

FAS Faculty Input Committee

Report of the committee November 18th 2013

Our Committee's Charge

This committee was given its charge by the Provost and President on April 29, 2013, to better understand the mechanisms in place for faculty input at other institutions, including elected bodies and faculty senates, and to consider possible approaches that could be effective here at Yale. We were asked to “produce a short report on the pros and cons of possible approaches that could be taken at Yale, to offer recommendations for potentially effective models to consider, and to outline the next steps necessary to move forward on each possible approach.” We were also asked to bear in mind, when suggesting possible approaches, the many existing demands on faculty time.

Committee Members

Steven I. Wilkinson (Political Science) *Chair*

Michael Della Rocca (Philosophy)

Beverly Gage (History)

Catherine Panter-Brick (Anthropology, Health and Global Affairs)

Anna Marie Pyle (Molecular, Cellular, & Developmental Biology and Chemistry)

Mark Saltzman (Biomedical Engineering)

Work of the Committee

Since April 29, 2013, our committee has met as a whole approximately twelve times, in addition to a great deal of other discussion, on and off-line. The committee has met with deans, chairs, and with other members of the faculty, individually and collectively, including at the Yale College Meeting on October 3, 2013, and at an open meeting on October 17, 2013. The committee has studied the systems in place at peer institutions, and has benefited from discussions with colleagues at those schools about how things work in practice.

The committee acknowledges the assistance it has received from the Provost's office and from the Yale College Dean's office, each of which has also provided data. The committee would especially like to thank the many individual faculty members who have spoken with members of the committee or written to us about their visions for better faculty input and governance at Yale.

Summary of our committee's recommendations

1. That the Faculty of Arts and Sciences establish an elected senate.
2. That a committee appointed by the President be charged with crafting a detailed plan for the structure, staffing, and rules of the new senate which will be presented to the FAS for a vote no later than December 2014.

We recommend that these motions be discussed and voted on at a special meeting of the FAS.

There are many existing demands on faculty and administrative time and there is a well-known tendency for assemblies, committees, and meetings to proliferate. So the FAS Senate Committee should also, in consultation with members of the administration, think about ways in which, once the FAS Senate is established, any duplication of effort among the various bodies, committees and structures we have now might be reduced.

Introduction

Yale is a superb university whose faculty members are fortunate in many ways, and eager to serve the institution and its students. Like our peers, Yale faces important challenges and opportunities regarding a whole host of issues that affect faculty in FAS: financial challenges, strategies for internationalization, adapting to new technologies, new teaching and research opportunities, the growth of interdisciplinary research, and various other matters. Most of the Yale faculty we have spoken to want to improve faculty input as the university and its faculty leaders think about these issues. We as a committee believe that the university's faculty leaders and administrators would also benefit from an organized forum in which they can discuss and deliberate on matters with a representative group of Yale's FAS faculty.

At present, as we discuss below, Yale is notable among large research universities for the absence of an elected faculty body that can aid the administration in decision-making and serve as a collective voice for FAS faculty opinion. Along with MIT, we are one of only two peer universities that lack an elected representative body of some kind. Other universities have found that these bodies have been important and helpful in improving the quality and legitimacy of their university decision making, especially as their institutions have grown in size and complexity. We believe that a FAS Senate here at Yale will preserve the best aspects of Yale's atmosphere of collegiality and cooperation while providing a vital institutional structure for mediating and expressing FAS faculty concerns. We think that, though this may seem to some like a significant departure it will rapidly, like the new tenure system that we instituted in July 2007, become an important mechanism for improving how things work at Yale and for broadening the sense of inclusion among FAS faculty.

Current opportunities for FAS Input at Yale and how they might be improved.

