

**FAS-SEAS Senate Meeting**  
**Thursday, December 15, 2022**  
**3:30 PM – 5:30 PM**  
**HQ276 and Via Zoom**

**Minutes**  
**OPEN SESSION**  
**APPROVED**

**Senators Present:** Paul Van Tassel, Chair; Meg Urry, Deputy Chair  
Sybil Alexandrov, Michael Fischer, Alessandro Gomez, Gerald Jaynes, Maria Kaliambou, Greta LaFleur, Hélène Landemore, Paul A. North, Maria Piñango, Ruzica Piskac, Larry Samuelson, Kathryn Slanski, Mark Solomon, Jason Stanley, Dara Strolovitch, Julia Titus, Jing Yan, Oswaldo Chinchilla

**Staff:** Rose Rita Riccitelli

**Absent:**

Elisa Celis (on leave), Valerie Horsley, Rebecca Toseland, Mimi Yiengpruksawan (on leave)

**Guests – Open Session:**

Yoram Alhassid, Costas Arkolakis, Carl Barratt, Beth Bennett, Jeffrey Brock, Casey Dunn, Drago, Milette Gaifman, Narasimhan Ganapathisubr, Marion Gehlker, Tamar Gendler, Larry Gladney, Elka Kristo-Nagy, Angela Lee-Smith, Nadine Moeller, Charalampos Papamanthou, Doug Rogers, Brian Scassellati, Peter Schiffer, Karen von Kunes, Peisong Xu

At 4 PM, FAS-SEAS Senate chair **Paul Van Tassel** adjourned the closed session of the FAS-SEAS Senate meeting and opened the open-session of the meeting. He introduced **Alessandro Gomez** to speak about forming a Yale Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), an organization (that has been active since 1915) that can reinforce (compliment) what the FAS-SEAS Senate has already been doing to promote faculty governance and other initiatives at Yale. He said he and others who also support this effort will be promoting a membership drive, and said that once a chapter is formed, there will be an election of an executive committee and the adoption of a charter (using guidelines from AAUP), and the group can then work on selecting initiatives to focus on. **Mr. Gomez** encouraged senators who agree with forming an AAUP chapter to talk about it in their respective departments/programs in order to promote AAUP membership. **Mr. Fischer** asked how the two entities would work – will their power be split or would they speak as one voice on issues. He noted that we want the university to pay more attention to the FAS-SEAS Senate and said he is not sure if AAUP will be helpful. **Mr. Gomez** noted that he feels that the AAUP will reinforce the actions of the Senate rather than take a different point of view than the Senate. **Hélène Landemore** spoke in favor of an AAUP Chapter at Yale and sees it as a being complimentary to the work of the Senate.

**Mr. Van Tassel** introduced **Costas Arkolakis**, Chair of the Committee on Economic Status of Faculty (CESOF) Report, who will present the recently released CESOF Report on faculty compensation, how it is distributed among academic divisions and the various faculty ranks, and more recently the focus on how it compares at Yale to our closest peer institutions. **Mr. Arkolakis** said he will focus on main elements of the report – salaries and trends. He said one concern he has is that the ladder faculty size has remained stable in the last decade, and with the increased size of the undergraduate student population during this period, the instructional faculty have taken on the additional burden of teaching and administrative duties. He said that what is recommended is the increase in size of tenured faculty, and we need to make sure that this hiring is done in the most effective manner. Another finding, he said, is that the trend of declining salaries versus our peers has reversed in the past few years, however the reverse has not been as fast as needed. He noted that we don't have data for last year, so things may have gotten better. However, he said, the news is not good for science and engineering where the gap has not improved at all, and we are behind our peers in terms of salary and compensation. The administration has made a commitment to resolve the gap issues in science and engineering. He also noted that there seems to continue to be a discrepancy in higher salaries for external candidates compared to internally promoted faculty. **Elka Kristo-Nagy**, a member of CESOF, spoke next. She said that she and a sub-committee that she belonged to, looked at the instructional faculty data that they received from Yale and AAUP, and that this data was difficult to compare with Yale peer institutions because of the disparity of roles, the disparity in titles, and disparity in length of contracts. She said that there were so many variables that it was difficult to draw strict comparisons. She noted that there has been a newly formed committee – The Instructional Faculty Working Group, with a charge to review instructional faculty well-being and other concerns. And, she noted, because there is a larger number of instructional faculty in the humanities, the committee is largely focusing there and will then expand their efforts to include all of the instructional faculty at Yale. **Ms. Kristo-Nagy** mentioned that recently there were two raises given to faculty – one in July of 2021 and another in January of 2022. She also mentioned that her sub-committee also looked at the impact of COVID and that there was nothing of particular note and that most things were satisfactory. **Doug Rogers** continued with his portion of the report as a member of the CESOF Sub-committee on Institutional Processes that looked at the salary gap that emerged from the findings, and if the ways that information was shared was optimal. He noted that after conversations with the administration and listening to concerns from faculty through the FAS Senate, we came up with three recommendations for useful ways of sharing information.

