, American Studies
Kathryn Slanski, Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations
Julia Titus, Slavic Languages and Literatures
Robert Wooster, Statistics and Data Science

Ms. Alexandrov also acknowledged the assistance the committee received from:

- Micah English
- Jay Emerson
- Kathryn Lofton
- Jason Zentz
- Members of the FAS-SEAS Senate
- Members of the Instructional Faculty Working Group, FAS and Humanities Division
- Rose Rita Riccitelli

Ms. Alexandrov noted that there has been many positive changes since the 2017 Report:

-Change in title: From non-ladder faculty to instructional faculty (although non-ladder still remains)

-Across-the-board salary adjustments

-Increase to course rate minimums

For full-time, multi-year appointment:

-access to free lunches in the Yale Colleges

-laptops

-professional development opportunities (SAL2 and others)

-child-rearing leave

-childcare support

-short-term medical disability

For Senior Lecturer II and Senior Lecturer I & II:

-primary investigator (PI) status

For lecturers, Senior Lecturers I and II, and Senior Lectors II:

-a pilot phased retirement plan for certain term-limited faculty members

-expanded emeritus status

Ms. Alexandrov explained the Survey format and distribution:

-Qualtrics - 26 Questions

- Gender, Race, and Ethnicity Citizenship
- Track and rank
- Affiliation by division, department, and/or program
- Course load and additional responsibilities
- Salary and benefits
- Open-ended questions: pros, cons, enhancements

Distribution:

-FAS-SEAS Senate administrator

-List generated by FAS-SEAS Dean's Office

Analysis:46:30

Instructional Faculty from Statistics and Data Science who helped with the survey:

-Brian Macdonald

-Ethan Myers

-Bob Wooster

Narrative questions:

-content coding

Response Rate:

Yale University-wide Faculty Climate Survey: overall faculty response/30%; Instructional Faculty response/18%

Yale University-wide Faculty Climate Survey FAS-specific: overall faculty response: Overall response 32%; Instructional Faculty response 20%

FAS-SEAS Senate Instructional Faculty Survey: Instructional Faculty response 58%

-237 respondents in 2017

-235 respondents in 2022

Top Priorities in 2022:

-Compensation

-Job security

-Advancement

-Current benefits

-Course design freedom

-Paid professional development leave

-Sense of belonging

Compensation:

Committee determined that “due to the engagement of instruction faculty, academic unit chairs, and administrative leadership, **the salary of Yale instructional faculty far exceed the national average.** The instructional faculty recruited to Yale are highly trained educators whose research supports their teaching to the positive benefit of faculty colleagues and Yale students. They hold post-graduate degrees from the best institutions of higher education and are distinguished practitioners in their respective fields of journalism, business, science, culture, and the arts. They are vital members of their curricular communities. **Their appointments are competitively remunerated, and the vast majority are fully benefits eligible.**

Ms. Alexandrov compared the criteria/top rank for each track, and commented that there is much that is expected of our instructional faculty. She noted that regarding compensation, job security, and benefits, Yale continues with increased raises to catch-up with inflation. They review salary variations in Lector/Lecturer tracks. The committee found that many peer institutions, such as UC and Rutgers, offer tenure or tenure-like positions to faculty in the instructional rank.

Ms. Alexandrov talked about job security and that from contract to contract, there is always the anxiety of whether your contract will be renewed. Regarding child scholarship contributions, **Ms. Alexandrov**, the committee recommends that Yale significantly increase the maximum scholarship contribution. Regarding phased retirement, the committee recommends that it

includes Senior Lectors I for this benefit. Regarding Emeritus status, they also recommend that Senior Lectors I, be eligible for emeritus status.