Some Yale faculty members express their appreciation for Yale's internal structures, in which the President, Provost, and other administration officials are active members of the Yale faculty, and make themselves available for faculty comment and input. Others feel that the existing structures do not allow for genuine input that could potentially affect significant decisions before they are made. There are several ways in which this input and communication currently takes place. First the three main governance institutions of FAS: the monthly Yale College Faculty meetings (YCFM), the meetings of the FAS Joint Board of Permanent Officers (JBPO), and the occasional meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences as a whole. Our faculty leaders and administrators regularly attend all three of these meetings. Second, there are the many standing and ad hoc committees appointed each year

by the President, Provost and Deans, which include dozens of faculty members. Third, there are the many informal contacts between faculty and faculty and others in the administration, which take place in departments, smaller meetings, and over email and phone.

In the past few years, there has been some faculty concern over existing channels for input into particular decisions that have been made, such as Shared Services, Yale-NUS, and the purchase of West Campus. In part to respond to this, Yale has created a variety of new bodies and structures: a new FAS Faculty Forum; an increase in the frequency of administration meetings with Chairs, Directors of Graduate Studies, and Directors of Undergraduate Studies; sending out more emails informing faculty and staff about the state of the university and policy initiatives; and more recently creating a new 'University Cabinet' in which senior faculty administrators and officers can discuss policies and their wider ramifications around the same table.

We feel as a committee that the current channels that exist for faculty input and governance, as well as the recent changes, welcome though they are could still be improved upon in several important ways:

First, as currently configured, none of the three larger FAS bodies that meet regularly (the JBPO, Yale College Faculty Meeting, and Faculty Forum) has a clearly defined mandate or the agenda time to deliberate on FAS issues, represent FAS faculty views, and enable two-way FAS communication between faculty and the administration (For details on the current composition of each body, and attendance at each in 2012-13, see Table 1).

- *The Joint Board of Permanent Officers* (JBPO) includes only those members of the FAS ladder faculty carrying the rank of full Professor (i.e., including neither tenured Associate Professors nor Assistant Professors), and spends most of its time hearing cases for appointment and promotion. As of fall 2013, there are a total of 445 individuals eligible to attend and vote at the JBPO meetings. The fact that the JBPO is, under Article 42 of the by-laws, a *de jure* governing body comes as a surprise to many of its members.
- *The Yale College Faculty Meeting* (YCFM) has a broad and somewhat complex membership. It is open to "All ladder faculty of departments and programs in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. In addition, full-time paid adjuncts in all ranks, full-time senior lecturers, full-time lecturers with appointments for more than one year, full-time senior lecturers, and full-time lecturers with appointments for more than one year are also invited to attend and vote. Certain other individuals who have continuing and significant interactions with undergraduates may also attend and vote. This group includes non-ladder faculty who serve as chairs, directors of undergraduate studies, or residential college deans or masters; ladder faculty in

professional schools who regularly teach in Yale College; deans in Yale College; assistant, associate, and deputy provosts; and officers of the university.” As of fall 2013, there are a total of 909 individuals eligible to attend and vote at the YCF Meetings.

The Yale College Faculty Meeting spends most of its time, quite properly, on maintaining Yale College’s excellence and dealing with curricular and student life issues, and it therefore does not have the time to act as the central forum for discussion of all the issues that might be relevant to FAS.

- *The FAS Faculty Forum* was started in 2012-13. The Faculty Forum is open only to the FAS ladder faculty, including full Professors as well as ladder-track faculty who are pre-tenure. As of fall 2013, there are a total of 685 individuals eligible to attend the Faculty Forum. The Faculty Forum, while meant to improve FAS communication, is still viewed by many of the faculty as a largely irrelevant body, though some faculty we spoke to appreciate the process through which agenda questions were generated directly by faculty. It is a body that has an unclear mandate, and competes for attention with the many other demands on faculty time as well as two other established bodies, the YCFM and JBPO. Members of the faculty think it lacks a clear purpose, and the poor attendance reflects that.

Among other smaller bodies at Yale that potentially could play a larger role in FAS communication, we note that the Graduate School advisory council, valuable though it may be, also has a very specific function that prevents it from being an obvious forum for all matters of broader FAS interest.

