

**FAS-SEAS Senate Meeting**  
**Thursday, October 13, 2022**  
**3:30 PM – 5:30 PM**  
**Zoom and in-person at HQ276, York Street**

**Minutes**  
**APPROVED**

**Senators Present:** Paul Van Tassel, Chair; Meg Urry, Deputy Chair  
Sybil Alexandrov, Oswaldo Chinchilla, Alessandro Gomez, Valerie Horsley, Gerald Jaynes, Greta LaFleur, Maria Piñango, Ruzica Piskac, Larry Samuelson, Mark Solomon, Jason Stanley, Dara Strolovitch, Julia Titus, Rebecca Toseland, Jing Yan,

**Staff:** Rose Rita Riccitelli

**Absent:**

Elisa Celis, Michael Fischer, Maria Kaliambou, Paul A. North, Mimi Yiengpruksawan

**Guests (open session):**

Alhassid, Yorum; Baker, Keith; Brock, Jeff; Bennett, Beth; Gehlker, Marion; Gendler, Tamar; Goren, Shiri; Heeger, Karstan; Jacobson, Matthew; Kaufman, Ronit; Koundi, Soumia; Maruyama, Reina; Papemant, Charalampos; Radev, Dragomir; Reynolds, Russell; Schiffer, Peter; Schweiiger, Sophie; Spangler, Stephanie; von Kunes, Karen; Vuturo, Kathy; Whelan, John; Yeret, Orit

**Mr. Van Tassel** adjourned the closed session and began the open session at 4:00 PM

**Open Session: 4 PM – 5:30 PM**

**Paul Van Tassel**, Chair of the FAS-SEAS Senate welcomed non-senators to the FAS-SEAS Senate meeting. He called on the chairs of the various Senate committees to give a report on their committee activities.

**Gerald Jaynes** spoke for the Governance Committee. He noted that the committee met on October 6, 2022. The committee decided that their first initiative would be to issue a draft report of the unfinished administrative growth report from last year to the Executive Council and the full Senate, and that initially they will conceptualize what the objectives, purpose, and scope of that report were originally supposed to be. Then, he said, they would draft a report using appropriate data from the two versions that we had last spring along with any supplemental data that we gather. The committee also agreed to draft a report that would be a complete committee process and involve full participation at each stage so that if disagreements or questions arise, they can be addressed in a timely and ongoing fashion rather than have the entire committee handed a long report before any member had an opportunity to offer criticisms that they may have. And, he said, the committee has set aside their next three meetings to work on doing this.

**Mr. Jaynes** noted that this is the major work that the Governance Committee will focus on this year, although there may be other things that will come up later on in the year.

**Valerie Horsley** spoke for the Budget Committee noting that the committee will work on the issue of having longer faculty leaves so faculty can work on their research, and it will do an analysis of faculty benefits including tuition reimbursement and cost-of-living resources. Also, she said, we want to look at FAS and SEAS budgets and faculty productivity and administrative support across units to make sure faculty are able to do their research and teach without being overburdened with administrative responsibilities.

**Sybil Alexandrov** spoke for the Instructional Faculty Committee and said the committee's main objective this year is to conduct a survey to measure the metaphorical climate of the instructional faculty. The survey's format will be similar to the Senate's [FAS Senate Report on the Status, Pay, and Condition of Non-ladder Faculty](#) that was conducted in 2017. She noted that we are aware of the progress that has been made since, and perhaps this progress was due to the initial survey and we would like to ask how this progress is perceived and which are the most urgent issues as we move forward. In addition, the committee wants to compare the responses of our survey with the responses of the University-wide climate survey that was conducted last fall, the results of which we hope to see before the end of the current semester. She noted the timeline is to conduct the survey in early November 2022, analyze the results with guidance from the Statistics Department in late winter, present our findings in early spring, and produce a report at the end of the academic year. If time allows, the committee also would like to advocate strongly for research funds and sabbatical for all instructional faculty with multi-year contracts.

**Maria Piñango** spoke for the Diversity Committee. **Ms. Piñango** reported that the Diversity Committee's objectives are:

1. To discuss the implications of an absence of guidance for romantic faculty-graduate student relations that impact the students' educational experience, in themselves and in connection to other contexts involving power asymmetry such as chair-instructional faculty relations. The result of this discussion can potentially be a proposal to the Graduate School involving specific guidelines to be included in the graduate school handbook.
2. To understand Yale's system in place for providing accommodations for faculty in situation of disability. The starting points are Yale's Resource office on Disabilities and The Office Of Institutional Equity and Accessibility. The result of this fact-finding process can potentially be a set of specific recommendations for how to better support all faculty as they deal with situations of disability.

