

FAS Senate

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

Minutes for the FAS Senate Meeting

Thursday, January 19, 2017

HGS 211, 322 York Street

APPROVED

In attendance: Chair Emily Greenwood, Deputy Chair/Secretary Doug Rogers, Jill Campbell, Beverly Gage, John Geanakoplos, Shiri Goren, John Harris, Ruth Koizim, Christina Kraus, Kathryn Lofton (arrived at 4:30 PM), Reina Maruyama, Mark Mooseker, Yair Minsky, William Nordhaus, William Rankin, Charles Schmuttenmaer, Ian Shapiro, Katie Trumpener, Karen Wynn

Absent: David Bercovici, Matthew Jacobson, Vesla Weaver

Invited speakers: Provost Ben Polak, Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Stephen Murphy

Guests: Julia Adams, Jeff Alexander, Steven Berry, Ronald Breaker, Richard Bibescas, Enrique De La Cruz, Stan Eisenstat, Donald Engelman, Tamar Gendler, Alan Gerber, Karsten Heeger, Valerie Horsley, Charles Musser, Dragomir Radev, Joel Rosenbaum, Christian Schlieker, Constance Sherak, David Skelly, Bethany Zemba

Faculty of Arts and Sciences Senate (FASS) Chair, Emily Greenwood, called the meeting to order at 4 PM. Ms. Greenwood announced that the FASS will sponsor a special presentation by Susan Gibbons, University Librarian and Deputy Provost for Libraries and Scholarly Communication, on Thursday, January 26, 2017. She noted that this presentation comes out of the work of an informal working group of FASS members that formed in response to faculty questions about the future of the Bass Library, including discussion of a substantial relocation of its collections. She said that the group met with Susan Gibbons in the summer (2016) asking for information and passing on the concerns raised by faculty about how the University Library systems cater for research and teaching needs. Ms. Greenwood also addressed a message that circulated among faculty before the winter break about the question of travel to Syria and countries that are under international sanction. She said that she received six messages from members of FAS who asked her, as chair of the FASS, to contact the General Counsel's Office and ask for clarification on what the legal situation is and what guidelines are available for faculty. Ms. Greenwood received a reply from the General Counsel's Office and will circulate this response to the FAS faculty who contacted her. Ms. Greenwood gave an update on a meeting that she and Doug Rogers had on December 13, 2016 with representatives of the student group Students Unite Now, who represent concerns about the student income contribution and who advocate elimination of the student income contribution. She said that she and Mr. Rogers were clear that they were there as concerned faculty and not representing the FASS, and that they would listen to the students' concerns and relay them back to the FASS. She reported that the information they heard was mostly from students whose family income was less than \$65,000 annually, and for whom working to fulfill their year-round student income contributions takes a toll on their studies and their ability to thrive at Yale, creating a two-tier student experience. They wanted faculty to know the challenges that they face. They also wanted to find out what faculty know and think about this. Ms. Greenwood said that, in an unrelated development, shortly after they met with Students Unite Now, the University announced a new \$2,000 start-up fund for

students whose parents' income is less than \$65,000, a \$600 annual allowance in subsequent years, and a reduced summer income contribution. She said that she mentioned to the students that faculty are concerned about student welfare and about unintentional ways in which the demands of the student income contribution might undermine their academic work. She asked interested senators to contact her to discuss working with SUN representatives to identify areas of common concern.

Ms. Greenwood presented the minutes from the December 8, 2016 FASS meeting and asked for questions, comments, or changes from the floor. There were none. William Rankin motioned to accept the minutes as presented. Yair Minsky seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the minutes from the FASS December 8, 2016 meeting were unanimously accepted.

Ms. Greenwood called on committee chairs to give brief reports. She spoke on the Committee on Yale Committees and reported that the committee received a request for nominations for members of the Advisory Committee for the Search for the Yale College Dean, and that the committee, after consulting with the FASS Executive Council (EC), forwarded a list of their recommendations.