The second issue we see is that some of the measures to improve input –such as increasing the frequency of meetings with chairs, DUSs and DGSs—have involved asking faculty who already give a lot to the university, and are very busy with administrative tasks, to do even more. The difficulty here is that these busy faculty members inevitably find it difficult to meet as frequently as they would like with members of their departments, and pass ordinary faculty views up to the administration and pass information back in return. We also note that departments at Yale seem to have very different cultures and practices in terms of meeting regularly and exchanging information with their chairs. And these structures, valuable though they are, are not necessarily a substitute for a system in which ordinary members of the FAS faculty may speak to members of the administration directly, and in which they are free to set the agenda and ask questions in an unstructured way.

Third, the ‘town meeting’ format bodies we currently have at Yale, bodies in which all members of a community are free to come out (or not) to speak, deliberate and vote,

possess the advantages and disadvantages of all town meetings. The advantage is that everyone is a member and everyone is free to come out, speak and vote. The disadvantage is that most of them, on any given day, do not. Attendance tends to be uneven and unrepresentative, and the full breadth and insight of Yale's diverse and busy faculty is therefore not always present in the room. Attendance is high when a big controversial issue is on the agenda, so these town meetings do provide a forum for a backbench reaction to something that has already happened, but they perform less well in providing a broad and representative group of faculty that can deliberate on the many issues along the way, where faculty input would improve the quality of decision-making.

In Table 1, we report data on the membership and attendance of each of our existing town meetings from the most recent year for which data are available, 2012-13. The attendance at the JBPO, which has department quorum nominees, averages 12% (2012-13) at the beginning of meetings but is often much less at the end, and the presiding dean periodically has to exhort faculty to stay in the room so as to keep quorum. Attendance at the Faculty Forum averaged 4% in 2012-13, for the three meetings for which we have attendance numbers. And attendance at the Yale College Faculty Meeting averaged 9% of the 909 eligible attendees, with a low of 4% and a high of 16%.

We think that, with the many demands of teaching, research, service, family and other obligations it is unrealistic to try to solve this problem of uneven attendance by hoping that a higher proportion of faculty will turn up for even more town meetings. Even if they did, this would not necessarily be desirable, given the extra burden it would create on faculty time. We think that an elected representative model that expected, regularly, a smaller but more representative portion of the faculty to turn up for a specific purpose would be a better and more efficient solution. As we have noted, although Yale has a valued tradition of informal communication with faculty, Yale currently has less formal faculty input than virtually any other major research university we have examined. We think Yale can improve, and in the process make better and more broad-based decisions, which further the university's goals of excellence, innovation and inclusiveness.

Where does the system at Yale currently fit, relative to our peer institutions?

Our committee examined models of faculty input at Yale and across nine peer institutions: Berkeley, Chicago, Cornell, Columbia, Duke, Harvard, Michigan, Princeton, and Stanford. This involved reading the by-laws of governance institutions at each place, reading up on the histories of these bodies, as well as their recent achievements and controversies, and, perhaps most importantly, talking with colleagues at many of these institutions about how things really work at these peer universities in practice.

Our research on other institutions revealed that Yale is a considerable outlier in terms of faculty governance. Only MIT, among our peer institutions, has a system that closely resembles ours. Other universities, as they have grown from colleges into much larger research universities, or in the wake of particular controversies, have all moved to a wholly elected or partly elected system. A conflict at Berkeley, for instance, precipitated the creation of the academic senate there in 1920, which has since served as a model for many other universities. Eight of the ten institutions we examined have elections, of some sort, for faculty councils, senates or, in the case of Princeton, for direct election of faculty to important committees. Outside of the research universities we examined, so far as we are aware, elected faculty senates or councils are near universal.