**Mark Solomon** commented on the situation between graduate students and faculty and said the rules should be the same as they are for undergraduate students and faculty – that there should be no personal relationships between these individuals while the faculty member is in an advisory position with a student. He also said that from what he has observed, anyone in a department should follow these rules whether they are a direct supervisor or not, and all students should be considered off limits. **Meg Urry** noted that there is much work to be done in this area and that our primary goal should be to protect the educational experience of our students which is at risk with the current policy of “no policy” for graduate students.

**Ruzica Piskac** spoke for the Science and Engineering Committee. She reported that even though the committee has not had a chance to meet, they had an email discussion about what would be interesting topics to pursue, and there are two topics that the committee is currently discussing: one is to gain the better understanding of changes to royalty payout for patents developed at Yale, and we plan to talk to people who hold the patents to hear their opinion about the change, as well as talk with Provost **Scott Strobel** and Vice Provost for Research **Michael C. Crair**. The

other topic is to look into more permanent career possibilities for research scientists at Yale. **Ms. Piskac** also asked that anyone who had other topics that they would like this committee to consider to please send them to her by email at [ruzica.piskac@yale.edu](mailto:ruzica.piskac@yale.edu)

**Rebecca Toseland** reported for the Undergraduate, Admissions, and Educational Committee. She reported that the priorities of the committee are advocating for faculty participation in the Yale College Admissions process; improving our collective understanding of the changing demographics of Yale College and how we can further improve undergraduate education for both faculty and students; continued focus on mental health in Yale College, both understanding the issues and devising a solution.

**Mr. Van Tassel** spoke for the Nominations Committee and noted that this committee's work does not begin until the winter/spring by gathering nominations for the ballot for the Senate election in the spring. He did say that work has already been started by encouraging faculty to consider running for the Senate in spring 2023.

**Mr. Van Tassel** also spoke for the Peer Advisory Committee noting that the committee will continue advocating for an ombuds office at Yale – a neutral office that can handle disputes or concerns among faculty, staff, and students. **Ms. Urry** noted that since the Senate has been advocating for this position, there has been strong resistance to it from the administration and asked what the source of this resistance is. **Ms. Horsley** responded that when it was discussed last year with the Provost **Strobel** and **Dean Gendler**, the Provost noted that he feels that we already have systems in place that do the job of an ombuds person and perhaps what is not apparent is how to access those systems. However, **Ms. Horsley** noted, the Provost was still willing to listen to us about the need of an ombudsperson. **Mr. Van Tassel** said that even though Yale may offer similar services, an ombuds office would be neutral whereas Yale services are offered by individuals who work at Yale and therefore even if they try to be neutral, it still poses a non-neutral aspect.

**Mr. Van Tassel** report for the Elections Committee and said the committee is looking to outsource the election but that this has not been confirmed as yet. He said there will be more information coming on this matter at a later date.

**Ms. Urry** asked if anyone from within or outside of the Senate sees anything that they want to address in addition to what has been said. **Mr. Van Tassel** noted that he would like to see the Senate be more transparent than it is about issues that we are dealing with within the Senate. He said this will include committee chairs posting on the Senate's web site under their respective committee's page, what they are working on. **Ms. Horsley** said it was discussed at the EC meeting to respond to the **Provost Strobel** and **Dean Gendler's** letter regarding the Senate's resolution regarding the China Initiative so we can understand the policies that are recommended by the AAUP regarding faculty concerns about behavior, and what are the rights that the AAUP recommend. And to write a report so that we can compare this to the Handbook so that we can advise changes to the Handbook that can happen in the future. **Ms. Horsley** said that she is planning to work on this and give it to the Governance Committee so that committee can take the lead on this. **Ms. Urry** said that the issue is the Handbook which she has read and refers to whenever she has a question, and she noted that things in the Handbook change and she is not sure when or how these changes take place. She would like to understand the configuration control of the Handbook and if our faculty are notified when policies are changed, and this is something for the Governance Committee to look into. **Mark Solomon** noted that these concerns were raised in 2017 and the Governance Committee requested that changes be noted, and, in fact there should be a mechanism where track changes be noted. At that time, **Mr. Solomon** spoke