Ms. Greenwood called on Ruth Koizim to report on the Committee on Yale College Expansion. Ms. Koizim reported that she and Kathryn Lofton are going to meet with Paul McKinley (Director of Strategic Communications for Yale College) for an update concerning the status of the new colleges' website, and any other information on planning that is available. She said she was able to get a list of all of the committees that are working on Yale College expansion that includes their members and affiliations, and that this list is posted on the FASS web site (on the Committee on Yale College Expansion page).

Ms. Greenwood called on William Nordhaus to report on the Committee on Budget and Finance. Mr. Nordhaus noted that the Budget Transparency Report was approved by the FASS at the December 8, 2016 meeting. It was widely distributed and featured in the *Yale Daily News*, which gave a summary of the report and reactions from different people. He said he plans to distribute the report more broadly within the University and to members of the Yale Corporation in the next month. He noted that he feels that the Senate's voice has been heard and that there will be some progress made in the future. He reported that the Committee on Budget and Finance has created a sub-committee, the Sub-Committee on FAS Governance - to be chaired by Ian Shapiro. Mr. Nordhaus asked Mr. Shapiro to describe the sub-committee's charge. Mr. Shapiro said that this is a sub-committee of the Budget and Finance Committee and its members are Mr. Nordhaus, Beverly Gage, and Ramamurti Shankar, who is not a member of the FASS, however his membership on the committee is in keeping with the practice of co-opting faculty expertise outside the FASS on sub-committees. Mr. Shapiro shared the committee's charge as follows:

The Sub-Committee on FAS Governance is charged to evaluate the recent changes in the governance of the university with particular attention to their impact on the FAS. The sub-committee should explore how arts and sciences are managed and financed at other major research universities in order to inform the FASS about alternative organizational structures and budget processes. The committee should explore how well the changes in recent years are serving the health and excellence of the FAS and recommend changes if any are deemed warranted.

Mr. Shapiro added that this committee has nothing to report to date.

Ms. Greenwood called on Jill Campbell to report on the Peer Advisory Committee. Ms. Campbell said that there was nothing new to report.

Ms. Greenwood called on Yair Minsky to report on the Faculty Advancement Committee. Mr. Minsky said that the committee has been working on a faculty survey which is on the agenda for this meeting. The committee is beginning a discussion with the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Tenure and Appointments Policy (FASTAP) implementation committee and will be paying attention to that committee's progress.

Ms. Greenwood called on Charles Schmuttenmaer to report on the Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity and Inclusivity. Mr. Schmuttenmaer said there was nothing new to report from this committee and reminded the audience that Richard Bibescus, Deputy Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity, will be addressing the FASS at its meeting on March 9, 2017.

Ms. Greenwood called on Shiri Goren to report on the Committee on the Status, Pay and Conditions of Non-Ladder Faculty in FAS. Ms. Goren said that this committee, comprised of four Senators and three outside non-ladder faculty from different divisions, has met several times and is working on a report, scheduled to be submitted around April, and a survey that will go out to the entire body of non-ladder faculty in early February. She said the survey has gone through several drafts and that the committee is now meeting with the administration to see if they have other perspectives or points of view to add before the survey is distributed. Ms. Goren asked anyone who wishes to review the survey to e-mail her and she will be happy to share it with them.

Ms. Greenwood moved to a discussion on defending academic freedom and the role of universities in the current political climate. She noted that at the December 8, 2016 FASS meeting, it was debated whether the FASS would issue a resolution regarding these issues and that after reflection and consultation, it was decided that it might be more meaningful to devote the February 16, 2017 FASS meeting to a panel presentation on issues of academic freedom, defending the role of universities, and analyzing and critiquing anti-intellectualism. She said that panel speakers will be invited after receiving suggestions from FASS members. Ms. Greenwood asked William Rankin to give an update on a group from Yale who have been thinking collectively about what Yale can do to try to address and ameliorate divides and sources of inequality in local communities that have become particularly evident in the wake of the election in November.

Mr. Rankin noted that he, David Bercovici and Matthew Jacobson have looked into the number of initiatives that have formed. One, he noted, was meeting with members of New Haven Promise, an organization that helps New Haven residents gain access to college, and that they are now thinking of how to move forward and possibly engage other communities to come to Yale and share their needs involving different kinds of communities in different regions of the state. He said that they are thinking of other ideas and asked the audience to share ideas that they may have with him, Mr. Bercovici, or Mr. Jacobson.