- 1) Some of the main tables in the CESOF Report that goes into the report every two years can be tabulated every year and shared publicly every year, even if CESOF is not meeting or reporting during the off years.
- 2) The economic status of the faculty be a regular, yearly item of discussion for the Budget Advisory Group.
- 3) Sharing of information that Yale is able to access on peer salary levels with divisional deans who oversee various divisions.

**Mr. Rogers** noted that he understands that all three of these recommendations have been accepted. **Mr. Van Tassel** asked about data and how it compares to our peers. **Mr. Arkolakis** said

as long as the data from each university is provided in a similar form, the data is comparable. He noted that there was a problem with Yale data when it reported salaries including summer salaries, however this has been corrected and he feels that information is now reliable. **Mr. Gomez** asked to share data from the recent CESOF report. He said that when it is stated that we have experienced an uptake in salary, the report refers to the rise from 2017 to 2018, and in the face of the decline that has been going on since 2010, so being “caught up” is an over-statement. **Mr. Gomez** noted that the humanities is nearly caught up, the social sciences are less, and the biological and physical engineering are even less. He said the data has not been updated since 2018 so it remains to be seen what has happened in the ensuing 4 years, and if enough money was injected to compensate for these discrepancies. He asked why sciences were systematically neglected in the course of 10 years. He feels that if there was a faculty committee looking into this, this discrepancy would not have occurred. **Mr. Gomez** then asked what has happened since 2018 – how much money has been injected into this salary gap, and if we can we have granular data on which division is this money going to? He also said that even after we catch up, there still remains a gap on the order of hundreds of thousands of dollars for each faculty member because the fact that we have been sub-par for over a decade implies that basically each of us is missing around \$100 thousand to \$150 thousand, and thus looking at the numbers, the results are appalling. He said if there has been no resolve since the 2018 reported figures, it stands that we are offering 10% lower compensation compared to our peers to our assistant professors, and so how can we manage to be competitive if these numbers are correct? **Mr. Gomez** also shared information that we are also losing on benefits, and out of eight comparisons with our peers, only one - the University of Chicago - offers less than Yale. He concluded with a number of questions and recommendations:

**Questions:**

- Why has the salary gap not been addressed uniformly across divisions?
- What is the time frame within which the administration plans to address existing salary gaps?
- The gap in salary with respect to our peers is spread over at least a decade. After we are caught up, is the administration planning to compensate us for it?
- Is the administration planning to address “the large (10%) salary disparity between tenured faculty members that were promoted internally versus those hired with tenure from outside Yale”? Action should proceed independently of raises to address the salary gap with respect to peers.
- Are there options to make meaningful comparisons with our peers for the Instructional Faculty?

**Recommendations:**

- Comparisons be made by department as the ratio of Yale's average FAS salary to the average FAS salary in peer institutions.
- Relevant committee(s) (e.g., Budget and/or Faculty Advancement) in the FAS-SEAS Senate receive data from OIR independently of CESOF on a yearly basis, subject to the same confidentiality constraints, to expedite data analysis and solicit timely remedial action.
- Data for SEAS be treated and presented separately from FAS, in view of the newly acquired “autonomy” of SEAS.

- The administration state how much money was injected in the FAS budget since 2018 specifically to address salary gap a) with our peers and b) between internally promoted faculty and those hired from outside.
- This type of data should be shared in the future on a yearly basis.
- The data should show how the money was partitioned at divisional level and provide some statistical parameters (e.g., mean and standard deviation) for the faculty to assess how equitable the distribution was.
- In the spirit of greater transparency and shared governance, institutionalize a compensation committee to review salaries systematically and address imbalances. Faculty representation on the committee should be either negotiated with the Senate. This recommendation applies to both FAS and SEAS and is particularly timely for the second in view of the reorganization that is occurring after SEAS became an “autonomous” school.