with **Jason Killheffer** in the Provost's Office who was doing the changes. **Mr. Solomon** thought we had an agreement that **Mr. Killheffer** would do that, however it has not happened. He said he thought that we could do it ourselves, however it is not a simple task, so we should revisit this issue again. **Mr. Van Tassel** asked who makes the decision on the changes that then appear in the Handbook. **Mr. Solomon** said the Provost makes the changes. However, he also feels that a bigger issue is that not only highlights be pointed out, but any changes that may be subtle but may have a significant impact and may have big implications need to be pointed out. **Ms. Horsley** said she feels we need to advocate for the faculty to give input into the process of the edits of the Faculty Handbook – this is a priority. **Mr. Solomon** said that the in 2016/17, the Faculty Standards were put into place, and he believes that there was supposed to be a 5-year review and annual reports. So, he said, it would be helpful to find out what the committee has been up to, and if the policies that were proposed back then are still the right ones. **Ms. Urry** said this seems like it would be a good item to bring up with the EC's next meeting with the FAS Dean. **Dean Gendler** commented that the committee's 5-year review, as in many cases, will be done in the 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> year because we are behind because of COVID. She commented that she feels it is a very good idea to have this review be on the Senate's list of things to do. **Ms. Horsley** presented a draft report from the Budget Committee that was worked on last year by that committee, in which they analyzed what the FAS and SEAS budget consisted of and what are some items that the faculty leaders in the FAS and SEAS would recommend going forward for the budget to address. The first issues is that we understand from past CESOF reports and discussions with the current CESOF committee whose report will be out very soon, that there are still gaps in faculty salaries, especially in the sciences and engineering. These gaps are concerning because they mean that we do not retain or pay faculty to retain our excellence, so we recommend that these gaps be closed as soon as possible and that there are mechanisms put into place so that these gaps to not happen in the future. The second issue that the report addresses is ensuring budget autonomy for the FAS and SEAS. Historically these budgets have lived in the Provost's Office, and the Senate recommended last year that these budgets be moved to the appropriate schools. She noted that some of this has happened so we want to make sure that this transition is working as it occurs. Finally, she said, we learned last year that the endowment grew exponentially and we had much more money to spend. The committee spent 10 meetings of 90 minutes each, talking to 35 FAS and SEAS unit leaders to understand what are the things that this extra money could go towards that would help faculty be more excellent and efficient. The report has some general recommendations – that some money should live in departments so that chairs can provide money for things that are important to their faculty and students, and make it more efficient than the system has been in the past, and that there should be funds for research, teaching, travel, and other projects that are well advertised and made accessible to everyone. She said that this report is in its final edit stages and the committee hopes to bring it to next month's Senate meeting to present it for approval. **Mr. Van Tassel** presented the next topic of Tenure & Promotion at Yale in the time of COVID and introduced Promotion at Yale in the time of COVID and introduced Promotion at Yale in the time of COVID. The topic was initially introduced by **Reina Maruyama** and **Claire Bowen**, the Chair and former chair of the Women Faculty Forum who the Senate has paired with to address this issue. Today, **Mr. Van Tassel** introduced **Peter Schiffer** to further speak on this issue. **Mr. Schiffer** noted that the pandemic has affected most people in very serious ways, and the effects on our pre-tenure ladder faculty were particularly difficult because they are on a clock with their employment as pre-tenure

faculty. The effects were on their health, childcare, other family care issues, research that often requires travel and was interrupted (going to achieves and special facilities), and research requiring human subject study and interactions with people was seriously disrupted, along with supply chain issues that are ongoing and affected many lab scientists. And, he noted, it was harder to do mentoring and teaching. Access to labs, national facilities, and libraries were limited. Travel to conferences was severely restricted, as well as networking for interactions with people in their fields and letting them know what they were doing was difficult. Additionally and most importantly, he noted that interactions with people on campus were limited, which meant that the pre-tenure faculty did not have a chance to get to know each other and their senior colleagues. And, childcare was a problem with childcare centers closed or restricted and this disproportionately affected pre-tenure faculty and especially women. Mr. Schiffer said that early in the pandemic, the Yale Provost's Office gave a one-year clock extension to everyone; gave extra childcare benefits and alternative sources for childcare (which were helpful but were probably not sufficient for most people). The FAS and SEAS Deans Offices gave extra help in mentoring and coaching, and other support for pre-tenured faculty trying to help make the situation better for them. In February 2022, the FAS and SEAS Deans offices did a survey of all the pre-tenure ladder faculty looking for their impacts – what happened, what would make a difference, how can we help? They received more than a 50% response rate. The responses were rich in detail and heartbreaking in many cases where people detailed the issues that they had been facing. **Mr. Schiffer** reported that as a consequence of the results of that survey, in May 2022 we launched a program of accommodations and additional assistance for the pre-tenured faculty that was one of the topmost generous in the country offered – additional research funding, clock extensions, and teaching releases. It was made available in May-June, and again in September, for people to apply for what they in particular needed. He said that the vast majority of pre-tenure ladder faculty have applied for accommodations through this program. The approach in the two Deans offices is to try to be helpful to the pre-tenure ladder faculty to help them achieve their personal development goal and help them get to the tenure decision in a positive way. The candidates have the opportunity to include information about how the pandemic affected their research and teaching during this time, and the effects it has had on their development, and the tenure and appointments committees have flexibility to consider the pandemic when they are making decisions. He noted that the process is always evolving and the FASTAP process is probably ready for a review sometime in the next few years, and he is interested in helping **Dean Gendler** and **Dean Brock** with this ongoing tenure and promotions process. **Mr. Schiffer** noted that he is interested in getting feedback and advice on what we can do better, more effectively, and more fairly. **Reina Maruyama**, chair of the Women's Faculty Forum (WFF) spoke and said that the WFF represents women all over the University and the stories that **Mr. Schiffer** talked about FAS faculty are echoed all across campus on how difficult it has been for our pre-tenured faculty and she looks forward to working with FAS and the rest of the campus to address and resolve these issues. Ms. Horsley said there are two issues she has not seen addressed: 1) How are departments going to consider these items – there is no mechanism by which these items can come up in a departmental conversation; 2) Regarding **Mr. Schiffer's** comment that there would be ways that junior faculty could influence the gaps that they have had – **Ms. Horsley** said that most of the junior faculty that she knows don't feel that there is a gap, but everything is much slower, and especially in the sciences – the supply chain issues are huge and we cannot hire people in the same way. She said it is just affecting everything we do, and those are things that are real. Her concern is that the people who on the **TAC** and people in