Ms. Greenwood noted another matter that arose out of discussions at the December 8, 2016 FASS meeting on the question of University protocols when faculty are harassed or directly threatened by individuals or members of political organizations as a result of their work. She said that the EC took this question to a meeting with President Salovey and the FAS Dean and asked Dean Gandler to speak on this subject.

Dean Gandler said that after the meeting with the EC and President Salovey, she met with the President's special assistant, Joy McGrath, and they both agreed that this is a campus-wide concern. She said that Ms. McGrath has taken on this project and will report her findings to Dean Gandler who hopes

to have an update to present at the next FASS meeting in February, 2017.

Ms. Greenwood introduced Yair Minsky to give an update on the Faculty Advancement Committee's progress with drafting a survey for faculty to respond to issues pertaining to faculty excellence. Mr. Minsky distributed a copy of the most recent draft of the survey. He said that the Faculty Advancement Committee consulted with the FASS on how this survey should go, and explained that there are two types of surveys –qualitative surveys where you ask open-ended questions and people give their own answers, and quantitative surveys where questions have concrete options for people to check boxes. He noted that after deliberation, the Faculty Advancement Committee settled on the second option – a more quantitative survey, and Mr. Minsky asked people to review the draft and offer comments and suggestions. He said the primary objective for conducting this survey is to map out peoples' perceptions of faculty excellence, what they look like, how they vary across divisions and ranks and how they interact with each other. He said the expectation is that we will learn something that we did not expect, and that the free response sections will identify new ideas, strategies, and new visions for what the University should be doing. He noted that the first section of the survey collects technical information about respondents, and that one difficulty the committee has is deciding on how much to ask about the respondent – if we ask for too much information, this may identify the respondent and people may be reluctant to take part in the survey. He said that the second section is designed to find out where the respondent's own department or field stands, and the next block is about the research environment. He noted that the committee tried to incorporate free response boxes throughout the survey for people who have more to say. He said that there is a section about non-tenured faculty where there could have been more questions asked, and the last section is about recruitment and how people feel about the university's effectiveness in recruiting faculty. Mr. Minsky welcomed questions from the floor. Mr. Rankin noted that the committee is mindful that the President and Deans have set up an e-mail system where they receive feedback from faculty, and the committee wanted to create a survey that will capture a different type of information. Ms. Koizim, speaking as a non-ladder faculty member, said that most of the questions on the survey are exclusionary for non-ladder faculty. Mr. Minsky noted her concern and said that the committee is still working on a way to rectify this. Ms. Goren agreed with Ms. Koizim's concerns and said that the committee is aware of them and is still having conversations on how to handle these issues. John Harris said that, in general, it is a good survey, however he asked how the committee decided not to identify departments. Mr. Minsky said that the committee was concerned about people in small departments being able to be identified, however, he said, it may be a good idea to have departments identified by name and to find a way to assure respondents that their responses will be held confidential. Mr. Harris said that it depends on what kind of information the committee wants to get from the survey that would affect the questions and the wording and the information asked about the respondents and their division and/or department. Beverly Gage suggested creating questions that would ask how one views their level of engagement and participation in their department as another level of information. Mr. Nordhaus said if he were designing the survey, he would ask what are the key things we want to ask and how to get a good representative sample. Also, he said, one of the questions he found most useful was how people experience their own research environment. John Geanakoplos noted input from this audience is very valuable in revising and finalizing the survey. His view is that the more provocative we are in uncovering problems, the better the committee's report will be. He also would like a question asking if the faculty know how admissions are structured and run, and if faculty would like to have a role in this process. He believes that we still have great ambiguity about what our tenure standard is and said the Handbook is not very clear on this and input from faculty would help. He pointed to the issue of the number of graduate students and the financial burden they put on the University which also has a huge effect on the research and excellence of the faculty, and he said it would be helpful to get individual views on this topic. Mr. Geanakoplos said that if anyone had