Ms. Alexandrov noted the discrepancies in salaries between Lectors and Lecturers, and lengths of contracts and review times. She spoke about career advancement and recognition and requested that there be an annual workshop for the lecturer track to clarify the process, respond to questions, and establish clear communication. She spoke of the need for guaranteed annual funding for teaching, research, conferences, and other professional development activities, to include an amount that would cover all or most of the costs involved. **Ms. Alexandrov** asked for an amendment to the PDL policy to make it a routine, non-competitive opportunity every six years. In addition, we recommend fewer restrictions on the types of projects permitted, provided they contribute to Yale's academic mission. **Ms. Alexandrov** noted an email that was sent by acting FAS Dean **Kathryn Lofton** in August 2022 where she acknowledged the labor of academic work as important, and encouraged faculty of all ranks to talk about their work, having meaningful discussions in departments and programs that will ultimately lead to meaningful action. Regarding inclusion and well-being, we second the FAS Dean's Office initiative to encourage inclusion of instructional faculty (IFWG Report) in departmental meetings and committees, when appropriate. She noted that the current survey indicates that 60% of lectors and 48% of lecturers report being invited to faculty meetings by their departments, and we encourage instructional faculty to vote when permitted by university rules. We recommend creating a peer mentoring program to assist new instructional faculty with aspects of their transition to Yale, and want to encourage instructional faculty to meet regularly to discuss successes and impediments. We want allocation of additional resources to centralized units to assist with increased responsibilities due to accommodations. We also want departments to add support to focus on tasks related to instruction. Regarding improved record keeping, we ask that the university maintain up-to-date lists of all faculty tracks and ranks; provide more-nuanced information for instructional and research faculty on OIR; make available on OIR or another secure site, information on minimum thresholds for salaries and standard minimum raise associated with promotions; make available a list of committees in which instructional faculty may participate. Ms. Alexandrov gave a list of impediments for instructional faculty: compensation; job security; possibility for advancement; two-tiered system. She gave suggested enhancements: opening of the institutional mind to the rarity and magnitude of the skill needed to teach well in a place like this; finding a systematic way to bring instructors into the culture at Yale; recognizing that non-tenured faculty is a vital part of the university for both education and research. **Ms. Alexandrov** noted that the report will be finished this year and will be distributed at the beginning of next school year so people will have more time to read it. **Ms. Horsley** and **Jill Campbell** commented on the fine work the Instructional Faculty Committee put into this report and thanked them for their work. **Ms. Campbell** commented that there was much information in the report that she was not aware of and that it has prompted her to become familiar with the instructional faculty in her department and their contributions to the department. **Mr. Fischer** pointed out that in his department, there were few instructional faculty until recently, and now they are depended on as an important part of their teaching program. The presentation concluded with a request from **Ms. Alexandrov** and **Ms. Toseland** to please send any comments/suggestions to them as the committee finalizes the report. 1:24

Mr. Van Tassel introduced the topic of Yale's Faculty Handbook that documents university policies and practices on matters concerning the faculty. He noted that the Senate intends to issue a letter requesting clarification on certain policies, including the processes by which the handbook itself is revised. He said that the Senate has receive complaints about the Faculty Handbook from faculty that are of concern: fairness; flexibility; compassion; and clarity. He said possible Calls for Action are: committee to review Handbook and make recommendations; mechanism of continual monitoring/improvement. He noted some possible calls to action: form a committee to review Handbook and make recommendations; have a mechanism in place of continual monitoring and making improvements. **Mr. Van Tassel** then recommended that the FAS-SEAS Senate consider creating a resolution, or writing a letter, or other means of communication to the intends to the administration asking for action to review the Handbook and have more faculty input in what is listed in it. **Mr. Fischer** noted that the Faculty Handbook plays multiple roles, and on the one-hand it is a legal and binding contract between faculty and the University, and it is vague enough to protect the University against being sued for not following procedures in certain situations. **Ms. Horsley** said she feels we need to ask for faculty input in an informal manner so that we get a response from the Provost and our Dean about how that might happen. She noted that we have talked about this, even last year, and there was going to be a process where faculty could give input, and she doesn't know if that mechanism has been put into place and therefore she feels a resolution is appropriate. She suggests that we have specific areas of the Faculty Handbook that we comment on and then perhaps the focus of the committee would be on these areas. Mr. Fischer noted that our job (as faculty) is not to change the Faculty Handbook, but to comment on what we want, what we like, and what we don't like – representing the faculty and in order to affect these changes by the administration. **Mark Solomon** noted that yes it is, in effect, our contract with the University. However, he said, we did not negotiate it. He said there are major changes made to the Handbook that have faculty input, but there are also other changes that are made each year without faculty input or knowledge, and some are not in our best interest. **Mr. Solomon** suggested that we form a FAS-SEAS Senate committee to review the Handbook, reading it from cover to cover, in have knowledge and understand what it actually contains, and where the areas are that need attention. **Jill Campbell** agreed and noted that at the very beginning of the Senate, the issues regarding the Faculty Handbook serviced and she feels that it is time to address these again. **Greta Le Fleur** agreed with **Ms. Horsley** and Ms. Campbell that we should have a formalized process where we can review changes to the Handbook before they're made. She noted that until about 5 years ago, she used to read the Handbook every year and when she did, she noticed that there were substantial changes that were made from previous years. She agrees that we need to have a substantial mechanism for weighing in on whatever changes are set to be made, and have some weight in decision-making on any proposed changes. She suggested asking for a formal review period where people can review and weigh in on proposed changes before they are approved to go into the Handbook. **Jing Yan** commented that it is critical to have input into what goes into the Handbook. He said that there have been cases where the Handbook has been used in cases against faculty, and there is no procedure in place for faculty to appeal these procedures. He also feels that it is difficult to make changes if we simply advise the administration on what we think, and he feels that we need a more formal way to offer our opinions that will ultimately lead to change. **Alessandro Gomez** noted that the process of reviewing the Handbook and incorporating