**Mr. Van Tassel** asked if there has been data produced since the 2018 report that would alter this discussion and **Mr. Arkolakis** replied that we did not have the 2019 data for this report, however it is possible to have this data produced now. **Mr. Arkolakis** also noted that **Mr. Gomez’s** presentation was very passionate and that we have to work with the administration to fix the problems. **Mr. Gomez** asked how the data was presented and if it was more granular than the report used. **Casey Dunn**, a member of CESOF, said the data that was used was not at the level of granularity that **Mr. Gomez** would like to see. **Gerald Jaynes** noted that looking at **Mr. Gomez’s** charts, a reasonable hypothesis to make is that Yale, specifically compared to our peers, overreacted to the great recession (downward spiral began in 2008/9/10) and that makes it systemic rather than because of our current administration, to the way Yale’s budgetary decisions get made, noting that the same thing happened in 1989 when there was an overreaction to the October 1989 Black Friday Stock Market crash, and at that time a faculty committee was formed that ultimately stopped any overreaction. **Meg Urry** stated what she termed “the obvious” saying that Yale speaks with two voices. – one when we talk about academic quality and that we need to be the best, we need to be one of the top universities in the world. She said that when we talk about other things – including faculty compensation, competitiveness, etc., the standard has dropped to being no worse than our peers, and it seems that the goal is to raise salaries so that we are no worse than our peers. First, she noted, the salary gap leaves a big hole that it appears no one is talking about fixing. Two, shouldn’t we be the University that people are desperate to come work at, that people are fighting to get a job at Yale because it is great and because faculty are rewarded for their quality and effort? **Mr. Van Tassel** asked CESOF committee members if they have interacted with people at other universities, and if so, do they feel that they are underpaid or are they satisfied with their salaries? **Mr. Dunn** noted that CESOF does not interface with other university committees. **Ms. Landemore** wonders if we can connect the salary gaps for faculty to administrative growth. **Mr. Van Tassel** asked if anyone knows if there are any surveys going on at Yale to study the economic status of say, students or staff. **Greta LaFleur** noted that she believes there is a group for graduate students that are doing similar work. **Mr. Arkolakis** asked who will be following up with the administration on how they go forward

with the current CESOF Report and its findings. **Mr. Van Tassel** said that the FAS-SEAS Senate will follow up closely with the administration including the administration's response.

**Mr. Van Tassel** introduced the final topic on the agenda which is the Governance Committee's report on administrative growth with **Mr. Jaynes** giving an update on the process. **Mr. Jaynes** announced that the committee's report will be presented at the FAS-SEAS Senate meeting in March 2023. He reported that the committee has met 5-6 times this year and has worked exclusively on this report which is an assessment of administrative growth at Yale and the effects that it may be having on the various aspects of FAS and SEAS. He mentioned that there were two reports done last year with a similar question that were tabled because they did not agree with one another, and a decision was made not to issue either one of the reports and to first, take a fresh look of what the Senate had asked the committee to do. He said the committee spent two meetings talking about the charge that the committee was given and then fashioning that charge in a way that we could actually do it. We began by inviting two of the people who spent a lot of time crafting the reports from last year – **Valerie Horsley** and **Nicholas Christakis** – who played important roles in the methodology and data that was generated in the two reports. We as a committee wrote up a charge and made an outline of what the (new) report would cover. Rather than have a couple of people working on the report, and to avoid some of the problems that arose last year, all committee members are part of the process of crafting this report so that when we have a completed report, we will have the approval of all committee members. He said the committee is attempting to review both reports from last year and take what was useful from them and formulate a report using this useful information. One of the key elements of the new report will be that the university had not been transparent with respect to administrative growth over the last decade and a half, and that transparency is needed. And also, he said, that there needs to be more faculty input in decision-making processes with respect to important changes in reorganization of administrative offices and creation of high-ranking administrators (such as vice presidents). He said that the committee thinks it possible to synthesize the two reports and incorporate additional data that has been given to us from the Provost's Office, to provide a report in March that will give us a much firmer grasp and understanding of how administrative offices and officers have grown over the decade and a half, and we will attempt to tie that to various aspects of concern to the university. He mentioned that we won't be able to make a definitive causal analysis of whether or not growth of the administration has had an impact on the salary decline with peers that we discussed. This will require a different kind of analysis and data. **Mr. Van Tassel** made note that the two reports that **Mr. Jaynes** referred to are actually draft reports and not finished reports. He also asked if the committee is getting all the data that it needs. **Mr. Jaynes** said that they are continuing to receive data and getting more cooperation from the Provost Office in getting data that was not happening in the past. **Mr. Gomez** mentioned that the reason for last year's conflict on both reports was that each report used different data, and he asked what data is being used for this new report. **Mr. Jaynes** replied that the committee is looking at the strengths and weaknesses of the two sets of data used last year, and is trying to take the data in each report where its strengths are obvious and apply it to the questions we are asking, and is trying to avoid the more egregious weaknesses in that data.

**Mr. Van Tassel** adjourned the FAS-SEAS Senate meeting at 5:15 PM, extended holiday greetings to all, and invited in-person participants to a holiday reception.