ideas on questions that would address these three areas, he would be grateful to hear them. Doug Rogers mentioned that some of the answers to questions on the survey would differ according to gender or race and asked if this has been taken into consideration, noting that this has been a topic of discussion among members of the FASS since its founding. Mr. Minsky said he disagrees with the suggestion to ask respondents for gender identification. Mr. Rogers asked that the full committee discuss this issue in revising the survey and expressed confidence that they would come to a good resolution. Ms. Greenwood noted that people will be sending their comments to Mr. Minsky and his committee. Richard Bribiescas commented that since this is a survey on faculty excellence, he was surprised to see that there is no mention of diversity or inclusion or climate, and he strongly suggested that these areas be included in some way in the survey. Jeffrey Alexander noted that there are questions relating to hiring but not about leaving, and he encouraged the committee to incorporate this into the survey. He also noted that the problem with these surveys is that they must be representative samples, and if this survey is to be a collective representation of these views speaking on behalf of the faculty, there need to be some sampling procedures or a way of claiming that this is a representative rather than selective sampling. He said he hopes that the committee considers how to do this. Alan Gerber asked if the committee plans to pilot the survey, and Mr. Minsky said that they plan to. Mr. Gerber also said that using the demographic information that Mr. Rogers spoke about could give you different ways of using the data. He mentioned that a third of the faculty in Political Science spend a great percentage of their professional time designing and analyzing surveys and that it might be useful to reach out to some of them to see if they are interested in helping, or in taking a look at the survey and offer comments on what he called "the remarkable work that the committee has already done."

Ms. Greenwood thanked everyone for sharing their comments and ideas on the survey. She introduced Provost Ben Polak and Vice President of Finance and Administration Stephen Murphy to present a discussion of Academic Priorities and Long-Term Planning. She noted that the EC is working on a plan to meet with the Provost, the Vice President of Finance, and other members of the Provost's Office on a more regular basis to talk about their perspectives and input into key decision-making. She also said that she is very grateful to the Provost's Office for their engagement since the FASS produced their frank report on budget transparency.

Provost Ben Polak began by saying that he wears two hats as Provost – one as the chief budget officer and one as the chief academic officer of the University. He noted that President Salovey presented his vision of faculty excellence at the University and the Provost's job is to implement that vision. Provost Polak said he will focus in today's session on science and the humanities at Yale, and that he believes that the mission of the University is to support research and teaching. He said the university is an intellectual community that is more than the sum of its parts, and he finds that Yale brings research and teaching together in a unique and special way. He deeply believes in this model. He spoke about the intellectual community at Yale and how much he benefits from being around experts in fields other than his own. He said that in our country today we are seeing attacks on the very notion of intellectual expertise, the very notion of knowledge of facts and of truth. This is a problem for us as a university because we are defined by our commitment to knowledge and truth. He said that we have to speak the truth about issues like climate change, and we have to speak the truth and speak for truth in general. Universities are not about political advocacy, but if truth is going to be politicized, then we are going to have to be political and we cannot back away from that.

Provost Polack then spoke about President Salovey's upcoming prioritization of science at Yale, noting that we will have a big push over the next two decades to improve science. He emphasized that having a push in the sciences does not threaten strength in other areas, and he believes that stronger science at

Yale will strengthen the whole of Yale – it will strengthen the humanities and social sciences and the arts. Yale has underinvested in science probably since the 1950's and been playing catch-up ever since. Science and technology are hugely important to the world: science changes lives, improves lives, and saves lives. Science is advancing at a tremendous pace and Yale must not be a bystander given its mission to discover truth. He said that there will be a university-wide committee formed that will work on this initiative and that it will incorporate faculty expertise. He noted that this initiative will take an enormous amount of money because science is expensive. More than money, it will take resolve and determination. He recalled President Richard Levin's term as President of Yale and its focus on internationalization, saying that raising the level of science at Yale will require the same level of determination as President Levin devoted to internationalization. He noted that we have advantages already with the great scientists who are already at Yale and the proximity of our medical school. He mentioned that there have been huge steps taken on Science Hill and that there is a big project already taking place with the new science building. More projects will be coming.