Yale, however, has not substantially changed its original town meeting system, even though it has grown from an institution in which there were only 102 faculty, lecturers and lectors in all of Yale College in 1939/40, to one with 444 faculty and lecturers in 1962-63, after the postwar expansion and 1956 merger with Sheffield, to a university with nearly 700 ladder faculty and 124 lecturers and lectors across FAS today.¹ The JBPO, which according to the *Yale Book of Numbers* was a relatively small body with 34 full Professors in 1939-40 (plus professors from Engineering and Sheffield), grew to 112 in 1962-63, and now (October 2013) has a total of 445 full Professors. So Yale today has approximately ten times the number of JBPO members as it did in 1939/40, with all the complexity and coordination challenges that inevitably brings, but has had no corresponding change in its town meeting system.

Across the ten institutions we have examined, including Yale, we have identified three broad types of faculty input and governance.

1. Institutions with regular town-meeting bodies of the faculty as the prime means of faculty governance and input. Only MIT and Yale, out of all major research institutions, have kept this model, although it was once the norm. Additional input at both places is largely supplied by major standing and ad hoc faculty committees, appointed by the Deans, Provost and President, and of course through many informal links and communications.
2. Hybrid systems with some elected element. Harvard and Princeton, among our peers, have each responded to requests for more input over the years by grafting some electoral element onto their systems, in addition to retaining their traditional monthly faculty meetings. Harvard's system seems to have less input, with the 18-

¹ 1939-40 data from George W. Pierson, *A Yale Book of Numbers: Historical Statistics of the College and University 1701 – 1976* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983) <http://oir.yale.edu/1701-1976-yale-book-numbers#D>

member elected FAS Council generally having operated more as the Dean's Cabinet, and some candidates encouraged by the FAS Dean to run in the elections. The Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard still chooses the important committees, and there has also been some recent controversy over whether the FAS Council system is sufficiently representative and whether it needs reform.

Princeton has a more interesting model. In addition to a 50-member Council of the Princeton University Community, which includes faculty, student, staff, alumni and administrative representatives, there is also an important elected component in which faculty directly elect members to several important university committees. A majority of members of the most important committees are directly elected by the faculty, though only senior faculty may be elected to some committees. At Princeton, by our count, six of the eight members are elected to the so-called "Committee of Three" which approves salaries and promotions (The President is chair, and the Dean of Faculty is Secretary), and 9 of 11 members are elected to the "Committee of Course of Study" (the Dean of College is Chair and Dean of Faculty is ex officio). In addition, 6 of 8 members are elected to the important "Advisory Committee on Policy," which in turn appoints 8 out of 9 members to the "Committee on Committees" that populates all the committees that are not directly elected. In addition 6/6 members are elected to the "Committee on Conference and Faculty Appeal," 10/17 members to "Committee on Library and Computing" (the Provost is chair and Deans and 2 appointees are additional members), 6/9 members are elected to the Committee on Undergraduate Admission and Aid (the Dean and Director of Admission are among the appointees), 6/9 members are elected to the "Committee on Grading" (as well as the Dean of College, Dean of Faculty, and Registrar), and 2/10 members of the University Research Committee are elected. So by our count at least 51 members of the Princeton faculty are in elected committee roles at any one time.

3. Elected Representative Senates: *All of the other peer institutions we examined (and many more beyond) have an elected, representative faculty senate or council, almost always representing all the important schools and divisions in the university, rather than just the FAS. At Stanford, for example, by our estimate only 41/71 senate members are from what would be FAS departments here at Yale, and at Chicago only 26/51 senate members are from FAS departments. These senates usually elect by division, often after a process of nomination by departments. Most of these senates/councils are advisory, but they typically discuss all important initiatives, as well as more routine matters, and they also provide a valuable arena for faculty to raise issues and questions before frustrations have a chance to build up.*

There is an obvious difficulty, familiar to students of government, in asking all the individual members of bodies like senates to liaise effectively with administrations and take timely decisions on the many issues that come up before and between meetings of the full senate. So senate members at other institutions typically elect an executive committee of 4-8 members, usually according to some divisional distribution, which allow these bodies to efficiently carry out senate business and communicate with their administrations. The executive committee of a senate usually sets the agenda for the full senate meetings, at which the chair or vice chair of the executive committee presides. At some universities, the senate or executive committee also appoints or acts as a *Committee on Committees*, which populates or helps populate university committees, almost always through conversations with the administration.