faculty input into what goes into the Handbook is not a simple process and will take much time and effort. He suggests that the Senate make a resolution asking for a committee and that the committee be outside of the Senate, with Senate representation on the committee. **Mr. Solomon** would like to have a mechanism where changes made are tracked and shown, even the smallest changes. **Mr. Gomez** pointed out that this would be a very tedious job. **Mr. Van Tassel** asked people to send him any suggestions they have and he will put this as an agenda item for the next Senate chair to address. **Jennifer Klein** commented that the changes in the Handbook often seem to serve management and administration issues. She feels what we see should be placed in a larger context, and she noted that especially the leave policies no longer serve the faculty and their larger roles than when these policies were first implemented.

Mr. Gomez spoke about the Rutgers faculty strike where Unions representing full and part-time faculty, graduate workers, and postdoctoral associates went on strike over salaries and other issues. He noted that the strike lasted only 5 days and was suspended after receiving quite a few achievements from the university. **Mr. Gomez** noted that the faculty were able to get a 44% wage increase over the life of their contract, and increased job security. **Mr. Gomez** commented that having a union is beneficial, however Yale faculty are not able to unionize, Therefore, he said, forming an AAUP Chapter to represent Yale faculty would be the next step in the absence of a union. He talked about alternatives to striking that we may use to get our needs heard – perhaps a service strike that would get the administration’s attention and not affect the students if it were of short duration. He is looking for some “signal” that the administration is being protested by the faculty without hurting our students. **Mr. Gomez** remarked that there has been a steady decline over the years of faculty input which is in direct opposition of the idea of shared governance. He feels that faculty must take a hardball approach to this problem if we hope to affect change, and until we play hard, nothing is going to happen. **Mr. Fischer** commented that when he came to Yale in 1981, Yale experienced major campus unrest regarding C&T issues, Yale fought back, and it wasn’t until Yale began negotiations with the C&T Union, that beneficial changes were made. He also noted the most recent example of this with the forming of the Graduate Student Union that helped address longstanding issues that were not listened to by the administration before unionization. He said that Yale will fight any changes until they are forced to address issues by means of implementing systems that result in public embarrassment. **Ms. Alexandrov** commented that it goes back to having a conversation between ladder faculty, instructional faculty, and research faculty and talking about having a strong core. She said that instructional faculty have to trust ladder faculty before we can move forward. **Mr. Van Tassel** mentioned the possibility of instructional faculty and perhaps postdocs joining forces with graduate students, and **Ms. Alexandrov** noted that this is a conversation that is happening. She noted that in the past, when she asked colleagues if they were interested in unionizing, the answer most often was no. **Ms. Campbell** commented on the issues of playing hard ball versus cooperation. She noted that the University does not want change and wants to keep things the way that they are. She feels that the Senate exists because faculty created enough disruption that President Salovey thought it would be better to have a Faculty Senate than to have people stand up at Faculty meetings with demands to have issues added to the agenda. She also said that she believes that if you really want change, you look to gaining cooperation by conversation and working together, which sometimes requires the threat of some disruption. **Kathryn Slanski** noted that there is a JBPO (Joint Board of Permanent Faculty) and she is more comfortable

aligning with ladder faculty than with Graduate Students. **Mr. Gomez** pointed out that the JBPO is somewhat of a “rubber stamp” for things brought before them. **Mr. Fischer** pointed out that the JBPO is supposed to have the power to govern the University. **Mr. Solomon** asked where we might find the rules of governance of the University, and **Mr. Fischer** said it may be in the By-Laws of the Corporation. It was decided that we will look at the Corporation By-Laws. **Mr. Van Tassel** adjourned the meeting at 5:30 PM.

Unions representing full and part time faculty, graduate workers, and postdoctoral associates are currently striking over salaries and other issues. What does the strike mean for higher education in the US? (Senator Alessandro Gomez)