Commented [AS1]: Not sure, but this might be TRAC

departments are not going to consider those when they look to how someone is doing, especially when they think about how it effects productivity and the ability to do good work. She also said that she feels that the tenure system at Yale is **alike** a medieval torture device, and she knows that other people feel the same way. One of the reasons is that the people waiting **has** no idea when the vote is going to happen and she would like to see more transparency in the process. **Mr. Schiffer** commented that **Ms. Horsley** expressed good points and significant questions. He said that the 2007 and 2016 FASTAP reports were prepared with significant faculty input and that recommendations from faculty where a number of faculty voiced the same concerns, would be considered if there was a revision. **Ms. Urry** referred to the COVID issue where she acknowledged how difficult it has been during this time for people to do their work in many cases. However, she asked the question “What is best for Yale.” She said that Yale should retain the very best people that they can get. And, she noted, Yale has hired those people and we should be concerned how our tenure process will play out over the next few years in keeping faculty who are the best. She noted that one thing we have learned in the field of gender equity is that bias is present and **how** to avoid it is to have discussions that are not related to the case under review and not made when discussing a particular case. When discussing individual cases, it has been proven that decisions are made in a much more **bias** and inaccurate way. She said that it is imperative that the Tenure and Promotions Committee have conversations in advance of reviewing any cases affected by COVID about how they view the impact of COVID on the kinds of decisions they need to make – what is it that we’re trying to achieve – are we trying to count publications and citations, or are we trying to be sure that the very best people who could be at Yale, stay here? **Ms. Urry** stressed that Yale needs to have these types of conversations so that we can decide what the path forward will be. **Rebecca Toseland** noted that these issues also impact the reappointment and promotion process for instructional faculty. **Dara Strolovitch** commented on the point of the good of the institution and the good of the candidates is one that we should think about capaciously to make candidates feel heard and supported. She also said it would be good to think about who the best people are, what the best people do, and what the best people would bring to the University.

**Mr. Van Tassel** thanked **Mr. Schiffer** and **Ms. Maruyama** for leading the discussion, and then introduced the last agenda item on the Yale Health CEO Search with **Stephanie Spangler** leading the discussion with **John Whalen**, Vice President for Human Resources. **Ms. Spangler** noted that we each interact with Yale Health differently, and for many of us, Yale Health is our health plan and we get all of our care and coverage there, and for others who have other health plans, Yale Health is still where we get vaccinations and health information, and it is where our students get traditional student health coverage and mental health counseling even if they don’t have Yale Health coverage. She noted that it is an organization that encompasses a lot of activities and there were the public health functions during the Pandemic. **Dr. Paul Genecin** has been the CEO of Yale Health for over 25 years. Today we want to talk about the kind of leader we would like to replace him, but also about the kind of direction Yale Health should be taking because it does impact. She said she is joined by members of the search advisory committee – **John Whelan**, and **Kathy Vuturo** from Russell Reynolds Associates, a management consulting firm Russell Reynolds Associates who is well-networked across the country, that will help us with the search. Ms. Vuturo will ask some of the questions we are asking of faculty, staff, students, and leaders across the campus so that we can produce an accurate position description with a goal to identify candidates for the position before the year is out. **Mr. Whelan** said he is happy to be