Possible models here at Yale

Our committee considered five possible models to further improve faculty input here at Yale, given our existing institutions and by-laws, as well as the models that exist elsewhere.

1. Minor changes. The first option we considered was not much change at all. It is clear that our administration is interested in faculty input through the existing institutions, so it may be that larger changes are simply not needed. The financial crisis has also lessened, somewhat, and with it perhaps many of the tough decisions that have created some frustrations. Since 2012, as we have acknowledged, the administration has also added various meetings with chairs, deans, DUSs, DGSs, and with all the deans and officers in the Cabinet, in an effort to get more faculty views into the system.

But for the reasons we outlined above, we do not recommend the option of no change at all, or only minor changes, because that would not deal with what we see as the three central gaps in the current system with regard to FAS input: first, there is no body with a clear mandate that is charged with dealing with FAS concerns and representing FAS interests as its primary focus; second, many of the current institutions allow for 'top down' input, rather than 'bottom up,' in which faculty can voice their own concerns and talk with members of the administration on matters that concern them most; and third, the current town meeting formats do not always generate the broad and representative portion of Yale's busy and diverse faculty that we think we need for better deliberation and decision-making.

We also note that we have seen some questions about process, representativeness, and faculty input expressed at MIT, the other university which uses the town meeting model, which might suggest that there is at root a problem with the institutional form of the town meeting model.

2. Restructure the JBPO to operate as a governing and deliberative body. The JBPO, according to article 42 of the by-laws, is the governing body (or, at least, one of the two governing bodies) of the FAS. So one serious possibility we considered is that we could streamline the process through which the JBPO currently spends lots of time considering promotion cases that have already been through a rigorous department and divisional process and which therefore, by the time they reach JBPO, are relatively uncontroversial. This time could then perhaps be used to deliberate on FAS issues in the JBPO's town-meeting space.

Many of the faculty members with whom we have spoken feel that the JBPO as currently structured is in clear need of reform. We think, however, that the option of turning the JBPO space and membership into a new body would not solve the issues we have identified with general FAS input, for two reasons. First, the JBPO is open to only full Professors, not to other ladder faculty and not to Senior Lecturers and Lectors, so it is hard to make the argument that it represents the whole of FAS. Second, the JBPO has all the weaknesses of the town meeting format we have discussed earlier, in terms of not regularly providing a representative segment of Yale's busy faculty, whose broad insights and perspectives we need for better decision making.

3. Hold regular FAS meetings. The full FAS faculty meeting is, together with the JBPO, one of the two governing bodies of FAS. Article 42 of the by-laws (reproduced in full here as an appendix) specifies that the JBPO shall be "...subject, in the case of Yale College and the Graduate School, to the authority given to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences." For this reason, and presumably also because the JBPO does not now deal with substantive matters, the practice at Yale, at least in recent memory, has been to convene a full meeting of the FAS Faculty to consider very significant changes in FAS, especially those institutional changes that affect faculty recruitment and promotions. The President and Provost decide whether to convene the full FAS meeting, and in the past decade it has been convened only twice: in 2007 to approve the "FASTAP" change from the old Yale tenure system to the new tenure-track system, and in 2012 to consider the Nordhaus Committee Report on the allocation of faculty slots. It will presumably next be convened to discuss the recommendations of our own Faculty Input Committee, as well as the Academic Review Committee appointed in 2012-13.