He then turned to the humanities noting that the humanities are in a different situation at Yale because science is university-wide and the humanities are mostly contained within the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS). Most of the efforts in planning for the humanities take place within the FAS and are therefore led by FAS Dean Tamar Gendler. He reminded Senators of the project to renovate the former Hall of Graduate Studies (HGS) and turn it into a home for the humanities. This is probably the biggest humanities initiative in the world and is certainly the biggest investment in the humanities at Yale in the last 50 years. This project goes beyond programs and the building: it makes a statement that the humanities are a critical part of a great university and a critical part of a liberal arts education. Several humanities departments will have space in the building, which will encourage faculty from various disciplines to interact with each other. He also affirmed that the university is not interested in merging or dissolving departments. He noted that the committee that will be formed to work on the sciences is going to be university-wide, and the committee that is working on the humanities is already underway and has been meeting over the last two years. Provost Polak opened the floor for questions.

Karen Wynn asked what the scope of the financial commitment will be from Yale to the sciences over the next one to two decades, and where it will come from. Provost Polak said that the scope is in the billions and he does not want the science community to be constrained by thinking about the budget. He would like people to think big and not be worried about funding at this stage. He said that money will need to be raised largely through gifts and other fundraising, as well as seeing if we can find internal resources and set money aside for this project. Federal grants and looking to corporations and industry, when appropriate, will also be important. He commented that he does not know for certain where the funding will come from at this stage.

Katie Trumpener talked about the humanities and said that she thinks it is going to be great to have the new building. However, she noted the need for more attention to other aspects of humanities research and teaching that, in her view, are not going well. These include: poor efforts to publicize humanities research; apparent plans to dismantle the undergraduate library; small indignities that departments suffered during the period of austerity (such as Classics Department students who should have received endowed money which in the past helped them become archeologists); the apparent failure of the admissions office to seek out or recruit humanities students; threats to small classes in which faculty work very carefully with students; and the assignment of Teaching Fellows to courses in which they have little or no expertise. She noted that these are all small things that continue to go on that are as important as having this new building. Provost Polak responded to Ms. Trumpener's concerns by noting that he agrees and is sympathetic to the fact that detail matters and says that these matters fall under

the FAS Dean's and Yale College Dean's Offices. He noted that, with the matter of publicity, there is a new person running that area who has only been in this position for a short time. Things have already begun to improve in this area. He also mentioned the issue of small classes and agrees on the advantages of these in certain cases, however he also said that there is an importance for big classes especially for first-year students. Sometimes a great introduction is a big class that gives them an excitement – a thrill – and he feels that there are roles for both small and big classes. He noted that there is going to be a really large auditorium in the new building on Science Hill where there will be large classes held.

John Harris said it was refreshing to hear the Provost's view on these matters. Mr. Harris said that what he has seen since the science initiative was announced are worries among humanities and social sciences. He has also noticed some worry within FAS from the scientists about the amount of the initiative that will be directed to the Medical School. He said, that Yale's initiative for the sciences is an even larger one than he had envisioned and that it will involve, in his view, at least \$5 billion. He also feels that it would be great, looking into the future, to make a commitment towards medical research, spinoffs, and companies, as some other research-oriented universities do. This kind of initiative would help attract medical researchers and scientists and benefit all. Provost Polak commented that just recently there was a fund started to address some of these concerns that will include medical research, life sciences, and Science Hill concerns. It was started with a small gift (\$10 million). He mentioned that the Medical School is funded in a very different way – roughly 45% comes from the clinical revenue and then NIH grants at 30%. It has its own endowment, so that the economics of medical schools in general are different than in the FAS. And so, he said, we need take advantage of the ways in which all of Yale's sciences come together.

Joel Rosenbaum said that he thinks that the Provost's intentions are good in building the sciences, but the focus should be on the best people rather than buildings. Many top scientists have departed in the last 10 years largely due to economic considerations: they want good labs, they want good support when their grants stop, they want money to keep them going until they get more grants, they want good salaries, and in some cases, they want good jobs for their spouses. He said that putting up a brand new building is not going to bring Yale up from its current position in world research science, but bringing in good scientists will. Provost Polak agreed with Mr. Rosenbaum that people are more important than the bricks and mortar and equipment, not just in science, but in general. He noted that new science buildings will not be the whole solution, but are a necessary step in the right direction.