Commented [AS2]: like

Commented [AS3]: have

Commented [AS4]: the way

Commented [AS5]: biased

helping with this search and is open to any input and guidance from the community. **Ms. Vuturo** said that we are in the process of collecting diverse input from the organization, including faculty, staff, students, employees, union representation, and the intent is to be able to produce a robust position specification that is accurate and captures the community's aspirations for Yale Health, and that is attractive to excellent candidates in the country. She asked the audience for their input on what they think the strengths are of Yale Health, and what is the direction they think the new leader should take as this person steps into the role. **Mr. Van Tassel** asked about Yale Health and said that it much be much bigger and much more comprehensive in their activities today as it was in the past. He asked how this growth affects the future and what it means for new leadership. **Ms. Spangler** said that Yale Health opened 50 years ago and was the first staff HMO in CT. When it started, it had 10,000 people, and currently it has 40,000 which includes students, faculty, employees, and their dependents. Also the Yale Health Plan sees Medicare retirees who have been members before retirement. She noted that 15 years ago, the Union, faced with increasing healthcare costs of other plans, encouraged their members to join Yale Health, at least for the first three years of new hires, which has formed a strong partnership with the unions as well. It serves, she said, over 70% of employees and over 80% of union employees, and not available outside of the Yale community. So, she said, what we are looking for in terms of growth and development is what is new and innovative in health care. **Ms. Horsley** noted that the Yale Health Plan is very convenient and that there have been many changes since she arrived in the last 13 years that has made it more efficient. She has also seen a change in the way practitioners interact with patients- in a more humane and friendly way which has changed the culture and clinical experience for patients. She recommends that we really need to focus on student mental health and making sure that we grow that area and make it a priority as students are going to continue to need mental health support. And, she said, we need to do a better job of impacting trans help and in conversation with her students, they said it has been horrible for some of our students with interacting currently and we can do a better job of giving these students the care that they need. She also said that improving the time for getting an appointment is a major point. **Ms. Toseland** agreed with the need for more mental health help for our students, and to be aware that our undergraduate community has become increasingly diverse in the past 15 years and it would be fantastic if the clinicians in Yale Mental Health and Counseling and all of the other departments in Yale Health reflect that diversity, and it would be especially beneficial if that diversity was reflected at the top of the organization. **Greta Le Fleur** seconded the comment on trans health help and wants to emphasize that as a need. **Mr. Van Tassel** asked about the mental health question with those services being in greater demand than they have ever been. He ask how that department is growing and how are they responding, and what direction do you see it going? **Ms. Spangler** said that the demand has been increasing and they have steadily added providers to the degree that they are looking for additional space and have actually added space. She said it is not a question of whether they will hire more people, the problem is being able to find people to so the job. She noted that they have begun to work with Yale College and the professional schools to imbed counselors in each area. They have also increased availability for help through tele-medicine. She noted that they have not fully solved the access and demand problem of mental health, however they are working on it daily and it is at the top of the list of what is being addressed. **Mr. Van Tassel** asked as members of the FAS-SEAS Senate, what can we do to help the process along? **Ms. Vuturo** noted that what would be

Commented [AS6]: members?

Commented [AS7]: Which one?

Commented [AS8]: have

Commented [AS9]:

Commented [AS10]: confusing

Commented [AS11]: asked

Commented [AS12]: embed

helpful is to hear the group's thoughts on what they would prioritize in terms of the background of the individual we are seeking – education, experience, competencies, what type of organization they might be sitting in today – if you had to make a list of your ideal candidate, what would that individual look like and what are the characteristics you would be looking for in a leader? Mr. Solomon said that one thing that stands out in the position is that it is called the CEO. He thinks that this is inevitable and necessary, however he hopes that a practicing physician or someone who was a practicing physician and just moved into administration, is still an option. Also, he is always a fan of an internal hire when the possibility is there. **Ms. Horsley** said that someone who is aware of the impact of medicine on racial and gender divides so that they understand what they need to do to make it better for the future. **Ms. Vuturo** said that input still can be made by using a [web form](#) that was provided in the chat and that form is monitored daily and includes the opportunity to make nominations. **Ms. Spangler** said that the committee hopes to have a job description within the next couple of weeks, and we would really like to have feedback and suggestions and we move forward with this search. With no other business to address, **Mr. Van Tassel** adjourned the meeting at 5:20 PM.