The full FAS faculty meeting has the virtue that it is obviously meant to discuss FAS issues, and that its membership is broader than that of the JBPO, which currently has 445 members. As Table 1 shows it includes all ladder faculty, currently 685 members in total. However we have rejected the option of adding a regular FAS faculty meeting for several reasons. First, mindful of our charge to not burden faculty unduly, we worry about adding a third town meeting each month to which nearly 700 faculty are invited on top of the already scheduled YCFM with 909 invitees and the JBPO with 445 (not to mention the Faculty Forum). Second, we have the same objections to the town meeting FAS format that we have mentioned above with reference to the YCFM and JBPO. Third, under the current rules the FAS meeting would contain no representation at all for Lecturers Convertible, Gibbs Professors, Senior Lecturers and Lecturers, and Senior Lectors and Lectors.

4. Introduce a 'hybrid' system with some elected element. We considered introducing a mixed system of the type at Harvard or Princeton, but in our view these systems are less suitable for Yale. First, we note that the Harvard model with an elected 18-member FAS Council is currently under some faculty criticism there as too 'top down', as well as too small a body to represent the interests of diverse departments, with press reports in May 2013 stating that a committee similar to ours will shortly assess whether it needs to be changed.

The Princeton model is interesting, and unique, but we think that directly electing each committee for the large variety of purposes for which we need committees across Yale's FAS, including promotions, would be a mistake. Most of the faculty members we spoke to think that the current department and divisional promotion and review system that we have at Yale works well, and are not in favor of changing it.

5. An elected FAS Senate with representation from all the major FAS divisions. This is the only system that we think will allow genuine faculty deliberation and input into FAS policies and practices, while operating in a more efficient way than the current system, because fewer faculty will have to attend than in the current town meeting format. The fact that the body will be elected and representative across the divisions will help to give the body legitimacy as a clear voice for FAS faculty and as a forum for discussion of FAS issues. It would also help the administration when it wants to find out 'what the faculty thinks,' about a particular issue or initiative.

Recommendations and Discussion

Our committee, having considered the structures we have now at Yale, as well as the various systems in place elsewhere, recommends that we establish an elected FAS Senate. We also recommend that the Faculty of Arts and Sciences vote on this proposal. If the Faculty of Arts and Sciences supports the creation of a FAS Senate we recommend that a Faculty of Arts and Sciences Senate committee be appointed to craft a detailed plan for the structure, staffing, and rules of the new senate. We think that this committee should, given the scale of the task, report back to the faculty with a proposal by December 2014.

Our committee is mindful of the many existing demands on faculty and administrative time and the well-known tendency for assemblies, committees, and meetings to proliferate. So the FAS Senate Committee should also, in consultation with members of the administration, think about ways in which, once the FAS Senate is established, any duplication of effort among the various bodies, committees and structures we have now might be reduced.

We are not recommending a full university senate. This is partly because our committee's charge is to look only at FAS. But it is also because we recognize that the smaller faculty size of some other Yale schools (e.g. Forestry and Environmental Science, School of Management, and the Law School) makes the traditional 'town meeting' model work better for them than it does for the nearly 700 ladder faculty in FAS. It also seems that some other larger schools, such as Medicine, with different faculty, teaching and research needs, and strong Deans representing their views to the administration, seem more satisfied with their current representation within the overall university structure.

The FAS Senate we propose, unlike most senates, would represent only FAS Faculty. The FAS Senate would serve as an institutional voice for FAS comparable to the institutional voices of other schools. It would also act as a sounding board for major administration initiatives, as well as a source of advice and deliberation along the way. Though the senate would be formally advisory, as elsewhere, there would be an expectation that major initiatives and policies affecting FAS faculty be brought for discussion to the FAS Senate in a timely manner. The FAS Senate would also serve as a forum for the Provost and his or her designees to present on the budget; the state of the university, and major university policies that affect FAS, which we think would improve transparency and communication, as well as improve the quality of decision-making.