David Skelly commented that he agreed with Mr. Harris's assessment of how much it is going to cost over the decades to support the science initiative – in the billions of dollars. It has been his experience that it is possible to find donors and get them on board with a vision of emphasizing the liberal arts model in a way that our peers do not. He said that he also agrees with the comments about people and infrastructure and that we need to do some careful thinking about the programs and the courses, and it is nice to be able to think about our aspirations after going through a period of constraints since 2009.

Ms. Goren said it is inspiring to hear the Provost talk about research and teaching but it's important to note that quite a lot of the teaching at Yale, from small labs to language classes to really big statistics classes of several hundred students, is being done by non-ladder faculty. Their teaching is excellent and innovative, and in fact several of the non-ladder faculty at Yale are considered leading figures in the field of pedagogy in the United States. With that, she said, when we look at salaries, it is unbelievable to see how low are salaries earned by faculty who teach here every day, in comparison to our peer's institution. She also said that in the past few years, the roles and the work done by non-ladder faculty

has increased and spread dramatically – service, advising, mentoring, to name just a few areas. She asked how the Provost envisions the role of non-ladder faculty in this formula of “research and teaching.”

Provost Polak then took a comment from Scott Miller from the Chemistry Department, who said that he is excited about the plans, and that the most profound part of what has been shared with us is that the planning process is about to begin. He hopes this process will engage the community in a forward-looking way, bring insight from disciplinary expertise from interdisciplinary communities, and bring people from the Medical School and FAS together in ways that have been done ad hoc in the past.

Jill Campbell pointed out that there will have to be budget transparency for the faculty to be able to truly participate in this initiative. She said that it is inspiring to hear the belief that the University has to be a center for study of all kinds. But there will be trade-offs: resources will be going in one place rather than another, but if we as faculty do not have access in knowing what the priorities are and what the trade-offs are, then the faculty cannot really participate in this process of thinking about keeping people, supporting infrastructure, and making Yale a great university across humanities, social sciences and sciences. She wants to reinforce that the work that the budget committee has been pressing on is essential to this exciting prospect. She also said that she was disappointed in the view of the humanities that the Provost presented in his opening remarks because she believes that the humanities also improve lives and in fact save lives. She wants to hear that there is a vision for the humanities that goes beyond the wonderful building that is being created. Provost Polak commented that he agreed with Ms. Campbell’s assessment that the humanities does save lives, and he thinks that buildings are not just about bricks and mortar but about how they are used so that Yale faculty and students can do great work.

In responding to Scott Miller’s comments, Provost Polak said that this endeavor will be hard and will take a lot of time and resolve to complete. In response to Ms. Goren’s question, he said that he did not mean to say that non-ladder teaching is not important. To the contrary, he appreciates the enormous amount of work that the non-ladder faculty do at Yale. He pointed out the actual detail of who teaches what is not held in the Provost’s Office – it is within Yale College and in departments and with FAS deans.

Ms. Greenwood thanked Provost Polak for his presentation. She noted that as chair of the FASS she is encouraged by the responsiveness over the last year from the FAS Dean’s office and believes that things are definitely changing. She asked the Provost about the interaction and communication between his office and the FAS Dean’s Office. She noted that the FAS Dean’s office is reintroducing departmental reviews, which have not taken place for a long time, so one suggestion would be to ask departments to begin drawing up their academic priorities at a departmental level, rather than relying on committees representing entire divisions to know what these needs are. It would be great if there were a mechanism to send departmental wish lists to the Dean’s Office or Provost’s Office and see what resources it would take to realize these needs. The Provost responded that this is something for Dean Gendler to work on, and he thinks that it is good to dream big and to prioritize, even though Yale will face budget difficulties throughout this process. He also commented that he works closely with the FAS Dean’s Office and spends more time with the FAS Dean than most of the other deans. FAS Dean Tamar Gendler commented that she agrees with the Provost and that one of the things to recognize is that Yale made a larger change in governance structure than had been made in 75 years. There are a lot of things that have not yet been fully worked out, however there are an extraordinary number of things that have been worked out. She concluded that the FAS should be grateful to have a Provost who is so deeply

supportive of the mission and vision of the FAS.

Ms. Greenwood adjourned the meeting at 6:12 PM.