We envisage a small body, occupying less aggregate faculty time than the bodies and meetings that exist now, but one still large enough to represent a good cross-section of the expertise and views of our tenured and tenure-track FAS faculty, so perhaps a body roughly similar in size to the current faculty quorum (37) of the JBPO. The 18-member FAS Council at Harvard, we note, has been criticized as too small to adequately represent the diversity

of the faculty there. Larger bodies than the 35-40 we envisage, though more representative in some ways, would also require more faculty time and potentially be less efficient. We think that the model in which elected senate members themselves elect a smaller executive council to liaise with the administration and take decisions that need efficient executive action works well elsewhere, and should be adopted here. The elected executive council would set the agenda of the meeting, mindful of issues the administration wants to bring to the floor, but also mindful of the faculty's own interests and concerns.

Our committee has heard different opinions on whether non-ladder faculty should be represented in any new FAS Senate. Some faculty feel that a body that helps to make decisions that affect ladder faculty and larger academic policies, should be composed only of ladder faculty, perhaps even only of tenured faculty, particularly as non-ladder faculty are already included in YCF meetings in recognition of their substantial contributions to Yale College. Others feel that non-ladder faculty play an important part in FAS, and should be fully included in all FAS decision making.

Our committee appreciates the point that senior ladder faculty need to play the leading role in any body that helps to direct the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, although junior faculty should of course also be represented. The proportion of senior to junior representation is perhaps the easiest one to deal with, both because 69% of our ladder faculty is tenured and because, as elsewhere, the proportions of representatives of tenured and untenured faculty representatives in each division could always be specified in the rules. In the case of non-ladder faculty our committee feels that they play an important role at Yale now, especially in the humanities, and that they will play an important role at Yale in the future. We therefore recommend that, as at some other universities, they are represented in the new FAS Senate, in a manner to be determined by the implementation committee.

As at other schools the FAS Senate we envisage would organize its own elections, have the right to distribute agendas and other materials to faculty, and be able to hire a permanent secretary to facilitate the work of the Senate. As elsewhere, and in line with current Yale practice for the JBPO and YCFM, the minutes and materials would generally be available to all eligible attendees via a secure website.

If approved, an implementation committee for an FAS Senate would, of course, have to consider how the new body could work most effectively with the Provost, the Dean of Yale College, the Dean of the Graduate School, and the various bodies, such as the Yale College Faculty Meeting, which are so important to the functioning of FAS.

Liaison with the Corporation. Those faculty who have met with Corporation members in recent years have found them thoughtful, interested in faculty research and teaching, and

eager to hear faculty opinions about various matters affecting the FAS, Yale College and the University. In the past, when members of the Corporation used to stay in the colleges and meet with faculty, there were many opportunities for such conversations. Corporation meetings now however, reflecting the busy lives of the participants, are often highly structured and scheduled, affording little opportunity for ordinary faculty to speak with members of the Corporation and for the two groups to learn from each other.

Other universities deal with the need to open up channels of communication between the faculty and Trustees/Corporations in several different ways: 1) members of the executive committees of their senates present to their Trustees or Corporation members once or twice a year; 2) senates host a lunch or dinner once or twice a year at which senate members and other invited faculty may mix informally with members of the Corporation; and 3) by rules that require or allow written documents and proposals from the Senate to be passed up to the Corporation.

We think that perhaps one or more of these measures ought to be considered at Yale. This follows very much in the spirit of the 1993 Yale Committee on Governance's recommendation that the faculty council it proposed at that time (never implemented) have the "right and responsibility... to afford general consultation...occasionally to the corporation on major policy issues."² It also follows in the footsteps of an even earlier 1971 report on faculty governance, which recommended that the Corporation receive "information and advice from faculty and students"³

Possible Objections

The sentiment has sometimes been expressed that faculty senates impede efficient and innovative decision-making, and interfere with direct communication between those faculty who are in the administration and faculty at large. Several senior professors have told us that Yale is a place where, for these professors at least, communication between senior professors and the top academic officials is closer, more frequent and informal than at many universities. They worry about the bureaucracy and inefficiency that might come with a senate. They have also expressed the worry that a new body will interfere with that

² *Report of the Committee on Governance*, May 1993 p.9.

³ *Report of the 1971 Yale University Study Commission on Governance*, pp.25-26.

<http://www.yale.edu/yale300/collectiblesandpublications/specialdocuments/Governance/governance1971.pdf>.

kind of close communication and informality and that, as the 1993 Berson report on governance at Yale put it, 'a new class of politicians [might] appear.'⁴

We think, however, that these worries are overdrawn. We find little evidence, as we look across our peer institutions, that a permanent new class of academic politicians has emerged. The more pressing concern, which the implementation committee should think hard about, is to how to encourage broad and representative faculty participation, and ensure the willingness of busy faculty to stand for election. In regard to concerns about unnecessary delays, we would point out first that most senates are advisory, as this one will be, and second, that universities may be better off if administrative decisions that are made with input from too small a group benefit from a slightly longer process of informed discussion and debate. Lastly, we should point out that having faculty senates does not seem to have prevented Yale's peers from innovating, taking decisive actions and thriving in recent years. The University of Pennsylvania and University of Chicago, for instance, have made major strides in building new academic initiatives and programs, working with their surrounding communities on urban redevelopment, as well as in areas like fundraising, that do not appear to have suffered because these schools possess faculty senates. It is likewise hard to argue that Stanford, by any measure a high quality and successful university, has been held back by its strong faculty senate. Finally, any potential 'cost' in terms of efficiency is, we think, outweighed by an increase in legitimacy, the credibility of the process and, most important of all, better decision-making

⁴ *Report of the Committee on Governance*, May 1993, p.8.

Article 42 of the Yale Corporation By-laws

“42. The members of the faculty of each school who are Professors on permanent appointment shall be the Permanent Officers of the school and, together with the President and the Provost *ex officio*s and its Dean, shall constitute its Board of Permanent Officers. The Board shall be the governing board of the school, entrusted with matters relating to the educational policy and government of the school but subject, in the case of Yale College and the Graduate School, to the authority given to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. In a school with an insufficient number of Professors on permanent appointment the President may appoint a Governing Board consisting of senior members of the faculty. This Governing Board shall carry out the functions of a Board of Permanent Officers. The Board of Permanent Officers or other Governing Board of a school may in its discretion refer to the faculty of the school for action any matters except recommendations for appointments of Permanent Officers and the assignment of Permanent Officers to the school.”

Source: Yale Corporation By-Laws as Approved by the Corporation, September 28, 2013, <http://www.yale.edu/about/bylaws.html> 10/23/2013.

Table 1: Membership and Attendance in Yale’s current FAS faculty bodies

| Category | JBPO | Meeting of the FAS faculty | Faculty Forum | Yale College faculty meeting |
|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Full Professors (445) | 445 | 445 | 445 | 445 |
| Associate Professors with tenure (35) | 0 | 35 | 35 | 35 |
| Associate Professors on term (52) | 0 | 52 | 52 | 52 |
| Assistant Professors (153) | 0 | 153 | 153 | 153 |
| Lecturers Convertible (2) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Gibbs Assistant Professors (13) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Non-ladder faculty with full-time multi-year appointments (124) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |
| ‘Others’: non-Yale College faculty who regularly teach in YC, Deans, Assistant, Associate and Deputy Provosts and Officers of the University (85) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| Total Membership | 445 | 685 | 685 | 909 |
| Average Meeting attendance in 2012-13 (Percent of those eligible to attend) ⁵ | 53 (12%) | NA | 29 (4%) | 84 (9%) |
| Highest and (Lowest) Attendance 2012-13 | 67 (40) | NA | 41 (12)⁶ | 149 (40) |

⁵ The JBPO attendance record reflects the *highest* number of recorded votes for any case at each meeting. Attendance at the end of each meeting is typically lower, sometimes endangering the quorum of 37.

⁶ Attendance for one faculty forum meeting in 2012-13 is not available.